OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

9-10 EDWARD VII., 1909-10

VOL. XCV

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



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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 22, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIAL.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE, in the absence of the chairman, Mr. Geoffrion, presented the second report of the special committee on the Lumsden charges, as follows:

The Special Committee appointed to investigate charges and allegations made by Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden regarding a portion of the engineering staff of the Transcontinental railway beg leave to present the following as their second report: Your committee recommend that the proceedings and evidence taken by the committee be printed from day to day for the use of the committee, and that rule 72 be suspended in reference thereto.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice that the report recommends the printing of the evidence for the use of the committee. The members of the House are all deeply interested in this, and I think a sufficient number of copies should be printed to give every member a fair supply.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it understood that a larger number will be printed, because I think it would be very desirable? Every member should be given an opportunity of examining the evidence before the committee has made its report to the House, so that he will be in a better position to deal with it when it reaches the House. I would move that the motion be amended to that effect.

Mr. FIELDING. Although the motion reads that the report be printed for the use of the committee, it invariably happens that there is a somewhat larger number available, and I have no doubt that if any hon. member desires the report he will be able to obtain it. Of course, it does not come to the House until the committee has reported, but I think there will be no difficulty in any hon. gentleman obtaining a sufficient number of copies through the committee.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. GERMAN. I have a notice on the order paper which is No. 15 among the notices of motion. It would necessarily have to come up on private member's day, but as there will be no more private members' days, I beg leave to withdraw the motion as I wish to bring it up in another form.

Motion withdrawn.

COMMANDER WAKEHAM'S REPORT ON LOBSTER INDUSTRY.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved that the fifth report of the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries be now concurred in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the report?

Mr. SINCLAIR. During the recess Commander Wakeham, an officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, was appointed to take evidence with reference to the lobster industry. He completed his work and brought in his report recommending certain changes in the fishery law. These recommendations have been referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. The committee recommend that a thousand copies of Commander Wakeham's report be printed.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR PAPERS, &c.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to answer a question which was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). He made an inquiry as to a return which was moved for at the last session of parliament with regard to the dredges which are owned by the government and their operation for the last four years. The return has been prepared and has left my department, in the ordinary course to go to the Department of the Secretary of State, and I presume that within a day or two it will be ready for submission to the House.

The hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) asked a question regarding the Sault Ste. Marie dry dock, a question which I am bound to say was unusual, I would not like to say offensive, because if it is offensive, it probably was unconsciously so on my hon. friend's part. He asked if a statement I made with rgard to the action of the government in reference to the Sault Ste. Marie dry dock was true, and he referred to some statement contained in a newspaper that an order in council had been passed deciding to grant assistance to the dry dock. I may say to my hon. friend that I have nothing to add to or take from what I said previously. The formal application has not yet come before the government; it will not come before council until the report of the engineer is ready and no order has been passed and no action taken with regard to the subsidy to this dock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether or not there are to be any supplementary estimates, and, if so, when it is likely they will be brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. The supplementary estimates for the current year are being prepared at this moment. As to the supplementaries for the coming year, I am not in a position at the present to answer my hon. friend's question. It would be some little time before they could be brought down if there are to be any. The supplementaries for the current year will be brought down at an early day.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the Naval Service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Mr. Speaker, I had the honour last evening of occupying the time of the House for a few minutes with the discussion of this question, and I think I can promise the House that I shall not occupy very much time this afternoon. But, coming from a maritime district, as I do, in fact, coming from the farthest western constituency in Canada, I think it is incumbent on me as a member for that particular district, to have a view on this question and to be prepared to put that view before this House. Last night I made some reference to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), who preceded me, and I wish to make further reference to one or two things to which that gentleman attached great importance in connection with the policy of the government, which is now before the House. I wish to make a very important and very necessary correction to one argument advanced by my hon. friend last evening. He stated that perhaps the most mischievous and most insidious feature of the government Bill was an attempt, a veiled and unpatriotic attempt, to change the relations of Canada to the motherland. By section 15 of the British North America Act the Commander in Chief of all the armed forces in Canada is declared to continue to be vested in the Crown, and my hon. friend went on to explain that in his opinion the constitution of this country, section 15 of the British North America Act, was very seriously interfered with, and that the policy of the government presented to the House and to the country made no provision for retaining the authority of the Crown with regard to the operation of the naval or land forces of the empire or of Canada. My hon. friend, by this argument, simply announced to the House that he had not read the Bill before the House, for section 4 of the Bill provides exactly according to the terms and the very words of section 15 of the British North America Act. I shall read the two sections, as I did last evening, in my hon. friend's absence, because he attached such supreme importance to the position that he was taking. As a matter of fact, it appeared to those of us who listened to my hon. friend as if he had made a very important discovery. This matter had not been mentioned by any of the leading members of the opposition, and it did really appear from the attitude of my hon. friend that he had a very important discovery, and that the government, in providing for this policy, was actually destroying the constitution of Canada, and forever interfering with the harmony that ought to exist between Canada and the motherland.

The section in the British North America Act to which he referrred, reads:

> The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King.

Or in the Crown, if you like. I shall now read the section in the Bill before the House:

> The command in chief of the naval forces is vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty, or by the Governor General as His representative.

He concluded that this unconstitutional act was an evidence of the disposition of the government to bring about the breaking off of the alliance, that proper and reasonable, and staunch alliance between this country and the empire, and to lead this country out into the development of absolute independence and perhaps in the future absolute separation from the em-

pire. That is the attitude assumed by my hon. friend, and the strongest evidence which he produced that the policy before the House showed such a disposition on the part of this government was the fact that in this Bill they had failed to provide for the carrying out of the British North America Act in regard to the authority of the Crown, in the control of the naval and military forces of Britain and of this country. Thus, it is of tremendous importance that this matter should be brought to the attention of this House, and that the correction should be made.

The next point, and about the only point of attack that my hon. friend made upon the policy of the government was in relation to the fact that in time of war it was necessary for the Governor in Council of this country to give instructions as to whether or not the naval or military forces should be sent to the protection of the British empire. My hon. friend thought that was a very serious omission. I do not know exactly where he meant to place the responsibility, you have to have responsibility somewhere. But my hon. friend's argument went to show the House and the country that the leading ministers of the Liberal party were not true to the traditions of the British empire, were trying to develop an absolutely independent nationality, and his reasoning led him to the necessity of objecting to that provision in the Act, whereby it is necessary for the Governor in Council to provide that the military or naval forces of this country should be sent to the aid of the empire in case of war. I submit that the conclusion of my hon. friend was purely a political conclusion.

Mr. COWAN. Does the hon. gentleman propose to read section 4, without reading section 18, or does he read section 18 into section 4, and if the Governor can act what is the necessity of an order in council under section 18?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I am following my hon. friend's own argument. He complained last night that there was very serious danger in this country having to submit to the authority of the Governor in Council in case of hostilities occurring between Great Britain and any other nation, and he led up to that position by the announcement that he had no confidence in the leaders of this government, as he believed they tended to independence and separation. According to the conclusions of my hon. friend, he was deciding this question entirely on political grounds; because he had no confidence in the leaders of this government, he was afraid to depend upon them in such possible contingencies. I suppose my hon. friend would have no alarms at all if a Conservative government were in power. That is the answer to the whole position taken by my hon. friend. If his friends were in power, the Governor in Council would be all right and the empire would be perfectly safe. The thought struck me at the moment that even in that case my hon. friend could not be very confident, in view of the attitude of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), a very important person in the political party of my hon. friend, whom every one might reasonably expect would be a prominent member of a Conservative ministry. Therefore it struck me that my hon. friend could not entirely depend on the security of the empire even if his own friends were in power. If there is any tendency to independence on the part of any minister of the Liberal government, it has been annulled by the denunciation of British diplomacy by the leader of the Conservative party from the province of Quebec; and under these circumstances it would be unreasonable for my hon. friend from Vancouver to expect to make the empire secure by having as one of the principal ministers in a Conservative government the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. COWAN. May I ask the hon. member for Nanaimo, before he leaves the merits of the question, to answer the questions I put to him, and further to tell me what would be the result if no order in council were passed under section 18?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My answer to my hon. friend is simple. As I said, he controverted two things in the policy of the government last night. He said that the government were destroying the constitution of this country—that the authority over the forces of this country was provided in the British North America Act to be vested in the King, whereas there was no provision in the Bill of the government for such a condition? I have demonstrated to the House that in that my hon. friend is mistaken. The other position taken by my hon. friend was that if hostilities broke out between Britain and another country, it would be a serious thing to depend on the authority of the Governor in Council in this country, especially as it is constituted at the present time. Now, I am not contending against any legal interpretation that my hon. friend may put upon the Bill, now that he is in cold blood and sober senses; but I am replying to statements made by my hon. friend when he was a little excited; and if his statements cannot bear cold criticism, that is not my fault. What I am doing is criticising what my hon. friend has said, and I am doing it without prejudice and without feeling, as I have nothing but the best feeling for my hon. friend; but on an important question like this, the decision of members of this

House ought to be based on argument, not on excitement or emotion.

My hon. friend made a great deal of a statement of the premier in his address, which he repeated to the very great amusement of hon. gentlemen opposite. That was why I put myself out of order by making the remark I did. My hon. friend sought to contribute to the amusement of his friends in the House by trying to show how ridiculous was the simple statement of the premier that when Britain was at war, Canada was at war, and if Britain was at war Canada might not be at war. Now, Sir, the amusing thing to me was that a man would demonstrate the simplicity, and, if my hon. friend will excuse me, the vanity, of thinking that he could amuse or please his friends by a simple repetition of phrases. My hon. friend never attempted to analyse the statement of the premier. It never occurred to him that after all there might be something in that statement. When the premier made that statement, as a plain man, deducing plain facts from simple arguments, it was very easy for me at least to see that Britain might be at war without any necessity for Canada being at war. It does not follow that Britain may not in very many instances be engaged in hostilities at different parts of the empire, none of which would be sufficently important to necessitate calling in the aid of this country; and if I can understand the deductions of common sense, that is exactly what the premier meant by the statement he made.

Now, I want to ask the House to bear with me for a few minutes while I discuss the three principles which are before the House. We are called upon as members of this House to vote for one of three things; first, the policy of the government; second, the policy of the leader of the opposition; third the policy of the member for Jacues Cartier. What were the circumstances that gave rise to the consideration of this question? How is it that suddenly, within a year, we are called upon to consider and determine the question of providing in this country for naval protection involving millions of dollars of expenditure? The condition arose from the fact that a year ago some strange emotion and excitement took possession of certain gentlemen in the old country and spread to kindred political spirits in this country, and that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), becoming suddenly alarmed for the safety and security of the empire, brought up a motion in this House for the discussion of this question. As the result of that discussion, the right hon. the Prime Minister proposed to amend the motion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition made an arrangement, with the consent of his friends, whereby whatever resolution might be adopted at that particular time, should express the unanimous feeling of both sides of the House. That, in my opinion, was an ideal condition for the consideration of a question of this importance affecting this country and the empire at large. The proposal suggested by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) was amended by the right hon. the leader of the government and again amended by a change suggested by the hon. the leader of the opposition, and the proposition in its final shape was unanimously agreed to. Where was the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) at that particular moment? In view of the position he has since taken, in the discussion on this Bill, what excuse has he to offer for his inertness and inaction on that occasion? He had nothing to say a year ago when this resolution was unanimously adopted, but no sooner did this government commit itself to a proposal to do something to strengthen the naval forces of the empire than the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) declares that he never believed there was anything in this excitement regarding the naval forces of Great Britain, that it was purely fictitious and had spread from the old country to Canada. But if that were his conviction, when was the proper time for him to have expressed it? I submit that it was when the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) submitted his resolution when that resolution was being discussed in this House; but the hon. gentleman, instead of doing this, left his seat and went out of the House and abandoned his duty, and he did this, although he was at the time convinced that an exciting condition had arisen in this country which was not based on facts. Then was the proper time for the hon. gentleman to have made the criticism which he made a year later, and in neglecting to do so, I charge him with having failed in his duty. But a year later, when this tremendous excitement was cooling off, and things were coming to a normal condition, was the time he chose to show his temper and his teeth to his own friends and dispute the methods taken by his own political colleagues, and to show his anxiety to protect the empire by an amendment asking that the whole question be submitted to the votes and opinion of the people. I could not help being reminded of the old lines:

When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he.

The time for my hon. friend to have asserted his convictions and used his influence was at the beginning of the excitement but he shirked his duty. The

occasion for him to have corrected the wrong impression was just the one when he failed to do his duty.

Just a word more about my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It is amusing to consider the position of my hon. friend in contrast with the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan). That hon. gentleman spoke for two hours last night, and during nine-tenths of that time he was facing the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. One could not help feeling that really his arguments, his influence and his declamation, were directed almost solely for the benefit of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. He kept steadily looking that hon. gentleman in the face, although using words that might, by a wave of the hand, be sent across to the government benches, still it seemed to me that the hon. gentleman was really saying: Those fellows are bad enough, but you are a long ways worse, and I consider you are really a more dangerous factor as opposed to the empire than even are hon. members opposite.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) expressed great dissatisfaction with British diplomacy. He went on to remind the House of a statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister that if the supremacy of Britain on the sea should be weakened, the strength and integrity of Canada would be jeopardized, and expressed his dissent from that proposition. Then he proceeded to depreciate British diplomacy and the effects in Canada of that diplomacy. Well, I myself, am a little jealous in favour of Britain and British diplomacy. I am myself an Englishman, just a few years in this country, but while I do not question the loyalty of Canadians to Britain, what I do say is this, that no man is in a position to doubt the wisdom of British diplomacy who refuses to spend a dollar for the protection of his own country. Britain has undoubtedly, in her diplomatic negotiations, to make compromises, but it must be remembered that she has to protect every country within the empire, and all her diplomatic resources had to be exercised in favour of the empire; and in my opinion any hon. member who—as my hon. friend did in a very bitter speech—opposes the idea of Canada making any contribution or any effort in her own defence or that of the empire is hardly in a position to question the effectiveness of British diplomacy. Great Britain has had to make the best settlements she could. She has had to give as well as take. If her diplomatists insisted on taking every time, they would have had to fight every time. They had to consider grievances; they had to give as well as take. If they took every time, they would have to fight every time. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier demands of the British diplomats only consideration of the interests of the empire on every occasion, and yet he insists that not a man and not a dollar should be contributed by Canada in the defence of this country either by land or by sea. I submit that no argument has been presented by any member of this House so politically cowardly as that of the hon member (Mr. Monk). If he was right in remembering the faults of British diplomacy he should have considered also the difficulties under which British diplomacy operated. I do not say that every negotiation in the past has been carried on to the best interests of the empire, but I do say that the men who had the responsibility of carrying on these negotiations did the best they could in the interests of the empire. And, if there is to be a reflection on British diplomacy, it ought to come from men who are willing to back up their opinions with their own serength and their own money, and not from men such as a prominent leader of a great political party who reflects upon the diplomacy of the British authorities and yet refuses to spend a dollar to protect his own rights.

Now, I dispose of the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier as being outside the practical politics of the empire. For my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has placed himself outside the empire in his discussion of this question. I come now to the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). That amendment contains two principles: First, that we should make a voluntary gift of a sufficient sum to build two Dreadnoughts, and do it immediately on the assumption that there is an immediate emergency; second, that the question of naval defence in Canada should be submitted to the consideration of the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the strongest speech that could be made against the amendment of the leader of the opposition to-day would be an accumulation of the expressions of the leader of the opposition and his friends just a year ago. Within the last few days, I have spent several hours reading these speeches, reading them in the light of the amendment which the leader of the opposition has now placed before you, and I propose to give some passages that have not been recited from the speeches of such hon. members as the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and my good friend from the city of Victoria (Mr. Barnard)—interested as he is;—and I want to select a few very short passages (for I do not like to read extracts) to show that the arguments of these gentlemen a year ago are the strongest answers that could

be offered to the present policy of the leader of the opposition in this House. If I want to find an argument in favour of a Canadian navy, I must go to the speeches of these hon. gentlemen a year ago; if I want to find an argument against making a contribution to Great Britain for Dreadnoughts or anything else, I must go to the arguments of these gentlemen a year ago. I take first the hon. member for North Toronto. As hon. members listened to his words, I ask them to keep in mind the policy of the leader of the opposition, and keep in mind also the somersault performed by the hon. member from North Toronto a few days ago in the debate on this Bill—a political somersault that, I admit, was cleverly executed; no member of the party could execute such a ''bout-face' as did my hon. friend. His contention eleven months ago was in favour of a contribution. Speaking of the thing to be considered, he said:

> The first is the policy of a fixed annual contribution in money to the British government or the British admiralty. Now, that divides itself, apparently, into two branches, but it is really the same thing. One man says: Send one million dollars or two million dollars a year; another man says: Send a Dreadnought or two Dreadnoughts, and so far as Canada is concerned, these two are absolutely one.

The present policy of the leader of the opposition is to send Dreadnoughts, but the member for North Toronto demonstrated that, so far as the principle of the thing is concerned, there is absolutely no difference to Canada.

> When we translate one contribution into Dreadnoughts it comes down in the end to money which would be sufficient to build and equip a Dreadnought. And, therefore, I say, they are both parts of the one proposition——

Now, I would like the hon. member, and especially the hon. gentleman who is to follow me in this debate to remember this:

> —an annual fixed contribution of money to the British government for the purpose of national and imperial defence.

If that statement be correct, then this House has to consider not only the proposition of the leader of the opposition for two Dreadnoughts at the present time, but the more serious contingency of a repeated contribution to the British empire which is involved in the principle necessarily and according to the hon. member for North Toronto himself. Let us get back to the foundation of this proposition. If we are not to have the establishment of a Canadian navy, if we are to remain in the empire, if we are to make the contribution this year because we have not the necessary ships within the country to help the British empire, and if, as hon. gentlemen say, we are not to have a Canadian navy, is it not logical to say that for all time to come, every time a little cry is raised, every time a possible contingency threatens in Great Britain, hon. members opposite will stand in favour of making direct contributions in cash from this country to the empire? They cannot escape the necessary conclusion. That, Sir, in my opinion, is the very weakness of their position. If the hon. gentleman had said: We will build a Canadian navy and we will make a contribution, that would have been a different proposition. But the hon. gentleman takes the position: We will not build a navy, but we will send a contribution. Sir, if you never begin to build a navy, you will never have one, and if you never have one, and remain within the empire, then you will for all time have to resort to a direct subscription of money by the people of this country.

The next proposal of the leader of the opposition is to submit the question of the establishment of a Canadian navy to the people. Well, I do not know what I would do under exactly similar circumstances as the hon. gentleman, but in contending for a principle I always try to put myself in the other fellow's place. But so far as I can see, if I had been the leader of the opposition, I would have reversed that proposition, I would have asked the people of Canada if they are willing to send a contribution of 20 or 25 millions to the empire, but I would assume that I had a mandate from the people to take proper measures to defend their trade and their coasts. As I say, my hon. friend reversed that proposition, and says: We will send away the money of this country, over which we will have no control, and we will not ask the people for permission to do so.

Mr. BURRELL. I would like to ask the hon. member if he considers there is an emergency, and if so, what does he propose to do?

Mr. R. SMITH. I intend to make my own speech in my own way, and I will answer my hon. friend on the question of an emergency before I get through. I propose to go from one point to another in logical sequence; I do not depend upon a manuscript nor read an essay like my hon. friend. I have to use the logical faculty with which I am possessed, just as necessity arises, but I try to use it in a proper way. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the opposition assumes that he has a mandate from the people to make a money contribution, but he has no mandate to build ships, and shipyards, and dockyards, and develop a naval protection for Canada. I say that my hon. friend's proposition on the face of it is contrary to the principles of responsible government, and it cannot but confuse the public mind from its con-

tradictory nature. Why, Sir, it is evident to every one that my hon. friend's resolution was conceived for the purpose of consolidating conflicting elements within his own party. One element of the opposition says we ought to send a contribution equal to the value of two Dreadnoughts to meet a crisis, and the leader of the opposition had to provide for that feeling. Another man thought it would be a foolish thing to build a navy in Canada under any circumstances, and my hon. friend had to make some provision in his policy for that feeling. A third contingent thought that before building a navy in Canada we ought to consult the electors of this country as to whether we should do it or not, and my hon. friend had to make provision for that feeling. So there are three positively divergent principles that had to be worked into one symmetrical whole, and he endeavours to combine into one party different men of all these different temperaments. And so we have the simple expedient of the hon. gentleman's resolution to combine the conflicting elements among his own followers.

Now, the proposition of giving two Dreadnoughts, or a contribution of money, to the British empire is based on the assumption that there is a crisis. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) wanted to know what I proposed to do in case of a crisis. I will ask him another question. How are we to determine whether there is a crisis or not in Britain? By what process of reasoning are the members of this House to arrive at an assurance that there is a crisis at the seat of empire? Because every member of this House will agree with me that we must not be carried away by every little wave of sentiment that comes along. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), and the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), could get up an excitement of that kind in 24 hours. Now, Sir, if it should ever happen that hon. gentlemen opposite took the reins of government in this country, and if I myself became leader of the opposition, I can imagine that these hon. gentlemen would be wanting to send Dreadnoughts every 48 hours in order to meet an imagined emergency, and I would have to oppose them.

Now, I submit that the question of whether a crisis exists is to be determined by some reasonable process. The leader of the opposition said we must determine whether there is a crisis in Britain by the statements of responsible men in England. In that I agree with my hon. friend. But can my hon. friend, or any other man of this House, conclude that there is a crisis, or a serious danger, from the statements of responsible men in England? I may be told, how is it that the Liberal government in England, for the last two years, and especially the last year, have been increasing the power of the British navy; and according to the despatches received in this country yesterday, the speech from the Throne, at the meeting of the British parliament, asks for a further increase in the provision for strengthening the navy. Well, Sir, I look upon all that as an evidence, not of a crisis, not of danger, but of a determination to secure absolute security. It is not an evidence that Britain is going to be interfered with by Germany, it is an evidence that neither Germany nor any other country will dare to interfere with the integrity of that great empire. The question as to whether there is a crisis should be decided by members of this House, in view of the policy, the statements and the actions of responsible ministers in the old country. I want to read one or two short extracts from the columns of one of the most responsible newspapers in England. As an Englishman I take a great interest in the press of that country, in the news which it publishes, and in the intelligent expression of public opinion which we may seek in its columns. Here is an article commenting on the present policy of the government, and of the leader of the opposition on the question now before the House. I think the House will agree that this is one of the most responsible newspapers published in the city of London, and the article from which I propose to quote discusses the very conditions that we are now considering to-day. The statements that this paper makes have an important bearing upon this question. Let me read the article for the benefit of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo, who is alarmed about this crisis. I know that my hon. friend will appreciate the sentiments that come from the source that I am about to mention. I refer to the London 'Spectator' for January 15, 1910, which says:

> The conviction of the indivisibility of the empire, which grows deeper and more earnest in the British dominions as time passes, and as one significant event gives place to another, was nobly expressed in the speeches of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Borden on Wednesday, when a Bill for creating a Canadian navy was introduced in the Canadian House of Commons. We have always maintained that the colonies ought not to be harassed into making contributions to the British navy; that an empire which is to have any reality cannot be maintained by pressure from the centre on the circumference, but must exist and flourish by the spontaneous desire of all the different parts to remain in a fixed relation to the mother country by accepting the implied obligations.

Let me read another passage from the same editorial:

> Last April it was reported that Victoria and New South Wales would combine to give

a Dreadnought, but upon consideration they preferred not to divert any money from their policy—which has been under consideration for a good many years—of having an Australian navy. The decision of Canada was understood also to be in favour of a local navy, but nothing definite was known till Sir Wilfrid Laurier made his statement on Wednesday. The man would be ungraceful and unromantic, indeed, who could read without pride and intense appreciation the language in which the scheme was discussed, or without feeling convinced that, whatever vicissitudes may follow, a movement has been begun which is bound to go on from strength to strength. . . . It is quite impossible now that there should be any return on the part of Great Britain to the principle adopted by the Imperial Defence Committee in 1906. The Imperial Defence Committee then disapproved of the Australian proposal to maintain a local navy. It acted on the advice of the admiralty, which was to the effect that an efficient navy is one and indivisible, that small local navies with independent characteristics could not be readily absorbed into the Royal navy in an emergency, and that the best assistance which the dominions could give to the mother country would be regular contributions of money. Canada and Australia, in their different degrees, have rejected that advice; and though we quite see the logic of the admiralty point of view, we think on the whole that Canada and Australia have decided wisely. There are two chief objections to the policy of naval tributes. One is that the British tax-payer would be tempted to regard them as made in relief of his own pocket.

My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo can appreciate that statement.

He would forget that the co-operation of the colonies in naval defence is intended to make assurance doubly sure. The other is that the colonists themselves would take infinitely less interest in imperial defence if they simply put down sums of money to be spent invisibly in Great Britain, instead of having navies of their own taking shape under their eyes, manned by their own people, and perhaps built in their own yards.

I submit that as the soundest, the most intelligent and the most independent advice that has been given by any newspaper in Great Britain during the consideration of this question. With regard to the condition of excitement that is sought to be created, and with regard to an emergency contribution for Dreadonughts I find this statement in another English paper:

What is the 'emergency'? It is nothing more than the superheated six pence a word rant of a Socialist agitator, backed by the prestige of the greatest living journalistic acrobat and mountebank—chief press agent of the Unionist party—Lord Northcliffe.

These two dangerous demagogues have played the strings of the war harp so clamorously and persistently, they have for political purposes so basely misrepresented the naval strength of England and exaggerated that of Germany, that half the nation believes Britain is in danger, and excitable Canadians have already begun to shout for a lifeline. This is to take the form of an 'emergency contribution.'

Here is a statement of Mr. McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, in answer to the ravings of Blatchford. Britain has now seven Dreadnoughts in commission, Germany has two; when Germany has four Britain will have ten, when Germany has five Britain will have twelve, when Germany in two years will have thirteen Britain will have twenty. He concludes by saying: 'I have not referred to ships of an earlier type than the Dreadnoughts. We have an overwhelming superiority in that class of ships. The navy scare has not the slightest foundation in fact.

I have also a statement from Mr. John Burns, a responsible minister, who ought to be taken by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo as a greater authority than Robert Blatchford. Both the hon. members for Yale-Cariboo and Kootenay endeavoured to prove to this House the existence of a condition of alarm and emergency in the old country by the writings of Robert Blatchford—Robert Blatchford, the paid agitator of Tory politicians, the gentleman who for years was willing to write for pay on one side and to write for pay on the other. An hon. gentleman who mentions the name of Robert Blatchford as a British subject and as an evidence of the existence of a crisis in Great Britain cannot believe in the principle of self-government in a country like Canada. Is there any man willing to destroy the principle of responsible government, and to send a contribution of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 to Great Britain at the instigation of Robert Blatchford? Yet, Robert Blatchford was held up to us as the authority to whom we must look for a true statement of the condition of Great Britain to-day. The hon. gentlemen were willing to accept a reason of that kind believing, that as far as Blatchford was concerned, they could find a good reason; at any rate, once every forty-eight hours. Mr. John Burns says in effect exactly what I am saying now.

I shall not take time to read some extracts from speeches by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) a year ago. He has set himself against the policy of establishing a Canadian navy. When I was thinking this thing out, I said to myself: I wonder if I could not commit a few extracts from this hon. gentleman's speech to memory.

Mr. HUGHES. You could not get anything better.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has stated the literal truth for once, in favour of a Canadian navy, we could not get anything better. What was the position taken by the leader of the opposition ten months ago? We know his position now, what was it ten months ago? Let me remind the Minister of Militia that

the leader of the opposition less than twelve months ago conceived the importance of a Canadian navy to be so great that he undervalued the land defences of this country, and then said we should spend half the money we are now spending for militia to formulate a Canadian navy. He laid stress on the importance of Canada's oversea trade in comparison with its overland trade, and contended that the argument was preponderatingly in favour of a naval policy as against a land militia. Said the leader of the opposition: Ninety-two per cent of the trade of this country passes over the sea, whilst the remaining eight per cent passes over the land. For this land business we subscribe an average of $6,000,000 a year. What would be wrong in taking three or four million dollars from the land defence and subscribing for a strong, magnificent protection of this country? I supported that principle because just a few weeks before I had made some little complaint in this House against the extreme expenditure on the militia from the standpoint that the ministers were contracting the appropriations for public works in the country generally on account of the financial conditions, and that when we were reducing the expenditure for productive public works, we might have seen our way at that particular time for that particular reason to decrease the large expenditure made on the militia for that particular year. When the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) put up his argument I agreed with him entirely. I shall read one sentence from the hon. gentleman's speech. He said:

> I venture to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House, that the expenditure in defence of our seaports, in defence of our coasts, in defence of the waters of the ocean which are immediately adjacent to our coasts is of immensely greater advantage and of immensely greater importance than the expenditure which, year after year, we are disbursing in connection with the military forces of this country. . . . I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own.

I submit that it is a marvellous exhibition to have these words from responsible leaders of great national parties. There can be no change in any conditions or circumstances which would correspond to the enormous changes in these opinions. What has happened in ten months that Canada should have a navy ten months ago and should not have a navy to-day? Perhaps the scare has been scattered. Perhaps hon. gentlemen think that there is no such thing as an emergency. If a Canadian navy to-day is not necessary because hon. gentlemen think there is not an emergency, by what line of reasoning can they suppose that there ought to be two Dreadnoughts? If it is not necessary to build up the protection of this country for the defence of Canada, for the trade of Canada, what particular reason is there that we should send $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 out of this country over which we would have no control? I submit that there is no reason or logic in the position hon. gentlemen have taken.

Another hon. gentleman, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) made a very magnificent speech last year and of course he switched around just as quickly as did all the rest of the hon. gentlemen. I wish to read a few words of my hon. friend's speech of a year ago. I read it just three hours before he delivered his speech this year, and as he addressed the House I was able to compare his speech of this year with his speech of last year, and to observe the wonderfully quick change that he had made. Let me read a few sentences:

> We are here to-day to protect the Dominion of Canada, a country that has a population of 7,000,000, a country that is thirty-three times as large as Italy, eighteen times as large as Germany, eighteen times as large as France, nearly as large as the whole of Europe, and slightly larger than the United States. We are here to protect the commerce and the productiveness of the Dominion of Canada. We are here to protect seven thousand miles of coast line on the Pacific coast.

Now I expect the support of my hon. friend in connection with the handsome Bristols that are to be built for Esquimalt in my district.

> We are here to protect 7,000 miles of coast line on the Pacific coast.

If that was his position ten months ago, what has happened? May I not confidently expect that he will vote to protect the 7,000 miles of sea coast on the Pacific, and support the government policy when he has an opportunity.

Mr. SPROULE. I would be very glad still to support it if the scheme which the government mapped out were in my judgment suitable to do that, but I do not think it is.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The hon. gentleman who commits himself to a proposition of doing nothing ought not to be a competent judge of the qualities of what ought to be done. My hon. friend has committed himself to a proposition of doing absolutely nothing. If he had said: If you will build so many Dreadnoughts, if you will build a navy of a certain capacity, if the government will decide to do just what ought to be done in the construction of this navy, I will support them—he might speak, but my hon. friend is not in that position; my hon. friend is in a position of opposing every thing so far as a Cana-

dian navy is concerned, and his explanation now to the House, that he would be glad to support a policy if it came up to his ideas of what ought to be done is not consistent with his expressed intention of voting for something that is absolutely nothing. I do not quite understand why my hon. friend objects.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask my hon. friend if he does not exercise the same right himself with regard to questions coming before this House. If they do not meet with his approval he does not support them?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Of course I do, but I am trying to point out that an hon. gentleman who says that he does not want a thing is not quite the man to reason as to what the thing ought to be; he is committing himself to contradictory positions. The hon. gentleman has announced that he intends to support the amendment of the leader of the opposition. If he intends to support a policy with regard to what a navy ought to be, why does he tell the country that he does not want a navy at all?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is doing an injustice, because if he read or listened to my speech carefully, he would see that I said that provided a policy was evolved by the government and submitted to the people for their approval, and they approved of it, I would certainly fall in with it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The strange thing about my hon. friend's conclusion is that he wants to submit a Canadian proposition to the people for their approval, but he is willing to tax them and send away their money without asking their opinion; yet he says to the House: I am quite willing to support a navy if you are willing to submit the question to the people. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the policy of establishing a Canadian navy is part and parcel of the great work of development in this country. If it is a reasonable thing for Canada to build railways from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and to transport the products of this country to foreign lands, but principally to Great Britain, is it not equally reasonable that these products should be protected on the high seas? If it is reasonable to open mines, to build factories and railways, to bring population into the country, to develop the country to such an enormous extent as we are doing, does my hon. friend consider it unreasonable that we should commence, perhaps in a small way, but as soon as possible to provide ourselves with the means of protecting in some measure the trade of this country and of supplementing the navy of the empire at some future day when a more serious emergency arises than any that exists to-day?

I do not intend to read any more of the speech of my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro). But he spoke of the magnificent productions of British Columbia, and Alberta, and Saskatchewan, and Ontario, and Quebec, and New Brunswick, and that important province down by the sea, the province of Nova Scotia, and asked if hon. gentlemen did not consider that these were the things we ought to protect, and if this was not a reason why we ought to commence as soon as possible to provide for a Canadian navy.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I beg to differ with the hon. gentleman in his interpretation of my speech. I have the speech before me, I have read it over and I entirely agree with everything in that speech. I will just read an extract from it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. With the permission of the hon. gentleman. If he does not want it, of course, I will not do it. I am making a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman has said that my speech of last year indicated that I was in favour of a Canadian navy. I will read an extract from my speech to show my position.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I do not think my hon. friend is entitled to get up and read from his speech; I can read it for myself.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I ask the hon. gentleman this question: Does he now say that my speech of last year indicated that I was in favour of a Canadian navy; and if he does, will he allow me to quote my own speech to show that that is not true?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. If I made the statement that my hon. friend said so then, I ought to be allowed, as having the floor, to prove my statement. I do not see why my hon. friend should be so extremely anxious to read his own speech. I wanted to save the House trouble and save myself annoyance. What I do say is that my reading of the speech led to the conclusion that the protection of the great resources of this country, which were being developed from the Pacific to the Atlantic, was the great question to be considered.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Now, will the hon. gentleman just allow me to read? I think that is only fair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the hon. member for Nanaimo has the floor, and cannot be interrupted.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take up so much time,

but now I am driven to read my hon. friend's remarks. I made the statement that my hon. friend said that the great business of this country was to protect the industries of this country from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. By means of the British navy.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I will read my hon. friend's remarks:

We are here to protect the great industries of British Columbia with her total yearly production of $88,000,000 worth, her fisheries worth between six and seven millions, her mineral production amounting to twenty-three million dollars, her 13,000 men engaged in the fishing industry, and her 9,000 men engaged on the shore fisheries of that province. Then I pass over the Rocky mountains and come to the province of Alberta. We are here to protect the nineteen million bushels of grain that are raised in that province, valued at ten and a half million dollars, and her $3,000,000 worth of cattle exported from that province last year. Then I pass on into the province of Saskatchewan. We are here to protect the 105 million bushels of grain raised in that province during the last year, and valued at sixty million dollars I pass onward into the province of Manitoba, and we are here to protect the 113 million bushels of grain raised there, of a value of something like $50,000,000. I come down into the old province of Ontario with its many agricultural products. We are here to protect the 185 million bushels of field crops grown in that province, to protect its butter, its cheese, its fruit, its cattle that are being exported to Great Britain. Then I come on to the province of Quebec, and we are here to protect its eighty-five million bushels of field crops, to protect its large exports of butter and cheese, to protect its 260 million dollars worth of foreign trade. I pass on to the maritime provinces, and we are here to protect the products of their farms, of their mines and of their fisheries. I pass on to the coast of Nova Scotia, with her unprotected sea coast of 5,600 miles, extending from the Bay of Fundy to the straits of Belle Isle. It is said that the farmers of this country will not sanction any contribution towards the maintenance of a naval force.

What kind of naval force did my hon. friend mean?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will my hon. friend allow me to explain what kind of naval force? Let me read this:

Every Dreadnought of the British navy is a movable fortification. Every Dreadnought can transfer its power from one portion of the British empire to another. Every war vessel is nothing more or less than a species of fortification that can be transferred to any part of the empire in which it is required. That is the strongest kind of portable fortification that any country can have It therefore behooves us to strengthen the hands of the British government and to give our contribution towards upholding the British navy.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Mr. Speaker, experience last night proved that hon. gentlemen opposite are very easily excited. Experience this afternoon proves that hon. gentlemen always act before they think. I was not contending—

Mr. HUGHES. Oh, oh.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Hon. gentlemen opposite always pass judgment before the truth is told, because they do not like it, especially my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton. I was not contending, I could not consistently contend, that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)) was opposed to a contribution to the empire. What I contended was that last year he was in favour of developing a Canadian navy. I was not denying the position that my hon. friend was willing to make a subscription to the British navy. I have asked my hon. friend a question which he has not answered. I could not say that he had an objection to building up the British navy when he is supporting the policy of the leader of the opposition in favour of a contribution of 20 or 25 million dollars. What the hon. gentleman said was this:

It is said that the farmers of Canada might not sanction any contribution towards the maintenance of a naval force.

What naval force?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The naval force I referred to is the naval force, a part of the British navy, as recommended by the admiralty.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend has made a very satisfactory explanation, and I am quite right in contending that he was advocating a Canadian naval force, but he says it is the kind of force which the British admiralty recommended. I was not questioning whether he wanted a little or a big one. I was simply declaring that a year ago the hon. gentleman advocated the establishment of a Canadian navy. In a little temper, my hon. friend protested against that statement and his friends around him applauded, but he finally admitted that he did want the establishment of a Canadian navy on the condition that that navy represented the recommendation of the British admiralty. Well, even that is a Canadian navy, and that is what I am talking about.

Now, I wish to say a word about my hon. friend the member for Victoria.

Mr. HUGHES. What Victoria?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) wants me to attach too much importance

to him. I was speaking of the hon. member from Victoria, British Columbia, (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. HUGHES. I was going to remark that in case the hon. gentleman was making reference to me, I would listen, but not otherwise.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is just about as unfair as I consider my hon. friend to be. I was speaking of my hon. friend from the city of Victoria (Mr. Cowan). He made a speech last night, in which he deplored the fact that the imperial navy had been withdrawn from Esquimalt and the rest of Canada. But what did he say in that connection? He said it would be a fortunate thing if, out of a regrettable incident of that kind, there should arise a better result and that it should lead to the establishment of a Canadian navy. That is what he said, and what I contend is that the tenor of his speech was in favour of a Canadian navy, although I suspect that he will cast his vote for a subscription to Great Britain and against a Canadian navy. The thumb screw has evidently been operating on the other side as well as this. That is a kind of thing which works both Liberal government have a patent on ways. The hon. member thinks that the thumb screws, but the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and his followers, could not twist the hon. gentleman around as they do, unless there was a thumb screw on the other side.

An hon. MEMBER. You mean the colony here.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I mean the prominent men on the opposition benches. I appeal to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as one of the old members of this House, one of its most respected, intelligent and experienced members, what can the people of this country expect from a party which could initiate a policy in this House on one of the most important questions that ever came before the country and support that policy, and then within ten months set themselves on record as positively hostile to that same policy. Why, hon. gentlemen opposite have not begun to reflect on the weight of their opinion in the national life of this country. It is an easy thing to turn around, it is easy to say one thing to-day and the opposite to-morrow, but the intelligent electorate of this country want at their head a combination of men to do the business of this country, especially in questions of national defence, on stable foundations—men, who know their own minds to-day and to-morrow—and hon. gentlemen opposite can make up their minds that so long as they exhibit their present weathercock tendencies, they will continue for very many years in the happy seats they now occupy. I must apologize to the House for detaining it so long.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. But I should like to discuss for a moment what is the disposition of Great Britain herself regarding the question as to whether or not her self-governing Dominions should subscribe in times of emergency to the establishment of naval forces of their own. Is it not important to know just how the British government itself, just how the British admiralty, looks on the question as to the responsibility of each self-governing country in the empire in this matter. Is it in favour of each portion of the empire handing in a servile subscription and waiting for a crisis to arise before doing it? Sir, for fifty years the policy of Britain has been to encourage her self-governing Dominions to establish their own self defence. That the mother country has always regarded as the greatest guarantee of the integrity of the empire. And I appeal to sensible men, what would be the position taken by ordinary business men in their own domestic affairs. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) and my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) referred to the statements of the Prime Minister that the colonies would drop from the mother country as ripe fruit from the parent tree.

Can there be any objection to that principle? Let me remind the hon. gentleman that the analogy that is commonly used between the responsibilities of a family in domestic life and the relations and responsibilities of an empire, is a very striking one. The member for Yale-Cariboo says, I prefer the analogy of the family, the mother and her child. Sir, Canada is not in the position of a child towards its mother; Canada is in the position of a child that has set up housekeeping for himself, of a son who has taken on the obligations of an independent life. Will my hon. friend from Vancouver say that the son who leaves the old homestead and goes away 20 or 100 miles, and makes a home for himself, looks after his wife and family, maintains the integrity of that home, is he any less the guardian of the old homestead because he is maintaining himself and is no longer receiving pauper assistance from the old man? The analogy of hon. gentlemen only proves that they have never studied the question. The young man who stands up bravely, at a reasonable age, and says to his father, I am going to start life for myself—is there any objection to that? But in national affairs we are told that would mean disloyalty and separation. Is there any objection to the members of a family all leav-

ing the old homestead in due time? What pleases the old man's heart better than to get the glad news that every member of his family, perhaps a hundred miles away, is building a home for himself, is prosperous and happy? What is it that contributes to the happiness and security of the old homestead under those circumstances? It is the prosperity and security of the sons that have gone away from home. That, Sir, is the prosperity and security of the British empire to-day. I know how the imperialists would maintain it; I understand something of the tactics of the ultra-imperialists in England, and I believe they have very close relations in this country. The attitude and the doctrine of the imperialist is to interest himself in the affairs of people far away from home; he takes credit to himself for looking after the interests of other people. But the policy of the great democratic party in England, and the policy of democracy in any country, is first to set your own house in order. The empire is being maintained to-day under the policy of giving self-government to every colony in the empire, and encouraging it to depend upon its own resources. My hon. friends cannot have read the correspondence of the imperial conferences that have been held since 1897, they cannot have traced the political evolution in the relation of the independent colonies to the empire, as seen in the proceedings of those imperial conferences. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence will bear me out in saying that at that time Canada was the only colony represented in that conference to suggest that the proper thing to do was to look after Canada, and by so doing they would be looking after the empire. Every other colony represented in those conferences right down to the last one, was in favour of giving Dreadnoughts, of making contributions. But a change has come over their minds, and to-day what is the declaration? I have the record, and one of the most respectable reviews in Australia, one of the strongest men in Australia, says that public sentiment in Australia to-day is entirely opposed to the policy of a contribution, and that they have started out to defend themselves. They believe that the creation of an Australian naval defence within a few years will be a handsome contribution to the integrity of the British empire. That is all in keeping with the policy of Great Britain herself. Now, I will read a resolution which was passed in the imperial parliament in 1862, and that policy has been maintained up to the present time:

> That this House (while fully recognizing the claims of all portions of the British empire to imperial aid in their protection against perils arising from the consequences of imperial policy)——

The British House of Commons had no idea of the colonies subscribing money for the support of the British empire, but they were making provision in that resolution for the imperial government subscribing to assist the colonies under the disadvantages that accrued to them from the operation of the imperial policy:

> ——is of opinion that the colonies exercising the rights of self-government ought to undertake the main responsibility of providing for their own internal order and security, and ought to assist in their own external defence.

That resolution was passed unanimously in 1862, by the British parliament. In 1865, the Colonial Naval Defence Act was passed. Its object was to enable the colonies to provide for naval defence, and the Act empowers colonial governments to provide men and vessels of war, and also to raise volunteer forces to form part of the royal navy reserve established under the Act of parliament of 1859. This is what the Act says:

> The members of such reserves will be available for general service in the Royal navy in time of emergency, when an offer is made by the government of a colony to place them at the disposal of the imperial government.

Sir, when hon. gentlemen come to this House and propose that this country make a subscription to the empire in opposition to the policy of the establishment of a Canadian navy, I say they place themselves in direct contradiction to the policy of Great Britain for the last fifty years. Great Britain has always recognized that the security of the empire depended upon the strength and force of every part of that empire. Canada is the most difficult country within the empire to govern, Canada with its mixed nationality—and this is no reflection upon any people in this House or out of it. The very basis of this country is a constitution for mixed nationalities. In the nature of things, in the peculiar position of this country—enormous country as it is—every nationality in the world is being brought to Canada. The great problem for this country to consider is how these aliens and divergent peoples are to be blended into one. That is the commanding business of the statesman of the future. How is he to accomplish it? By raising sectional cries? By questioning the loyalty of a French Canadian Prime Minister? By telling every Greek, every Galician, every Doukhobor, every alien who may have made his home in this country that he is in a foreign land? Is that the policy which is to shape into unity the development of Canada? That is the policy of more than one hon. gentleman in this debate who has uttered insinuations or made direct assaults against important sections and influences in Canada.

Sir, what is the great characteristic of

British institutions? Does the true Briton upbraid the foreigner? Does he chide the alien? Does he slaughter the captured? The strength of the British empire and its institutions is that the Briton makes the foreigner feel that, under the British flag, he is better off than he was at home. Britain has always welcomed men from every country on the face of the earth. And how are British institutions to be maintained? They can never be maintained by fictitious resolutions. The sympathy of Canada with the spirit of the British empire can never be maintained by statute, by resolution, by edict, by force of any kind. What is it that attracts foreigners to this country? What makes them feel that in a British land they have the sympathy, support, the opportunity that it is not possible for them to have at home? The secret is that British institutions involve no tyranny upon any class. The one thing to be kept in mind in the development of Canada is to make every man feel, who was once an alien in this country and is evolving into a British subject, that we are not in a hurry to force him to declare that he is a loyal subject, or that he shares completely our enthusiasm for the grandeur of the British empire. If hon. gentlemen opposite had their way, if they could send money contributions from this country without the voice of the people, and if they could continue to tax the people to send money to be controlled and spent in Great Britain, it would not be long before we should have another such lesson as was taught when a large part of this continent was torn from the British empire. Mr. Speaker, the great secret of the development of British life in Canada lies in giving to every citizen of Canada the chance to work out his own salvation. Therefore, I maintain that no policy has ever come before this House that will do more for the development of our national spirit than the policy now under discussion.

What does this policy mean practically? We are not building navies for the purpose of having shipyards and docks, but we are building docks and shipyards because we are going to build a navy. Hon. members opposite have said that the strongest argument in support of our policy is the argument of the loaves and fishes. These are not the objects of this policy, but they are the results of this policy if carried out in a reasonable and businesslike way. Am I to assume that these hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to build our own shipyards, to dig our own docks, to develop our own mines, to construct our own ships to employ our own sailors and fishermen? Am I to understand, as declared by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), that what we want is to go back to the Crown colony stage, and, every time we are in trouble, crawl to the feet of the parent country and importune her to intervene and help us? I say, Sir, the policy of this government adds to the great name of this country, and gives an opportunity to the increasing intelligence of our citizens to go forward in national development, national manhood, national character, national strength, national defence, which, fifty years hence, will cause every man in Canada to wonder that any party in this country should have the want of foresight or audacity to question the necessity for the establishment of a naval force for our country.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, in rising to place myself on record on this important question, I wish to say, very modestly, that I cannot hope to add very much that is new to the debate. It has been the custom in this House, since I have been a member of it at least, for members on rising to address the House on almost any subject to make the claim that the subject to be dealt with is the most important question since confederation. Well, I have to confess and make that same assertion to-day. When I consider the far-reaching results which may come from the proposals which we are debating in this House and this country to-day, I think I can safely say that this is at least one of the most important questions since confederation. My hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) is certainly a very forceful speaker, but if we take from his address that part which he was forced to devote to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and other members of this House, there will not be very much left. The speech given by the hon. member for Vancouver last night caused a great deal of anxiety in the mind of the hon. member (Mr. Ralph Smith), who has just taken his seat, for he devoted to that speech a great part of the time he occupied in addressing the House. After getting through with the hon. member for Vancouver, he spent quite a time in talking about our friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Now, I am not going to take up much time—not because I do not regard it as important—in dealing with the address which we have just listened to. But I do wish to refer to a few matters in the hon. member's address. The feature of this debate has been as to what the individual or collective members of this House put upon this question, whether this Bill which the government has brought down tends to the consolidation of the empire, or whether it leads to disintegration. I believe, and I hope I shall be able to prove that it does lead to disintegration. Surely we have the right to determine what stand the right hon. lead-

er of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has taken all along during the years in which he has been a prominent member of this House, and what that stand, if carried to its logical conclusion, would lead to. The hon. member for Nanaimo, referring to the right hon. leader of the House last night, said that there is no man strong enough to alienate the Canadian people from England. Thank God, Mr. Speaker there is not, notwithstanding the fact that if the words and deeds of the hon. gentleman who leads this House had been carried out they would have lead to separation; but we have to be thankful to-day that, great as the influence of the hon. gentleman has been in this country it has not been sufficient, and never will be, to carry this country into separation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to address the House at any great length with regard to the remarks made by my hon. friend the member for Nanaimo. The naval policy of this government has been brought down. One thing is certain that everybody, or nearly everybody, feels that the present position of Canada is intolerable. Believing that the present position of Canada is intolerable, we are here as the representatives of the people to try and inaugurate a policy that will be to the practical benefit of this country and of Great Britain. This unanimity of opinion which I have expressed is the inevitable result of the growth of this country and of the agitation which has been going on for the past year or two. So much has been said on this question from the pulpit, from the platform, in the press, in private conversation, and in this House, that it is almost impossible for one to say anything new. All the sentiments and views to which anybody might give expression, or which I might state here to-day, have been more forcibly, logically and cogently expressed by others. Yet my own personal feeling in this matter is so great that it prevents me from remaining silent. I believe that my constituents would feel that I had not done my duty to them if I had not said something on this important subject. I feel confident that in speaking upon this question I am but the mouthpiece of a large majority of the people whom I have the honour to represent. Why are we discussing this question to-day? Is it because of anything the government has done? The opening up of this great problem, the awakening of the people to the duty which they owe to the empire, the arousing of the people to the task of doing something to relieve the taxpayer of Great Britain from the burden which has been upon him for years, did not originate in the mind of the right hon. the First Minister, or in the mind of any hon. gentleman in his cabinet. The right hon. First Minister has said of late that something has been doing since 1902, something was doing in 1907, and something in 1909. I will take occasion to refer to that part of the hon. gentleman's speech further on. We are discussing this question to-day because of the motion and address spread upon 'Hansard' by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). There is absolutely no doubt about that. My hon. friend had his motion on the order paper long before this agitation commenced in this country. My hon. friend set the people thinking, and asking themselves the question whether it was not about time that we should begin to be ashamed of ourselves, because we were absolutely dependent on Great Britain for the protection of our trade routes, and for the protection of our trade, yet we were enjoying and receiving that protection without it costing us one cent. Having great faith in the independence of the people of this country I do not believe that they would be longer willing that such a condition should exist when they became familiar with the facts. Before we became of age, when we perhaps had a revenue of $25,000,000, or $30,000,000,000, or $35,000,000 when we were in our swaddling clothes, we were very glad to receive the protection of Great Britain, but when we came of age we realized that the time had come when we should begin to do something for ourselves. The fact that we are the last of the great overseas dominions to come to our senses in this respect is not very much to our credit. What do we find? If I gathered anything from the words of the hon. member for Nanaimo just before he took his seat, it was that Great Britain was opposed to this contribution system. I do not know whether that is exactly correct or not. What I do know is that Australia, for years, has been giving £100,000 for the protection of the empire. I know that Cape Colony has been giving £50,000, I know that little New Zealand has been giving £40,000, Natal £35,000, and that Newfoundland has been giving its quota. What has Canada been doing? Absolutely nothing. We find that it costs the labouring people and citizens of Great Britain about $4 per head per year for the maintenance of the navy, to say nothing of the militia. When we take the two into consideration, the people of Great Britain are paying for protection about $455,000,000, to which we are not contributing one cent notwithstanding the fact that we are receiving great benefit from it. It is high time that we were up and doing. I do not agree with those who cry peace and believe we can escape the burden of an army and navy. We cannot become separated from the rest of the world in that respect. The United States tried it and absolutely failed. Canada, which we are proud of, and

which we are trying to claim is fast becoming a nation, must in this, as in other things, assume the white man's burden.

Any nation that seeks to retain its foreign trade must be willing to assume the responsibility of protecting its trade routes as well as its coast line and its fisheries. I do not for one moment underrate the great importance of the time in our history at which we have arrived. It would seem, as has been claimed, that we have reached the parting of the ways. We have been depending on Great Britain, the taxpayer of Great Britain has been assuming all the responsibility for the defence of the empire, and now we come to the crisis, the parting of the ways. As has been said, there are certain courses which we may take. I believe we have come to the finger post, and to me the finger points absolutely without doubt what course we should take. I do not say that to every citizen of Canada that finger points so absolutely. We may, Mr. Speaker, remain one of co-partnership, of a free self-governing state, acting together for a common purpose and mutual defence. We may cut ourselves adrift, become a separate nation, have our own policy. We may sink our individuality and become incorporated in the great country to the south of us, or we may remain a part of the empire, while refusing co-operation. I say that the last course is beneath the dignity of any self-respecting citizen, and that is why I am taking the stand I propose to take on this great question. As to sinking our individuality and becoming a part of the great country to the south, no man in this House has greater respect for our friends to the south than I, and why should we not have respect for them? To use an expression of the Prime Minister's, very much the same blood courses through their veins as courses through ours. They are a great people whom we must admire commercially and politically. They have done great things. They are good neighbours, and there is nothing that gives us greater peace of mind and greater happiness than having good neighbours. We always want to be friendly with our neighbours and I hope we will always be good friends. But I judge and believe, from a sound knowledge of the people of this country, that very few people want to become annexed to this country.

Then comes the third possible course, the independence of this country. I know there are some who look towards independence as the great goal of our ambition, and I shall refer to these later on. The Prime Minister, in view of what he has said in this country and in other countries of our position and what we look forward to, cannot say that we have not some reason to ascribe to him some of the independent views which have been ascribed to him from this side of the House. But I say that apart from the right hon. gentleman and a few men throughout this country, there are very few who look forward to or want to look forward to the independence of Canada. Rather we look forward to the consolidation of this great empire, the empire on which the sun never sets, an empire with one-third of the world's population, one-third of its land. Her flag and her ships and her enterprising sons carry the ideas of justice and fair play across every sea and into all the world's ports, and we are proud, every one of us, that we belong to that great nation, There are so many reasons why we should be proud to belong to that nation that it would detain the House too long to state them.

Then there remains but this one thing, to remain a part of this empire. I am not with those who say remain with the empire, let them protect you and do all that they can for you, but refuse to do anything in return. There is a class of people in Canada, including many of the clergy, and I regret to say that there are some of that class in this city of Ottawa, who are fond of saying that we want to remain part of the empire but that we refuse co-operation. They say that Canada should not give anything in support of the naval defence of Great Britain. True it is that these gentlemen and other gentlemen often end their pious declarations with the words: But if the time should ever come when Canada is in need, then we will spend our last dollar for its defence, we will give our last man. Even Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in his address, said: If the time ever comes when the supremacy of Great Britain on the high seas is challenged, I will take the stump, I will go through this country, especially will I talk to my compatriots in Quebec, and say that the salvation of Canada depends on the salvation of England. That sounds good, but it is mostly sound. Does this House realize, do the people outside of this House throughout the country realize that over one billion dollars of British capital is invested in this great country of ours? Do they realize that over $200,000,000 of British money is being invested in this country in one way and another every year? Do our people realize that we are the greatest borrowers of all the countries in the world from the motherland? If we do realize that, is it not some reason why we should be willing at least to do something towards the maintenance of this great country and its salvation, because we have to admit that the salvation of Great Britain and all its colonies absolutely depends upon the supremacy of Great Britain upon the high seas.

Let me read the borrowings of different countries from Great Britain. Of eight

countries, the annual borrowings from the British Isles are as follows:

Chili	$ 20,696,000
Japan	33,361,000
Russia	47,703,000
Mexico	64,371,000
United States	68,000,000
Brazil	73,000,000
The Argentine	117,000,000
Canada (nearly)	200,000,000

Receiving that tremendous amount of money every year from Great Britain surely we should be willing to do something in support of her navy. They say that in the hour of need they would be willing to spend their last dollar, but where would they get their last dollar, all these dollars I have been talking about? Further than that, what would our farmers do? We export to Great Britain about $135,000,000 worth of our products every year. What will we do in the hour of danger if we cannot get the money? I cannot understand the argument of our friends opposite that if the hour of need comes then they will do something. What can we do in the hour of need? If there is any one thing that any one country cannot buy, no matter how rich it is, it is naval strength.

It takes three years in Germany and five years in Great Britain to train soldiers; and if we should have a war with Germany, would it last three years or three months? How long do naval wars last in these days? And, unfortunately, we cannot buy Dreadnoughts at the corner store. It takes considerable time to construct these ships, which experts say are the only kind that are of any service to-day in naval wars. These patriots talk about duty and about what they will do when the hour of need comes; but they actually refuse to allow us to make preparations so as to be in a position to do our duty when the hour of need does come. They cry peace, peace, when there is no peace. There is no assurance for peace equal to a strong navy. What has done more for universal peace throughout this world than the supremacy of the British navy? No man will dispute the fact that in the past the paramount influence of the British navy has been the great factor in maintaining the peace of the world. But that influence must remain efficient and sufficient, so that England and Canada and all the other colonies together will be able to hold their own against all-comers. I picked up to-day the sayings of some men whose opinions are very much respected—not ancient men, but modern men. Mr. Roosevelt says that 'a first-class fighting navy is the most effective guarantee for peace the United States can have'; and what is true of the United States is true of every other country in the world. President Taft has just expressed the same opinion. Lord Roberts says that 'an effective army is an essential condition of peace and security'. The present German chancellor says that 'the moment Germany decides to reduce her equipment peace would be seriously threatened'. Mr. Deakin, the ex-premier of Australia says that 'they who prepare for war in point of fact do so only to preserve peace'. It is Alfred Austin, the poet laureate, who sings to us from across the seas:

> Nor you nor we would others wrong,
> We only claim to hold our own;
> For this we arm, for this keep strong,
> Safeguard justice on her throne.

No logical mind can deny the truth of the argument that strength discourages war and helplessness invites attack. The question of the safety of the empire in my opinion must be put beyond any possible doubt. As an empire we do not aim at any aggressive action or any increase of territory. We do not threaten any other country. We want to keep clear of all international disputes. But nevertheless we do wish to consolidate this great empire for the purpose of mutual defence. Hitherto the British navy has solely maintained that supremacy. In my opinion it is high time we were doing something to share that burden. We should be standing shoulder to shoulder as Britains. Union is strength, and closer union means greater strength. No other nation is so dependent upon waterborne food and raw material for its existence. We must keep our trade routes free from attack from other nations. Is there any doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman that an attack on our trade routes would paralyse the trade of Canada as well as Great Britain? To give this House and this country some idea of the enormous trade of the empire, let me give the relative proportions of the shipping interests, taking the latest figures of tonnage that I can get here:

	Sailing vessels. Tons.	Steam vessels. Tons.
United Kingdom	1,461,376	10,023,726
Australia	126,579	249,832
Natal	856	811
New Zealand	43,967	88,629
Canada (including inland navigation)	411,885	287,867
Newfoundland	129,876	12,352

All this tonnage has been hitherto protected by the British navy alone. Now, let us look at the figures of the trade of the British empire. The imports and exports, 1907 and 1908, were as follows:

	Imports.	Exports.
United Kingdom	£649,612,926	£520,138,135
Australia	51,896,809	72,888,003
South Africa	57,979,502	98,984,848
New Zealand	17,302,861	20,068,957
Canada	$309,756,608	$361,572,159
Newfoundland	2,143,130	2,487,461

All this tonnage has been hitherto protected. Something like $700,000,000 of our trade travels the high seas absolutely protected by the Royal navy, towards which Canada contributes nothing. Moreover, Canada does not contribute to the common defence of the empire. When the day comes when through international difficulties the existence of Canada is menaced, can the other parts of the empire be blamed if they decline to help us? What then becomes of Canadian hopes of a Canada one and indivisable? Mr. Speaker, when this government has been driven to act—and I use that word advisedly—I do not know of any one thing they have done in the way of expressions of loyalty or help to the empire that has not been forced upon them by the great Conservative party. When the government are driven to act, what do they propose to do? Just what any little South American republic would do. But the navy of any of these little republics is not reckoned in the safety or governance of the civilized world. Why should they do it? Because, sir, the right hon. gentleman who leads this House and the gentlemen who surround him to fail to recognize the position of Canada as an integral portion of the great empire of which we form so important a part. They are following the policy of Venezuela. It does not for the reason I have stated. Sir, in my opinion, it is an endeavour to differentiate between Britishism and Canadianism. I do not stand for a Canadian navy but for an imperial navy which will carry into the worlds' domains that conception of unity and co-ordination which, I believe, notwithstanding what may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite, is fast forming in the minds of our people.

My hon. friends opposite say that if we are to have a navy, we ought to build it at home. There is undoubtedly in that contention something which at first sight sounds very attractive. But even so, it is so contrary to anything these hon. gentlemen have ever advocated, that I cannot understand their bringing it forward as their policy now. Did you ever hear of these people advocating the building up of our home industries or the buying of goods at home if they could get them cheaper abroad? Has it not been the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite always to buy where you can buy the cheapest? In my own county, when talking about agricultural implements, my Liberal friends have time and time again put up to me the argument: Suppose you do make your own agricultural implements and increase your own home industries, see how much better implements you can get on the other side of the line. I now turn against them their own argument and I say that we are not in a position to-day to build Dreadnoughts that we are absolutely unable to do so. I even go further and say that if this government had any idea that they would ever have to depend on the ships they would build to protect our country, they would never dream of going to such a wholesale experiment. But they know well with whom they are dealing. They know that they are dealing with that old mother who has taken care of us all along the line, and they know that they can always depend on her to give us the protection of her ships, built out of the taxes of the English people and which have stood the test. It is about time that this government called off the bluff that they are trying to strengthen the empire and help the British navy. If we are going to sing God Save the King, and Rule Britannia, let us do something worth while and not embark on this miserably inadequate naval policy. When I consider the proposal of the right hon. the Prime Minister and his glowing statements about the duty of Canada towards the empire, I begin to have a new conception of the use of eloquence.

The declaration that if Canada should build a navy, that navy shall not be utilized for the empire unless Canada is satisfied that the cause is a just one, is to me offensive. What is the only inference which you can draw from such an assertion? It is this, we are willing to go to war with Great Britain so long as the war in which she is engaged is a just one. But is there any man in Canada to-day who believes that England will ever get into any other kind of a war. Does any one believe that that country, which has been the cradle of liberty for ages, which has ever stood for the rights of man, for the liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, justice and fair play—does any one in Canada believe that that country will ever engage in a war of tyranny and oppression? If we do not, then I say that when England turns to new ideas and engages in wars of this description, it will be time enough for Canada to turn to new gods.

I do not think that the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) answered very well the question put to him by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan). In the British North America Act there is a clause, section 15, which provides:

> The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

That section is embodied in the Bill in section 4, but there is in the Bill another clause, clause 18 which provides:

> In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal

navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

The point to which I wish to call attention is this. How can you reconcile these two sections? In the one, the command in chief of Canada's naval forces is vested in the King; and in the other, the Governor in Council may place that force at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in case of an emergency.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is an attempt to take away a power that belongs exclusively to the imperial government.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think it is. But in connection with the British North America Act, I would like to quote a passage from the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in which it seems to me there is more pregnancy than in anything I have heard for some time. This is what my hon. friend said about the British North America Act:

When the British empire is dissolved, the British North America Act goes also, and with it there departs every constitutional guarantee it contains. All beyond is chaos and darkness. What may be evolved out of that chaos and darkness, what constitutional status, what final relations, what ultimate balance of conflicting forces, no one of us today is bold enough to prophesy or wise enough to foresee.

Could there be more wisdom put into a dozen lines than our hon. leader has put into these words. I have stated my views in opening my address. I have stated why I believe we should have one united navy, an imperial navy, under one head. I believe that is the only way, I believe it is the cheapest way—if you want to bring the question down to a commercial plane—I believe it is the safest way to protect our trade routes and consolidate our great country. But these gentlemen opposite seem to dwell upon this aspect of the question. We on this side have done our best to convince them. I have no hope of doing more, than has been done, or even as much as has been done, by many on this side to convince our friends opposite that there is an emergency. Of course, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that England is arming, France is arming, Austria is arming—all the countries are arming to the limit. Why? For fear they will be attacked—not that they are going to attack anybody else, but for fear somebody else will attack them. Carry that argument to its logical conclusion and what can that conclusion be, but that we should strengthen the imperial navy, because we fear, and have good reason to fear, that Germany in the near future is going to attack us? I intend to quote—what has been quoted before—from some of the men who believe that there is an emergency. For, we do not need to look very deeply into the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite to see that their strongest point against procuring Dreadnoughts is that there is no emergency. I find that men like Lord Rosebery, Sir Edward Grey, the right hon. Reginald McKenna, the right hon. Alfred Lyttleton, right hon. Mr. Balfour, right hon. Mr. Asquith—men of all shades of politics on the other side of the ocean—have told us that there is an emergency. I shall not quote here to-day anything that was said by these men during the election campaign in Britain which has recently been concluded. I admit that some of them have made statements during that campaign not wholly in accord with statements of theirs which I shall read. But these later statements, it must be remembered, were made during the heat of one of the strongest political campaigns ever carried on in Great Britain. I shall not quote at length, but shall give only paragraphs that are directly to the point. Lord Rosebery, speaking at the Imperial Press Conference in June last, three months before the House of Commons closed, said:

Now gentlemen, you will forgive me if I come next and at once to what is by far the most vital topic that you will have to discuss at this conference, or which concerns our empire as a whole—I mean that of imperial defence. . . . All, then, forbodes peace——

He says there is peace.

—and yet, at the same time, combined with this total absence of all question of friction, there never was, in the history of the world, so threatening and overpowering a preparation for war. That is the sign which I regard as most ominous. . . . I admit there are features of this general preparation for war which must cause special anxiety to the friends of Great Britain and of the British empire.

Certainly, Lord Rosebery remains under a feeling of anxiety. It is true the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) and others of hon. gentlemen opposite do not feel anxious. But I have no right to regard these gentlemen as of the same authority in this matter as Lord Rosebery and others whom I have named. These hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that there is no danger, but the great men in England tell us that there is danger.

When I see one country alone asking for 25 millions of extra taxation for warlike preparations; when I see the unprecedented sacrifices which are asked from us on the same grounds, I do begin to feel uneasy as to the outcome of it all, and to wonder where it will stop. . . . Gentlemen, we can and we

will build 'Dreadnoughts' or whatever the newest type of ship may be as long as we have a shilling to spend on them or a man to put into them. All that we can and will do, but I am not sure that even that will be enough, and I think it may be your duty to take back to your young dominions across the seas this message and this impression: that some personal duty and responsibility for national defence rests on every man and citizen of the empire.

Is this the doctrine that our friends are trying to impress upon the people of this country? I think not. I say, and without the slightest desire to give offence, that the gentlemen on the other side, from the Prime Minister down, are trying to misrepresent the facts to the people of this country; and I believe that before I get through with my address I can prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Liberal press or at least some part of it, as well as many members of this House, are trying to misrepresent the facts in this matter.

Yes, gentlemen, take that message back with you. Tell your peoples—if they can believe it—the deplorable way in which Europe is relapsing into militarism and the pressure that is put upon this little England, to defend itself, its liberties—and yours! But take this message also back with you—that the old country is right at heart; that there is no failing or weakness in her; and that she rejoices in renewing her youth in her giant dominions beyond the seas. For her own salvation, she must look to herself, and that failing her she must look to you.

And Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary, speaking after Lord Rosebery at this conference, said:

I endorse every word he said. We are in comparatively calm weather, not in stormy weather, in foreign politics at the present moment, but the excessive expenditure on armaments makes the weather sultry. And the seriousness of that expenditure cannot be over-rated; but you should know to-day how conscious we are at home that we have far too much at stake to allow our naval expenditure to fall behind, however great the burden, and you from beyond the seas have made it clear to us how great the resources of the empire are. In upholding the empire surely we are going more and more towards the ideal to which Mr. Kirwan referred in his speech yesterday—of a union of allies—of self-governing dominions.

The right hon. Mr. McKenna said:

We look to the future and we see growing difficulties surrounding our empire. We foresee possibilities in which we should be called upon to unite our whole strength in a common defence.

I believe in a common defence. Yet, in the face of this utterance of Mr. McKenna, hon. gentlemen opposite try to convince the country that there is no danger, no emergency. Hence, they ask what is the use of giving Dreadnoughts? Why not be content with a tin pot navy? 'It is true,' they say, 'the Conservative party have forced us to do something, but we will do as little as we can. Then we shall be able to go to Quebec and other parts of this country and tell the people that we were forced to do something, but that we did as little as possible, and we can assure you that when it comes to real war our little tin pot navy will not be in sight.'

The right hon. Alfred Lyttelton said:

Well, my belief is, the actual position the actual situation of affairs at this moment is different from that which it has been since the battle of Trafalgar. We are in the presence for the first time of powers equal to ourselves in wealth, . . . and I was delighted to hear Sir Edward Grey on this occasion endorse what he said—that this country may always be relied upon to spend her last shilling if it is necessary for her own defence and for the defence of the empire, but that a time might come when it would be necessary for her own safety and for their own safety that the dominions over the seas should assist her in a tremendous struggle. I firmly believe myself that the ultimate destiny and fate of this empire will depend—must depend—upon the achievement of a really closer and more consolidated unity and a more perfect organization of defence.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, as a fair-minded man which of the two policies before this House leads to closer consolidation—the little home navy without one of the warships of any great importance, or the policy of this side of the House, declaring that there is an emergency, and that in that emergency we should send two Dreadnoughts at least, the only ships that will be able to line up at the front in time of war? Certainly the latter, without any doubt. What does Mr. Balfour say:

The fate of Australia, the fate of New Zealand, of Canada, South Africa, India—that is not going to be decided in the Pacific; it is not going to be decided in the Indian ocean; it is going to be decided here, and everybody who attempts to read the signs of the times will, I think, agree with the weighty words which fell from Lord Rosebery.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it, the great battle that is going to decide the fate of the British empire will be fought in the North sea. Germany to-day, from her geographical position, needs and possesses the strongest army in the world; she is able, if necessary, to put 4,000,000 armed men in the field. Great Britain, from her geographical position, must have the strongest navy in the world, and that navy alone will be the only thing to protect us whenever that crucial moment arrives.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

DOMINION MILLERS' ASSOCIATION.

On the order for private Bills:

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, before going into committee, I notice from the reports of yesterday's proceedings of the House, that some discussion took place with reference to Bill (No. 111), An Act respecting the Dominion Millers' Association. As I introduced this Bill to the House, and as several members want more information as to the particular features of it, I would suggest that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills for further consideration, so that the questions raised by hon. members yesterday may be further considered in committee. I, therefore, move:

That Order No. 71, further consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill (No. 111) an Act respecting the Dominion Millers' Association, be discharged and that the said Bill be referred back for further consideration to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at six o'clock, I was dealing with the question as to whether there existed an emergency, and as to whether this country, if it believed that there was an emergency, should do something practical to meet it. In support of that proposition I was quoting authorities from both sides of politics in the old country, words that were spoken, not at a time of political contest, but at a time when the country could give a fair and just expression of opinion. I gave all the authorities to which I wished to refer except Lord Roberts. He said:

Recent events, however, prove conclusively that a new era has commenced, and that our whole empire may again have to fight for its own, as the people of these islands have many times had to do in the past. The question is: Are we prepared to do this? Fleets and effective armies cannot be improvised to meet the rapid movements of modern times. Nothing but forethought and preparation, extending over years, can give us a naval or military strength which may be relied on in any great emergency, and which is in itself the greatest guarantee of that peace which we desire and need more than any other nation. I think I know what your main difficulty will be. It is not easy to convince the mass of the people in this country of the existence of real danger.

That is what Lord Roberts said, and I commend these words to my hon. friends on the other side of the House:

It may be even less easy to convince the populace of colonies that have enjoyed for a century protection, which has given them security from attack, that real dangers threaten them also. . . The growth of the colonies in wealth makes them more and more objects of envy to nations which do not possess such valuable areas of the world. So, if we are to be secure, we must stand side by side in common effort and common sacrifice.

Mr. Asquith said:

After very anxious careful examination of the conditions of ship-building in foreign countries, the government have come to the conclusion that it is desirable to take all necessary steps to ensure that the second four ships referred to in the programme shall be completed by March, 1912.

I will not refer to any more of these authorities. I think this House and the country will agree with me that the authorities to which I have referred should go farther and mean more than the authority of the Postmaster General, the First Minister or any of the friends who support them.

Now, a word or two about loyalty. That is one of the subjects which our friends on the other side of the House would rather we should not refer to. It seems to be a tender spot in their make-up, but whose fault is it? It is not our fault. It is not pleasant to see that we are led by an hon. gentleman who has placed himself, by his own words, in a position with which I think, we have just reason to find fault, and in a position which we believe is not in the best interests of this country, which we believe leads to disintegration rather than to what we should all desire—consolidation. Now, I wish to refer to these remarks, because I, personally, am impressed with the sentiment that the Bill which is before the House leads directly to the separation of this country from the great empire. The right hon. the First Minister, speaking in Boston, said:

Canada would never consent to imperial federation even on commercial lines alone, because the consequence would be the participation of Canada in British wars,——

I shall have something to say about that later on.

—and Canada would never consent to participate in British wars.

I hold out to my fellow countrymen the idea of independence, but, whenever the day comes, it must come by the consent of both countries, and we shall continue to keep the good feeling and the good-will of the mother

land. If we are true to our record, we will again exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees, and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree.

This Bill is another act in the drama. He also said of late:

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy.

Again:

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) no doubt would prefer an English shilling to a Yankee dollar; but for my part I am differently constituted. I am ready any day, whether I am charged with annexation or not, to take a Yankee dollar in preference to an English shilling. . . . I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in due course of time.

I do not think there could be anything stronger than that. The aspiration and goal are distinctly set out there, and notwithstanding all the eloquence we have heard from the other side, those words mean something or they mean nothing. If he meant what he said, those words were tending towards separation. The right hon. gentleman said further:

The conduct of England and Canada during the civil war of 1861-66 was a disgrace to the civilization of England and Canada. . . It is a great, a fatal mistake to make allegiance, British allegiance, the basis of trade. . . The present position of Canada cannot last, even at this day England and Canada have interests totally apart, and that the time will come when in the very nature of things separation must take place. I am a subject of the British Crown, but whenever I have to choose between the interests of England and of Canada, it is manifest to me that the interests of my country are identical with the interests of the United States of America.

Did anybody ever hear sentiments like that from Sir John Macdonald? Never. Those who sit on this side of the House, and the great Conservative party, have never had to devote their time to defending the loyalty of their great leader, Sir John Macdonald, and no one regrets in this House more than I do that our good friends on the other side have to spend so much time in trying to defend the loyalty of the First Minister in this country.

Sir Wilfrid says when England is at war, Canada is at war, but explains his meaning by saying that not always when England is at war Canada is at war. He says for myself I do not hesitate to say that if that war, the Crimean war, were to be undertaken by England under similar circumstances, I would hesitate very much before I would give my consent that we should take part in any such war. What was the position of loyal Sir John? What were his words, speaking in Toronto in 1888? Sir John said: Who can look back to the time when the Crimean war broke out and not remember with pride how Canada rose as one man to stand by the mother country. There was a rush of Canadians to go to the battlefield, and I had the pleasure to be instrumental in carrying a vote for $100,000 from the public treasury in order to show that Canada made common cause with England in time of war.

The right hon. gentleman is fond of quoting Scripture. His words are very eloquent, and when he finds himself in what we might vulgarly call a tight place he resorts to Scripture. He said the other day:

I am bound to say at the same time that I have been censured and criticised—severely censured and severely criticised—by those who within the party boast of their imperialism.

In his address he said: I am not an imperialist, and I am not an anti-imperialist —whatever that may mean, but it is just like the phrase Sir Wilfrid used when he was trying to be at once a protectionist and a free trader. After coming into power, in writing to his friend, Mr. Bertram, in Toronto, he said:

There are those in the Liberal party who are protectionist doctrinaires, and there are those who are free trade doctrinaires. For my part I incline neither to one nor the other.

The two phrases are very similar, and are indicative of an opportunism that has characterized the right hon. gentleman from the beginning. To continue the quotation of the Prime Minister:

—severely censured and severely criticised— by those who within the party opposite boast of their imperialism, who carry abroad upon their foreheads the imperial phylacteries, who boldly walk into the temple and there loudly thank the Lord that they are not like other British subjects, that they give tithes of everything they possess, and that in them alone is to be found the true incense of loyalty.

Those of us over here who claim to be imperialists, may possibly in the eyes of the hon. gentleman bear some sort of a badge like the one to which it has referred, but it cannot be said of us that we ever said in Boston that we would not participate in the wars of Great Britain, nor could it be ascribed to any member of the Conservative party that at the time of the rebellion in the Northwest, he said that if he had been there he would have shouldered his musket on behalf of the rebels. It can never be said of this party that at the time of the South African war we refused to send soldiers, that it was unconstitu-

tional. That was another case of the hon. gentleman's opportunism, nothing but the expressed opinion of the people of this country forced the hon. gentleman to take the move which he did. In my opinion an attempt has been made to misrepresent to the people the position that we on this side of the House take on this matter. Hon. gentlemen have tried to impress the people that in giving two Dreadnoughts or any number of Dreadnoughts in this time of emergency to assist Great Britain in the protection of the empire, we would be paying tribute. I wonder if they would say we were paying tribute when we gave $50,000 the other day to assist France. I wonder if they would say we were paying tribute when we gave $100,000 to Chicago at the time of the fire, and later $100,000 to San Francisco in the time of their emergency? I think not.

One misrepresentation is that this government, in bringing this Bill to the House, are doing what the admiralty of Great Britain asked them to do. That statement has been made over and over again, and I give it a flat denial from my place in this House to-night. They are absolutely not carrying out what the admiralty asked them to do. That little play was carried on considerably during the last by-election in this city. The hon. member for Ottawa said that in regard to a Canadian navy he prefers to take the opinion of British experts, and so do all sensible Canadians. That is what the Dominion government has not done. I say they did not do what the experts asked them to do. A newspaper in referring to this episode, said:

> Evidently the word has been passed around to the Liberal speakers in the present by-election to claim that in proposing to build a tin-pot navy the Dominion government is giving Great Britain what she asked. This is absolutely untrue. Great Britain asked for a fleet unit consisting of one Dreadnought and its auxiliaries, or if this could not be done, to build the Dreadnought.

Then, too, the press of this country seems to be full of that idea which to my mind is an exceedingly important one. I have met that myself. I have had letters from my constituents saying: Well, but the government is doing what these experts asked it to do. Is it doing that? I claim that if it was I and other members of this side of the House would be deprived of a good deal of the argument which we put up against the Bill in favour of the Dreadnoughts. I have here something which has been circulated by the Winnipeg 'Free Press.' I and other members are careful what we say about this fourth estate. There are two kinds of people who can sass us whom we have no opportunity to sass back, that is, the man behind the pulpit and the man behind the pen, the editor of a newspaper. I shall read three short quotations from the Winnipeg 'Free Press.' The first is:

> It will be seen that the composition of the Australian fleet unit is to be on the lines laid down by the British admiralty and does not include a Dreadnought.

I do not think any hon. member opposite would pretend to say that that statement was right or true.

> As all the world knows the Dreadnought tendered by Australia to the admiralty was declined in favour of the policy of the creation of an Australian navy on the same lines as those laid down in the Canadian naval policy.

That does not call for any remark. Again:

> There remains this fact that the vessels which Australia is to provide herself with are to be the same as those with which Canada is to provide herself.

I do not think anybody would claim that these statements are true. Now, what did the admiralty ask, in a few words? The memorandum is signed by Mr. McKenna, as First Lord of the Admiralty:

> In the opinion of the admiralty, a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war.
>
> The fleet to be aimed at should, therefore, in the opinion of the admiralty, consist at least of the following:—
>
> 1 armoured cruiser (new Indomitable class), which is of the Dreadnought type,
> 3 unarmoured cruisers (Bristol class),
> 6 destroyers,
> 3 submarines.

The admiralty and the English government had a great deal of difficulty in getting any representatives of this government over to the last conference at all, a very different state of affairs from what existed in New Zealand and Australia. New Zealand was anxious, subject to the best interests of the empire, that there should be a great imperial conference. Australia took the same view; but Canada did not see any particular reason why a conference should be held. However, after considerable correspondence and a number of cablegrams, the Canadian government agreed to send over two representatives. Their conference with the admiralty amounted about to this. Canada said: We are not willing to do what you want us to do. The admiralty said: Well, if you won't do that, what will you do? Canada said: You are the experts, and we would like to be advised by you what to do. The First Lord of the Admiralty said: It is impossible to advise you unless you will tell us how much money you wish to expend. Then our representatives mentioned two separate

sums which this country was willing to spend. Then the experts advised our representatives what they thought were the best ships that could be got for that amount of money. In a few words, that is about what occurred, and I do not think our friends opposite can possibly make the people of this country believe that in this Bill they are carrying out what the admiralty asked for.

Now, I am going to take a little time to prove some of the things I have said in reference to Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Here is a communication from the Governor of New Zealand to the Secretary of State on March 22, 1909, very near the time when this House debated the resolution of last year:

Government of New Zealand offer to bear cost of immediate building and arming by the British government of one first-class battleship of the latest type. If subsequent events show it to be necessary, will also bear cost of second warship of the same type.

That is what New Zealand offered, a country with one-fifth the population of Canada, and with less than one-fifth the natural resources of Canada. This is the reply received by New Zealand:

Please hasten to assure your Prime Minister that his message has been received by me with the highest appreciation of the generous and spontaneous offer made on behalf of New Zealand. It will be at once laid before His Majesty's government.

The following is also from the Secretary of State to the Governor of New Zealand:

I am commanded by the King to inform you that His Majesty is deeply gratified by the patriotic feeling displayed by New Zealand towards mother country in their splendid offer, and to convey at once his gratitude and high appreciation for fine patriotism and generosity shown in the magnificent offer made so promptly and spontaneously.

Again from the Governor General to the Secretary of State:

Am desired by Prime Minister to convey to His Majesty the King government of New Zealand's deep sense of gratitude for gracious message and for His Majesty's generous recognition of New Zealand offer of battleship to the mother country. People of New Zealand pleased to evince in a tangible way to His Majesty the King and to help to maintain strength of empire.

There was some doubt as to whether the federal government of Australia would offer Dreadnoughts or whether it would be done by the different provinces. The Governor of New South Wales made the following offer to the Secretary of State:

If Commonwealth parliament does not adopt this course, governments of New South Wales and Victoria have agreed immediately to take the necessary steps to obtain the authority of their respective parliaments to share costs of a Dreadnought on a per capita basis.

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

The Secretary of State to the Governor of New South Wales:

His Majesty's government warmly appreciate desire of New South Wales and Victoria to contribute their share of the cost of a Dreadnought, and would gratefully welcome such an addition to the naval strength of the empire.

We were told by the Minister of Militia the other day that in time of war the fleet which Australia proposes to build is not to go automatically under the control of the British admiralty. Now, the paragraph which I propose to read, from a communication addressed by the Governor General of Australia to the Secretary of State, would set that at rest:

In time of war or emergency, or upon a declaration by the senior naval officer representing the British government, that a condition of emergency exists, all vessels of the naval force of the Commonwealth shall be placed by the Commonwealth government under the orders of Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. The method by which the vessels shall come under the orders of the senior naval officer would be by furnishing each commander of an Australian vessel with sealed orders and instructions (to) the effect that upon the declaration to him by the senior naval officer representing British government that a state of war or emergency exists, such sealed orders shall thereupon be opened and, in pursuance of their provisions, he shall thereupon immediately place himself under the orders of the senior naval officer representing British government.

So far as I can see, the fleet will certainly come automatically under the direction of the admiralty in time of war.

Now, a few words in reference to the manner in which Canada received the invitation to come over and consult with the admiralty as to the best means of defence. The following is from the Secretary of State to the Governor General:

His Majesty's government have noted with much satisfaction the resolution passed by the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada on March 29 on subject of national defence, recording its approval of the organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with, and in close relation to, the imperial navy, and I understand that the Dominion government proposes that its Defence Ministers should come here at an early date to confer with the imperial navy and military authorities upon technical matters arising upon that resolution.

I desire therefore to commend to you the following important suggestion, namely, that a conference of representatives of the self-governing Dominions, convened under the terms of resolution (1) of the conference of 1907, which provides for such subsidiary conference, should be held in London early in July next. The object of the conference would be to discuss the question of naval and

military defence of the empire with special reference to the Canadian resolution.

That was on April 30, 1909. What was the answer of Canada to that plain and respectful invitation? The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) answered on February 8:

The ministers wish to point out that the views of the Canadian House of Commons on the question of naval defence have already been expressed, and, in pursuance of the resolution of that body two ministers, as already announced, will shortly go to London to discuss with the admiralty the best methods of carrying out that resolution. My ministers have not sufficient information to warrant them advising the necessity of such a formal conference as that suggested, but there will be no objection to postpone visit till July so as to suit convenience of imperial government.

One sees there in a moment the difference in the manner in which this invitation was received and accepted by New Zealand and Australia, and the manner in which it was received by Canada. The New Zealand government declared that, in the opinion of the ministers, a representation of all parts of the empire at the conference was essential, and that the course which the home government was taking was the right one and in the best interests of the empire. The Transvaal gave a similar answer, but every one in this House knows the position in which the Transvaal was at that time. Every one knows that the Transvaal was not in a position to give the same answer as New Zealand or Australia.

According to the admiralty memorandum this is their opinion:

In the opinion of the admiralty the Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war. The operation of destroyers and torpedo boats are necessarily limited to waters near the coast or to a radius of action not far distant from the base, while there are great difficulties in manning such a force and keeping it always thoroughly efficient.

Will any hon. gentleman pretend that the navy contemplated will, in time of war, be of any material benefit? I do not think they would be able to line up to the war line. In any case, they would be of no benefit in protecting our trade routes. Outside of our sentiment in favour of protecting our empire, and looking at the matter only from the commercial side, I think that what we want is something that will assist in protecting our great trade routes.

I believe that the time has come when we should say what we think in these matters. While I have not the slightest desire to give any offence, I must say that I believe, from the bottom of my heart, that this Bill is framed, in the manner in which it is, in order to please our friends from the province of Quebec. For that province and its people I have the greatest respect. It is one of the oldest provinces in this Dominion, and one of which we have a great many reasons to be proud, but I must say that ever since I have been in this House, it seems to me that in all questions of importance everything has had to be subsidiary to the interests of Quebec. That is hardly fair. I do not care whether you take the Autonomy Bill or any Bill that has ever come before this House, you will find the facts to bear out what I say. But I am delighted to see a glimmer of light in that province in that one respect. There is lots of light there in many other respects, but I find there to-day what I never saw before, and what I do not think any citizen of Canada ever saw before, I find one of the leading papers in that province asking, in connection with this question, is it fair or right that one province out of nine should stand up against the other eight. These are the words of one of the leading French papers in the province of Quebec. I say that this is as it should be. We ought not to legislate in this country for any province, but for the Dominion in the very broadest possible way.

Mr. RIVET. Give us the name of that newspaper to which you refer?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is 'La Patrie.'

Mr. RIVET. Which number?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I really cannot tell. I had the quotation here, but it was very lately—within the last three or four days.

Mr. RIVET. We do not object.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not think you do. I believe that every right thinking man, when we sit down and talk these things over, will say that is the right sort of sentiment, and that it is one which every Canadian should be willing to express.

Mr. ERNEST ROY. That is alright.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I want to say in closing that I am absolutely honest and sincere in supporting the amendment of my leader. If I believed that this Bill brought down by the government were of any practical value in the protection of this great empire I would be bound to support it, but I do not see how it can be. I have tried to prove by the very best authorities that to-day there is an emergency. My good friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) said that if we had started twenty years ago we might have had a fleet of some service to-day. There is something in that statement. But twenty years ago Germany

had a very small fleet and this great arming of the different nations was not going on, whereas to-day we are right up against an emergency.

The leader of this House says that it will be at least five years. Well, I do not think any one doubts that it will be at least ten years before the navy which it is proposed by this Bill to provide, will be in practical service. And I do not think there is a man in this House but believes that that will be too late. Suppose that war should come within the next two or three years, what would be the condition of all these colonies? New Zealand would be able to march up to the firing line with her Dreadnought; Australia the same; and I believe, as soon as affairs are settled in South Africa, that part of the empire also will be ready. But where will Canada be? She will not march up to the firing line; she will be standing away off shouting through a megaphone, as I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said: 'Don't come near us; we are good runners, but we are no good for fighting.' That will be absolutely the position of Canada, and the Dreadnoughts of New Zealand and Australia will have to defend our little navy, and what will such an inadequate navy cost. Built in England, $11,000,000. Built in Canada, $15,000,000. By time ships are finished at least $20,000,000. Maintenance at least $5,000,000 per year. Who is to pay for this? Not contractors; not makers of uniform, ammunition and supplies. All these will make rich out of the undertaking. The bulk of the expense will fall upon the farmer and the wage-earner.

There is a most interesting article in last night's Montreal 'Star'. I indicated a little while ago how careful we have to be in what we say about the fourth estate. But the Montreal 'Star', a newspaper of great influence all over this Dominion, probably the paper that goes into the homes of more people in Canada—and I am not advertising the 'Star' now—than any other paper. But I do not think that the 'Star' last night was fair. After thumping everybody on both sides of the House, the 'Star' gave us the assurance that it would announce its policy to-night. I am sure that every man on either side of the House is waiting in great anxiety to learn what this great paper is going to tell us. It will propound a great naval policy; it will tell Canada what to say and do. I sometimes think—cannot help but think—what a great blessing to this country it would be if some of the preachers and some of the editors were only in this House. We should not then have such difficulty in formulating and carrying out great policies. The press is a great institution. We have a tremendous lot to thank them for; they are the disseminators of all that is good. But somehow they sometimes get into the habit of saying pretty hard things. But we have only to wait until to-night, when the Montreal 'Star' comes in, we shall have a proper naval policy for this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I had no idea of taking up so much time. I have only now to sum up and present my conclusions:

1. I believe that the present position of Canada, that of absolute dependence upon Great Britain for our naval protection, is intolerable.

2. I believe that if the people of this country realized that such a condition existed they would vote almost unanimously to terminate that state of affairs.

3. As ninety-five per cent of our exports are water-borne, it is of the utmost importance that our trade routes be protected. Hitherto, Great Britain has policed the trade routes, but the time has come when Canada should relieve the British taxpayer of some of his burden in this respect.

4. We believe that the government's naval policy is miserably inadequate. We believe it to be a foolish, useless, expensive tin pot navy, one that will be of little service in protecting our trade routes or our empire in time of war.

5. I believe, not in a Canadian navy, but in a great imperial navy, the expense of which is borne by the whole British empire, and not by the taxpayers of Great Britain only. I believe that that navy should be under one directing head. I do not see how it could be effective otherwise. If the navy were made which this government proposes, and if it formed a component part of the great imperial navy, then, in time of war, as I have already said, it might be of some use. It may be my fault, but, for my part, I fail to recognize in this Bill anything that will do what I have asked should be done.

6. Experts tell us to-day that the effective vessels are Dreadnoughts. Then, we should demand the immediate construction of one or two Dreadnoughts to be built for Canada, and at the expense of Canada. That will help to stand off the German menace, or the menace of any other country, thereby giving our assistance in maintaining—what I believe to be of world wide importance—the supremacy of Great Britain on the high seas.

7. Sir, I believe that the great majority of the citizens of Canada realize that the future hope of the country, commercially, politically and sentimentally lies in continuing our close relation to the British empire.

I repeat that I stand for one throne, one flag, one navy.

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is a circumstance

of good augury for the measure now before this House that the further we proceed in the discussion of it the more we notice the marked contrast between the abundance of arguments used in its support and the obvious scarcity of reasons to be adduced against it. After having listened with a good deal of attention to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) I hold this opinion more strongly than ever. For, after having seen the hon. gentleman evidently labouring under pains of difficulty, travelling far afield in search of new arguments and finding none, drawing upon the resources of what I believe to be one of the most fertile imaginations combined with a good deal of the spirit of imperialism, the hon. gentleman at last came to discover—or thought he could discover—a new argument, and one which, I am sure, has been to every member of this House quite a surprise, quite a revelation. Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman stood in his place and stated that this measure had been introduced in this House for the single purpose of pleasing the province of Quebec, I was staggered, as I believe that to-morrow, when he reads it, my friend Mr. Henri Bourassa, the good ally of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), will be staggered.

I do not propose to follow the line of argument which has been adopted by the hon. member. However, allow me to tell him that in regard to this legislation, which I consider, as every member of this House considers, to be of the greatest national importance, the province of Quebec from which I have the honour to hail has not the slightest intention to take a different position from the other provinces. The motives which influence every Canadian irrespective of race and creed are as powerful in Quebec as elsewhere, and we intend to give an undivided support to this legislation, notwithstanding the attitude of some of the leading members of our race and our province, who to-morrow I hope will return to better councils and will admit that the majority was well inspired and took the proper course. The province of Quebec does not wish to assume in this House or in this country a position of isolation. That has never been the policy of the leaders of the province of Quebec. If at one time, and possibly under different circumstances, there happened to be some members of my race or of my province advocating a different course, thank God, those days are gone by, and they are to be found to-day in a hopeless minority.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, in the course of my remarks on the budget, I had the honour to inform this House that I purposed supporting the Bill that is now under discussion, and I did so without advancing any other reason for my intended action than the need of self-protection that should characterize both nations and individuals. I stated that later on I would explain in a fuller and more explicit manner the motives that actuate me in my attitude concerning a matter of such national importance. I am happy to be able to take advantage of the occasion which now presents itself to fulfil that engagement, and, under the sway of a deep-set conviction, a conviction based upon a serious study of all the circumstances that surround the misisterial measure, I rise to reiterate my confidence in the policy of the government.

At the outset let me say that I understand and appreciate to its fullest, the part that falls to my lot, and the responsibilities I assume at this moment. I do not forget the fact that, if the ministry shoulder all the merit or demerit, as the case may be, attached to the measure that it has originated, it is only a parliamentary majority that can impart to it a legal existence and an executive power, and must especially answer before history for the true or false interpretation that it embodies of the popular will. But I must add that it is without any apprehension, without any fear of the popular verdict, as has been here and elsewhere often declared, that I place my humble support at the service of the government. I am confident that the public opinion of this country, once enlightened as to the motive and results of the ministerial course, will quickly silence the prejudices and passions awakened by party spirit and will cordially support the government. But should it be otherwise, the prospect of a defeat should not, it seems to me, lessen our attachment to a cause that we in conscience believe to be just and in harmony with the best interests of Canada.

It also behooves us, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, to divest ourselves of all external influences and, in all conscience and full liberty, to exercise our mandate as representatives of the people. For, if, until the introduction of this Bill, we could have claimed the moral support of public opinion, ready to accept favourably the almost concordant expressions of the authorized leaders of the two great political parties, to-day, the unexpected somersault of the leader of the opposition, followed by the disavowal inflicted on him by his principal lieutenant from my native province, are ill-calculated to direct that public opinion in the direction of a solution of such a vast and yet delicate question. The parliamentary situation, as affected by the amendment and sub-amendment of the left, is more likely to set popular sentiment astray than to afford it a true solution of the question. What is that situation? By the Bill now introduced the government pro-

vides for the organization of a Canadian naval service. This Bill, with slight variations, is entirely based on our Militia Act, By clause 18 the government may, in case of emergency, place the naval service at the disposal of the British admiralty. On account of the circumstances that gave birth to the project of a Canadian navy, and on account of our particular position as a nation in the British empire, that clause 18 became inevitable and must appear quite a matter of course; but often, the most simple things in appearance, do not seem to be understood in the same way by every one, since our friends of the opposition have seen a world of differences in that clause, according as it has been viewed through the spectacles of Mr. Borden or those of Mr. Monk. And this difference of interpretation has served as basis of the two absolutely opposite systems that summarize the two classes of contradictory attacks made against the Bill.

In the opinion of the leader of the opposition, clause 18 upsets all the economy of a naval project, the principal aim of which should be to strengthen the British fleet. By that clause Canada withdraws with one hand what she gives with the other. In a word, according to Mr. Borden, the radical fault of the Bill is the too absolute control of Canada over the navy, the too rigorous application of the principles of autonomy that govern our national life. According to him, the same idea of autonomy is at the bottom of the policy of constructing vessels of a class only useful to Canada and of no use to the mother country in the hour of danger. The hon. member sees only one way to remedy the evil he seems to dread, and that is the gift of $25,000,000 to England with the subsequent approbation of the people—after the money would be safely landed in the British treasury. This is embodied in his amendment, which is the expression of the policy of the bulk of the opposition. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier thinks, on the other hand, that the same clause 18 is destructive of our autonomy, the upsetting of responsible government, the reducing of our parliament to simple municipal institutions, the total loss of all the fruits derived from the sacrifices and struggles of our fathers in the cause of liberty. For the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, a Canadian navy, created under clause 18, would only be a squadron of the British fleet, intended principally for the defence of the mother country, and this interpretation leads him to claim, in his amendment, that the government's policy modifies, in a wholesale manner, our relations with the empire—and he, therefore, demands an appeal to the popular vote.

Thus the two Conservative leaders reach the same goal, but by different roads. For both of them, clause 18 contains nothing worthy of the occasion. For the one, under its mask are all the traits of evil, where the other considers them the traits of good—and vice versa. In other terms, the leader of the opposition sees in that clause the incarnation of nationalism, while the hon. member for Jacques Cartier sees in it the incarnation of imperialism. Could a more flagrant contradiction be imagined? The best way to reconcile their views would be for both these gentlemen to change spectacles. But they will do no such a thing, for none are so blind as those who do not want to see. What is the truth, Mr. Speaker? If our friends on the left desire to sanely intercept clause 18, they will see in it none of the dangers that they apprehend from both sides, but they will find in it the guarantee that all desire —that is to say, our country's autonomy and our effective aid in the maintenance of the supremacy of the British navy. But, as I said a moment ago, this contradictory assault on the ministerial policy, and which, in case of an appeal to the people, is repeated outside, is scarcely likely to enlighten the public mind, nor to inspire a verdict in accord with facts. Hence, the duty of the majority arises from the very circumstances of the case. Invested with popular confidence to solve in this parliament all problems of national interest, we should fulfil our task without undergoing the jostling of divided opinions, nor the onset of passions excited by the prejudiced and unscrupulous. In this question, as in all others, our mandate authorizes us to safe-guard the true interests of the country, and, were we to be unfaithful to our duty, the people of Canada would be justified, later on, in visiting us with punishment for our lack of initiative and of patriotism. This much being said, Mr. Speaker, I assert that a Canadian navy, in conformity with the dispositions of the present Bill, constitutes one of the essential obligations of our position as a colony, and is one of the consequences of our national evolution.

Before discussing that proposition, I desire, Sir, to lay down some fundamental principles, which, in my humble opinion, underlie the spirit of this Bill.

1. The organization of a naval defence is not a blessing, but a necessity imposed on us by the present conditions of civilization. This principle has been admitted in all times, even by those whose convictions were opposed to war in every form. John Bright, an English statesman, well known for his pacific leanings, has admitted the necessity of national defence as long as, between nations, war should remain as the final tribunal of arbitration.

2. Militarism consists in a preponderance of an exaggerated sort given, in a country, to the military element; our defence

organization could only draw us into it in proportion to the degree in which we follow the example of the European nations that bend under the load of their armaments.

3. Canada is an autonomous colony of the British empire, enjoying practically a quasi-independence, but theoretically and absolutely under the domination of the British Crown. The colonial tie may be almost imperceptible; yet it exists in all its strength, and only a successful revolution, or the consent of Great Britain, could dissolve it. We will see later how the close of England's naval supremacy could effect our actual position.

4. The breaking of the bond with Great Britain would leave two alternatives for Canada: Independence or annexation with the United States.

5. The safest foundation of the British empire lies in the liberty of action and the free autonomous development of its component parts.

All those who have written or spoken against this Bill seem to have forgotten one or two, and, in some cases, all of these principles. It is not wonderful that such forgetfulness should have led them into contradictory conclusions, contrary to facts and to the best interests, both of the Canadian people and the British empire. I, therefore, say that it is not possible to discuss in an intelligent manner this problem of naval defence without having present to the mind the fundamental ideas that I have just indicated, because they must necessarily be found at the root of any policy respecting means of mutual protection, as between Great Britain and her self-governing colonies.

As I have already pointed out, the government, in its naval policy, has been from the beginning, confronted by two different and contradictory lines of attack. On the one hand, it has been claimed that the only policy that suggests itself under the circumstances is one of immediate assistance, by way of a cash contribution to the mother country; this is the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I am satisfied that such a solution of the question has already been proved unacceptable by some of the supporters of the government. It has been conclusively shown, to my mind, that a system of cash and periodical contributions is a temporary and costly expedient, that brings no definite solution of our relations with the mother country, in respect to naval defence, and is a violation of all principles of self-government, could only be excused on the ground of an imminent crisis in the naval history of Great Britain. As this alleged crisis has been found to be a night-mare, got up for political purposes, the position of the ultra-loyalists of the opposition becomes untenable. I propose then to leave aside that aspect of the political situation created by the Borden amendment, to deal exclusively with the opposition offered to the Bill, in other parts of Canada, namely, in Quebec, on the ground that the only policy to be followed by the government in matters of naval defence should be one of complete inaction. We now know the arguments of the opponents of a Canadian navy in the province of Quebec. Nationalists and Conservatives, the latter having taken the programme of the former, have agreed to try and convince the people of Quebec that military imperialism, according to their view, has brought us this Bill, and that, by the sacrifice of our autonomy, it has rendered the tie with Great Britain an intolerable yoke. Yet, the greater number of them, and the member for Jacques Cartier is one, have carefully avoided drawing the people's attention to the consequences for our country of a separation from England. While their premises drive them fatally into separation they have not had the honesty to go to the logical end, and to either cry out for independence or for annexation.

I am mistaken; the real exponent of nationalism, Mr. Oliver Asselin, in a pamphlet published under the title, 'Naval Defence and the British Empire', after having criticised in advance the naval policy of the government as being an attack on our autonomy, and the imposition of an undeserved and unbearable burden, faces the following alternative. Having declared that the government's policy would force us to take part in all wars wherein England's interests would be at stake, and having enumerated all the services we render to England, Mr. Asselin concludes thus:

> These services, these sacrifices, England cannot ask if, henceforth, we are to take part in all wars in which the honour or integrity of the empire are at stake. Independenec would then be doubly as valuable, and so it seems to me.

Thus the few of our opponents who have the courage and frankness to tell us whither they tend, raise the standard of independence. In the presence of such a declaration, it behooves us to calmly study the obligations that flow from such a new situation in our country. Would independence, from the standpoint of naval defence, impose greater sacrifices on us? It seems incontestible, and I doubt strongly if the partisans of independence are not imbued with the same idea—namely, that independence would entail a much heavier naval outlay than would the policy of the government. I cannot believe in the sincerity of men who place our national security under the wing of the Monroe doctrine, or under some species of American

equillibrium fashioned after that of Europe. A few days ago the hon. Postmaster General settled fairly that question of the Monroe doctrine. I will add only a few words to his eloquent remarks. In fact the Monroe doctrine is not one that enters into the international code, and, as such, is accepted by all nations. It has no obligatory force, it has no sanction outside that of the authority whence it emanates. Now, that authority is not the United States Congress or Senate, that have exclusive jurisdiction in matters of international treaties, but is the good will of the president of the United States, whose individuality changes every four or eight years. The so-called Monroe doctrine was only an expression of opinion by a president of the United States, given to harmonize with the circumstances of the time, not applying even to Canada, which it expressly excludes, which had been laid aside when the interests or the caprices of the American people required it, as has since been seen, on memorable occasions and which will be laid aside every time that such action is deemed necessary by our powerful neighbours. But even supposing that the Monroe doctrine would respect or protect our independence, is there a serious man in Canada or the United States who would pretend that such protection would exempt us from participating in the defence of our coasts and our ports? Is it at the moment when the American people aspire more and more to play a world-wide part, caress visions of imperialism, and accordingly impose fresh sacrifices on themselves and increase their naval budget, that they would consent to assume, without any compensation, the defence of such an extensive territory, as exposed as their own to attack? For all well-thinking people of Canada, as in the United States, the conditions of such a protection would be as humiliating for our national dignity as they would be dangerous to our liberty of action, and even of our independence. We would, in that way, become the vassal of the United States. Is there a Canadian, jealous of his national dignity and conscious of the great future of Canada, who would freely submit to the ignominy of such dependence? The argument of an American equilibrium compared to that of Europe is not serious. It is to insult Canada to believe that her protection may be the result of geographical conditions such as regulate the existence of small countries like Switzerland, Belgium, Denmark, or Montenegro. It is clear that the geographical conditions are not the same, and, moreover, there can be no comparison between those smaller countries, that have reached the zenith of their power, and Canada, whose growth has scarcely commenced. Moreover, history shows that the independence of those small countries is precarious, and is ever at the mercy of new combinations likely to arise, and that, besides, each of them is provided with a war fleet. Charles Dupuis, professor in the school of political science in France, in his book, 'The Principle of Equilibrium and the European Concert', writes as follows:

> The principle of equilibrium cannot be one of international law, unlike the law, it could never create a judicial principle, furnish clear, precise and identical solutions: it interdicts but few solutions and dictates none. It could only guarantee the rights of all if it could secure the maintenance of the statu quo or else counterbalance any increase of power amongst the stronger states, by means of a co-relative increase of the power of the feebler states. The maintenance of the statu quo is impossible and the counterbalances have rarely been established save to the benefit of the strong and the injury of the weak.

Thus our independence would not guarantee us against the cost of naval defence nor against equivalent sacrifices. Mr. Asselin, himself, in the pamphlet I have just mentioned, is obliged to agree, at page 40, he says:

> If we were independent, nothing would prevent us from creating for ourselves, for ourselves alone, that navy which we are bound to create for others and to make friends at the same time amongst the larger states, England included, with the trade benefits which we now give free to the metropolis.

The opponents of the measure in Quebec are not deceived on this point, and despite their cry about the Munroe doctrine there are but few amongst them who have any belief in any independence in the near future. If there be any who secretly nurse the thought of independence, its realization seems to them very far off, not of our generation, something to be secured only when Canada shall have attained a degree of development and power which would afford the ambition and means of holding that privileged position. I do not pretend that those Canadians who entertain the idea of independence at some future date, should be amenable to the tribunal of jingoism presided over by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It is not treasonable and it is not quite permissible to think and to say that Canada, having reached her full development, like the ripe apple falling from the tree, may eventually, by the force of circumstances, become a sovereign nation. I am not referring to those who may have that idea in mind. But I speak of the men who proclaim themselves partisans of a Canadian republic at an early date, and in view of escaping the obligations of naval defence, and I say that there is none of them who would not bitterly repent of his declarations and separatist speeches, if, in the near future, some fine morning, England were to aban-

don her finest colony to itself, leaving it all the risks and responsibilities of an independent state.

The hypothesis of an annexation to the United States scarcely need to be mentioned. If such annexation were the political doctrine of a given number of Canadians belonging to either or both of our great political parties, (for in this regard, in looking over their past, neither of these parties can cast a stone at each other), I submit that in our day, amongst the framers of public thought, save and except Goldwin Smith, we can find no one who openly professes that theory in regard to our national future. The same may be said of the mass of the people. In the province of Quebec, especially, despite the large number of its citizens who have emigrated to the United States, and who have kept up cordial and unbroken relations with Canada, annexation is looked upon as a danger for the institutions and for the language of the French-Canadian minority. This is why our fellow-citizens of the province of Quebec, more so than those of any other province, would prefer either the status quo or independence, to the risks of a situation so menacing to their race.

But it is quite possible that, between the peril of American assimilation and the terrors of military imperialism, some of our French-Canadian fellow-citizens may incline to the first of these evils as the lesser. In that case, it becomes our duty to undeceive them and to remind them that the dream of American imperialism, expressed in ever-increasing maritime armaments, would load them with a tax in money and men far heavier than could ever their free co-operation with the British admiralty in the defence of Canadian soil; and, on this subject, I may be permitted to point out, and without any thought of reproach, that the Spanish-American war claimed more victims amongst the soldiers and sailors of Canadian extraction, than did the Boer war, in which, indeed, many of our people fell fighting for the British flag. But I am convinced that few Canadians harbour any illusion in this regard, or imagine that annexation would bring them some kind of national sovereignty freed from the corresponding obligations—more burdensome than those of our present state.

The status quo, our position of self-governing colony within the British empire,—such is undoubtedly the desire of the great mass of the Canadian people. Their adhesion thereto is not baseless; it is reasoned and reasonable, it is founded on special advantages and benefits belonging thereto. These advantages and benefits have been enumerated. The Postmaster General, in his masterly speech the other day, told us of the liberties and extensive privileges that we enjoy under the British flag. If we have not the title of nation, we exercise all the leading prerogatives and responsibilities of one. The extreme independence in our economic and social life, the safeguards of our trade and industries, the prestige and advantages derived from the capacity of British subjects, and, especially for us French-Canadians, the guarantees that surround our institutions, our religion and our language; these are the principal actuating influences in our fidelity to our British allegiance. And this brings us to the one and only question: Can this status quo be maintained indefinitely without our fulfilling our obligations in regard to naval defence? If the reply be affirmative, the organization of a Canadian naval service, in conformity to the provisions of this Bill, would be no longer a free question of principle, but only a question of application and terms. I therefore submit, Sir, that in view of the principles that I have just laid down, the organization of our naval defence, in co-operation with the British admiralty, is only a natural result of our national evolution and of our situation as a self-governing colony. I say, further, that the government, in the application of its naval policy, has selected the time, the form and the means best suited to the interests both of the Canadian people and of the British empire. As I am disposed to repeat arguments used by some of those who have already spoken in support of the Bill, I will be as brief as possible in the demonstration of that proposition.

They who, like the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, claim that the government in its naval policy, bring in a dangerous innovation and lay aside the principles that have always governed our national life, have evidently not taken the trouble to carefully examine the declarations and the attitudes of the founders of our Canadian nationhood. All the negotiations that ended in confederation, the memorials and speeches of the statesmen concerned therein, come to show that their intention, apart from doing away with the parliamentary deadlock that had marked the closing years of the union, was mainly, to lay the foundations of a new and great nation, sufficiently strong to look after its own defence and to take part in the maintenance of British power. I may be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to make a few citations; they may cast some light on the present debate. In a letter sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in October, 1858, by the delegates of the Canadian government, in London, Messrs. Cartier, Ross and Galt, in regard to the project of confederation, I find the following:

But, independent of reasons affecting Canada alone, it is respectfully represented that the interests of the several colonies and of the empire will be greatly promoted by a more

intimate and united government of the entire British North American possessions. The population, trade, and resources of all these colonies have so rapidly increased of late years, and the removal of trade restrictions has made them, in so great a degree, self-sustaining, that it appears to the government of Canada exceedingly important to bind still more closely the ties of their common allegiance to the British Crown, and to obtain for general purposes such an identity in legislation as may serve to consolidate their growing power, thus raising under the protection of the empire an important confederation on the North American continent. . . . With a population of three and a half millions, with a foreign commerce exceeding twenty-five millions sterling, and a commercial marine inferior in extent only to those of Great Britain and the United States, it is in the power of the imperial government, by sanctioning a confederation of these provinces, to constitute a dependency of the empire, valuable in time of peace and powerful in the event of war, forever removing the fear that these colonies may ultimately serve to swell the power of another nation.

We all know that these first negotiations were not successful, and that it was only after the Quebec conference of 1864, and the ratification of its proceedings by parliament in 1865, that the adhesion of the imperial government to the scheme of confederation was again solicited by the Canadian delegates to London, Cartier, Macdonald, Brown and Galt. In a speech delivered in London, at a banquet given in their honour, on the 26th of April, 1865, Sir George Cartier, one of the delegates spoke as follows. I beg the indulgence of the House on account of the length of my citations, but they throw a vivid light on the present situation:

In consequence we seek a system that will permit us to make still greater progress, we wish to knot more closely the relations with the maritime provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. We frankly told them that we possess in Canada the necessary elements for the establishment of a strong nationhood, the population and the soil, but that we lack that other element which makes for England's greatness—the naval element. We told our friends that they are too restricted in their territory, while we need seaports and that, by uniting together we could become powerful and prosperous. Our government sent a deputation to England to show to the imperial government the absolute necessity of the realization of this confederation scheme. We desire its adoption not only to increase our prosperity and strength but also to be in a better position to participate in the defence of the British empire.

We fully conceive that in case of invasion we could not resist the enemy without the aid of England's armies, but with a union of all the provinces, we propose to take part in the defence of our country with all our might.

When we spoke of a confederation of all the colonies of North America, we did not mean a system of weakening the bonds that unite those colonies to the mother country, but a system calculated to develop, for the benefit of all, British American trade. Our confederation scheme has in it nothing to awaken a fear of events such as have been witnessed in the United States. There is no danger of a conflict between the rights of the different states and the privileges of the federal government. We purpose declaring to the imperial government that we are ready to do our duty even alone for the defence of our country, but we represented at the same time that, if this confederation became an accomplished fact, we would be in a better position to help Great Britain in case, which I hope will never come, of a war between Great Britain and the United States. I take occasion now to remark that, in binding ourselves to furnish our share in defence, we assume a considerable expenditure, but I add that you need not fear the results predicted—an increase of duty on English merchandise imported into Canada. As these predictions might lead to unpleasant impressions, I here declare that they are baseless. It was stated in both Houses of parliament, in certain newspapers of the country, that since Canada was separated, it would be better for England's safety to leave her free to become independent, or to be annexed to the United States. We in Canada know that we cannot be the cause of war, war can never come save by the will of the imperial authorities. We also know that our country is vulnerable, but we would suffer it to become a battlefield, if required, whereon to avenge the honour of England.

We in no way desire to become independent and still less to be annexed to the United States. We reject with horror the very idea.

Is this clear and explicit enough? It is the express and formal affirmation of Canada's obligation to organize her own defence and to give the mother country the benefit of that organization.

The same affirmations are to be found in the words of Sir John Macdonald, George Brown, Taché, and of all the fathers of confederation who spoke on the question. There is nothing surprising therein. To settle their work on solid foundations, the Canadian statesmen of 1867, understood the necessity of laying those principles common to all nations at its base. In order to give her the right to live, they sought to give their country the right of self-defence in defending, at the same time, the British flag, under the folds of which she should expand. The same aim gave rise to the policy of military organization in 1868.

Thus, as has been remarked, at the beginning of confederation Sir George Cartier took the portfolio of Militia. In that position it was he who had charge of the Bill that is still the fundamental basis of our military system. I have already quoted some of his remarks on the subject. I will ask leave to add thereto the following:

I do not fear, in introducing this measure, the same check as the Militia Bill of 1862

caused my colleagues and myself to fall. I believe it necessary to complete the great work of confederation. I have already remarked, on other occasions, that three indispensable elements constitute a nation; the population, the territory and the navy. But the indispensable crowning of the edifice is the militia. No people can ever pretend to the title of nation, unless they have with them a military element, a means of self-defence.

Cartier thus recognized that the time had come to endow Canada with an effective military organization and that the country should have the means of providing therefor. The success that crowned his efforts proves that public opinion was with him and acknowledged the responsibility of a nation in what concerns its own protection.

And to those that might pretend that Cartier's idea, and that of his government, did not go as far as the establishment of a naval service, I would point to the provisions of the Militia Act, which provide formally for the formation of a war fleet. Section 1 of that Act reads thus:

1. As provided by the fifteenth section of the British North America Act, 1867, the commander in chief of the land and naval militia, and of all naval and military forces of and in Canada, is vested in the Queen and shall be exercised and administered by Her Majesty personally, or by the government as Her representative.

Clause 6 of the Militia Act of 1868 reads, in part, thus:

6. The Militia shall be divided into active and reserve militia. The active militia shall consist of the volunteer militia, the regular militia and the marine militia.

* * * * * * * *

The marine militia shall be composed of seamen, sailors and persons whose usual occupation is upon any steam or sailing craft. . . . the waters of the Dominion.

By clause 61, the Queen had the discretionary powers to mobolize the militia in or out of Canada, in case of war, invasion or insurrection, without the assent of the government or parliament of Canada.

61. Her Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof for actual service, either within or without the Dominion, at any time, whenever it appears advisable so to do by reason of war invasion or insurrection or danger of any of them; and the militiamen, when so called out for actual service, shall continue to serve for at least one year from the date of their being called out for actual service, if required so to do for any longer period which Her Majesty may appoint.

Thus even at that time, the government's policy was not only to create a Canadian navy, but even to place the control of it in the discretionary power of the sovereign, acting on her own authority without the assent of the Canadian authorities.

It may be supposed that the causes for the postponement of Cartier's naval programme were both the absence of an immediate necessity and the meagreness of the public revenue. I might here multiply authorities and examples to maintain that Cartier's conception of 1868 was the true one: that is to say, that the navy is but the necessary complement of the military organization of any people, and that if, at that period, it was indispensable to provide for the country's defence by establishing a strong militia, the naval service was also to be included.

There is one page in the book of Mr. A. D. Decelles, 'Les Etats Unis,' which illustrates vividly the influence of sea power, over the destinies of nations. Although it may stir up painful recollections in the minds of my French Canadian colleagues, I cannot resist the temptation of quoting it. The writer refers to the last episode in that great drama played in America for the conquest of Canada by England. At the time referred to the army of Wolfe was within the walls of Quebec:

The chronicles of the time picture the anxiety of the English and the French in the springtime of 1760, after the second battle of the Plains of Abraham. The two enemies worn out by a long series of troubles, still saw the final issue undecided. They awaited the arrival of the fleet that was to either confirm the success of Wolfe's army, or to repair Montcalm's disaster and revive the hopes of de Lévis. As the first white sail appeared on the sky rim around the point of the island of Orleans, feverishly did their hearts beat and for a few moments there existed one of those agonizingly decisive moments in the history of a people. Finally the Union Jack spread its bright colours to the sky. A cheer of joy went up from Quebec, and deep bursts of grief from de Lévis' camp saluted that banner. England's maritime power had gained her the day, as, forty years later, she was to destroy the prospects of Bonaparte in the east, and to carry her might into every port in the world, while remaining herself, undislodgable behind her wooden walls.

In this connection, I wish also to mention that the United States, soon after the final recognition of their independence, adopted an aggressive policy of naval defence, and started to form the nucleus of a war fleet. In 1851, that war fleet was not very formidable, but it was the outcome of a systematic and well-planned policy in the direction of naval organization. In his speech delivered in Washington, on the 4th of July, 1851, on the occasion of the inauguration of an addition to the Capitol, Daniel Webster used the following language with respect to the navy:

The navy is the active and aggressive element of national defence, and let loose from our own sea coasts, must display its own powers on the seas and channels of the

enemy. To do this, it need not be large and it can never be large enough to defend at home by its presence all our ports and harbours.

But in the absence of the navy, what can the regular army, the volunteer militia, do against the enemy's line of battleships and steamers falling without notice on our coast? What will guard our cities from tribute, our merchant vessels and our navy yards from conflagration? Here again we see a wise forecast in the system of defensive measures which, especially since the close of the war with Great Britain, has been steadily followed by the government.

It is also to be remembered, that after the war of independence, the population of the United States did not exceed three millions. It is exactly this wise forethought expressed by Daniel Webster in the case of the United States that inspired Cartier and his colleagues with a policy of military armament, which, in their minds, equally implied the organization of a naval service. In their eyes, the future of Canada appeared as brilliant as that of the American republic, and it was this clear view of the high destinies of our country that inspired them to give to her economic life and her general development those guarantees of independence and security which had been adopted by the great country to the south of us. It did not flash in their minds, that the protection offered by England could absolve them from participating in the defence of a territory so vast and so exposed to the enemy as in Canada, and, in accord with the public opinion of the day, they considered that the best and most effective way to secure the protection of the mother country was to contribute thereto within the limits of Canada's resources. Under like conditions, and thanks to them since that day, Canada has been able to move along the different stages of development and to reach the degree of progress and power that she now enjoys. If the happy results of Cartier's policy are now felt by us, it is, however, proper for us to inquire if the time has not come for the final execution of that policy. If so, such can be done only by the adoption of a naval programme in accord with the present conditions of the country. Thus I come to that part of my theme wherein I purpose briefly indicating how and why the government's naval programme is but the logical and opportune development of the traditional policy of our early statesmen in regard to matters of national defence.

The partisans of the status quo or of abstention from any naval programme, forget, or seem to forget, that on both sides, in the mother country and in Canada, affairs have spun along at a lively rate since 1868, and that in each country, changes have taken place that necessitate modifications in our defence policy. In Canada we are far removed from the point we occupied at confederation and at the original organization of our militia system. The great growth in population, the development of our national resources, the wonderful expansion of our trade and industries, the establishment of a comprehensive system of transportation, as well as the importance of our sea-ports, threaten to make Canada a serious rival in the economic field. After a long period of folding herself up, in order to take a grander bound forward, Canada is now spreading out and seeking other outlets for her trade and productions. The systematic attention of other nations, at the birth of this new competitor has gradually turned into a mistrust that she may soon become a rival.

In this new situation, growing rapidly more pronounced, Canada owes it to herself and to the mother country, which has watched over her progress and development as effectively as situations would permit, to protect not only the vital parts of her economic organization but also her trade and industries. Despite the ridiculous pretention that Canada has no foreign trade to protect, on the pretext that her merchantmen are registered at the British admiralty, those vessels are truly Canadian ships, carrying Canadian merchandise and having a right to our country's protection. Were Canada to become a sovereign nation, those ships would none the less remain attached to our ports and would continue to carry on every sea the products and wealth of this country. Under these conditions, is it not evident that the exigencies of national defence have considerably augmented, and if we do not, ourselves, subscribe to them, England must be asked or else the United States to do so for us. We have seen that it is impossible to count on American protection for it would be too costly and too inimical to our liberty of action, to the preservation of our territory and even to our independence.

Can the mother country effectively protect our interests?

Have we the right to ask it of her?

In this regard, I may be permitted to recall the fact that while the work of our national expansion has been going on in England, an evolution in the conditions surrounding naval defence has taken place. That evolution was not so much the result of the British will as it was the outcome of the conditions of European equilibrium. Since 1867, an entirely new situation has arisen in Europe. The Franco-Prussian war, the birth of the German empire, the formation of the triple alliance, the aggressive expansion of Germany have obliged the other European nations to modify their alliances and increase their armaments in

an abnormal manner. To maintain her naval supremacy, and to be true to her alliances, England had, herself, to increase her outlay for naval defence. This state of things is certainly deplorable, contrary to the tendency of civilization and none regret and condemn it more than I do. But say or do what we may that situation is unavoidable, and we must submit to it with all the inconveniences it carries. There may be reason in the assertion that the defence of Canada has nothing to do with England's projects of armament. I believe, myself, that in her naval policy the mother country only obeys the influences that the present situation in Europe suggests. But we cannot say, in face of history, that the increased burden of defence is the effect of a wrong diplomacy. On the contrary, it is well known that England, spurred by the expansion of Germany's imperialism, has cleverly assured herself of such alliances and friendships as guarantee the peace of Europe. And for my part, as a French-Canadian, I rejoice in witnessing the realization between the land of my forefathers and England of that 'entente cordiale' which has produced and will produce again most excellent results for both countries and for the peace of the world.

Then, Sir, it so happens that as Canada feels the need of augmenting her means of self-protection, England, through the circumstances I have just related, is unable to offer us any additional guarantees of defence. In these circumstances is there aught more natural than that between the mother country and her first daughter an amicable understanding should take place, whereby the means most effective to secure a satisfactory solution for both countries may be obtained. If this need of understanding means imperialism, I have no hesitation in proclaiming myself an imperialist.

Imperialism, as it exists in this country, proceeds from two different sources. There is one kind of imperialism, which I may call sentimental, which is derived from that deep attachment which binds, heart and soul, all those Canadians who were born and brought up in England to their mother country. This love of their native land occupies in their sentiments a privileged place paramount to that devoted to Canada, their new country. They are Britishers first, Canadians afterwards. This sentiments leads them at times in all good faith and sincerity to sacrifice the interests of Canada to those of Great Britain. This is the imperialism of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have already spoken on this question. I respect their sentiments, but I must say that I cannot share them.

But there is another kind of imperialism based upon a reciprocity of interest as between England and Canada. This is the imperialism of those of our fellow-citizens who having been born and brought up in this country, are attached to their native land through one or more generations of their ancestors, and naturally give to Canada the first place in their hearts, without in any way forgetting their obligations to Great Britain, which has granted them their liberty, their self-government, and protects their interests and their national life. Such an imperialism is based upon a true conception of our position as a people and the future of our country, as well as upon the idea that the prosperity and greatness of the British empire chiefly depends upon the free development of its colonies and their voluntary co-operation in the work of mutual consolidation of commercial relations and means of defence. This imperialism is the one professed by the majority of the citizens of this country who think it is possible to conciliate their duties as Canadian citizens with their obligations as British subjects without any sacrifice of either. This imperialism is mine, and I ask my opponents to respect my convictions as well as I do their own. Need I say, Mr. Speaker, that the imperial conference of 1909 has been the outcome of this latter kind of imperialism.

The Conservative-Nationalist party in the province of Quebec imagined that in that conference they could see the fuse of a conspiracy hidden, threatening our political liberties. There are people who, craving the title of saviours of their race and their country, try to find ambushes and dangers everywhere—and in their mad desire, hesitate not to misrepresent facts, falsify language and impute to others the worst and most perfidious intentions. With the best motives in the world, no doubt, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier poses as the leader of the adversaries of a Canadian navy, and assisted by some newspapers in the province of Quebec, he is trying to divert public attention from the real issues involved in this Bill.

Mr. MONK. What papers does my hon. friend allude to?

Mr. RIVET. I am alluding to that paper published in Montreal called the 'Devoir,' but which to my mind has not the least notion of the meaning of that word.

Mr. MONK. If it is to that paper my hon. friend alludes, I may tell him that I cordially subscribe to everything it has said upon this question.

Mr. RIVET. Well, if the views of that paper suit him, he is welcome to them. Now a careful and impartial perusal of the deliberations of that memorable conference of 1909 will suffice to convince us of the futility of the nationalist theory.

A careful and impartial perusal of the deliberations of that memorable conference, should suffice to convince us of the futility of the nationalist theory. For all men of good faith, the report of the conference attests the spirit of conciliation that presided at its deliberations and above all, the solicitude of England to respect the liberty of action of her self-governing colonies. Thus, while the British admiralty insists on the importance, from a strategical point of view, of a single fleet maintained by the different parts of the empire, she does not scruple to admit that such considerations must give way to the political and geographical conditions that obtain in each colony. This is admitting the priority of colonial defence over imperial defence. It is this principle recognized and in practice, at all times, in Canada, that our plenipotentiaries upheld. The principle being once established, the only thing remaining was to come to an understanding as to the modus operandi. This was no easy task. If our representatives in London could, without difficulty, have their policy accepted by the English admiralty, they had but slight illusions as to the reception they would meet with from certain elements in Canada. They had good reason to fear that programme of the 'just midway' would not easily obtain the support of the extreme groups that represent here the olden bureaucracy traditions, on the one hand, and the olden spirit of distrust in and hostility towards England, on the other. However, they could reasonably expect that the two great political parties swayed by a just conception of the interests and duties of the moment, would unite in common action without any consideration other than the accomplishment of a national enterprise. The occasion was most favourable for proof that the ancient prejudice had no voice in the national assembly, and that a moderate view, that of the vast majority of our citizens would prevail in the House. The Liberal party had to assume the duty of justifying in all respects the forecasts of its leader, and the unanimous support given from this side of the House is ample evidence of its success. Does this mean, Sir, that the Liberal party had not to undergo the influence of extreme ideas, at an equal distance from both of which the government had set up its naval programme? Not at all, but our party's merit lies in its triumph over such influence, in its courageous undertaking to have the electorate accept its views. After the patriotic declarations of the leader of the opposition at Halifax, on his return from London, the hope was then entertained throughout Canada that the same course might be adopted by the Conservative party. Unfortunately such a hope has been of short duration.

Notwithstanding the open and repeated declarations of its leader, that party soon began to resort to its favourite tactics. After having oscillated between the two poles of nationalism and imperialism, which alternately attracted it, impotent as it was, to overcome either the one or the other of these influences, it has ended by dividing itself in two irreconcilable groups which each in its own way strives to defeat the ministerial policy. And that, Sir, instead of adopting a course of moderate and loyal criticism of the details of the Bill, such as might have been expected of an opposition, worthy of its part, hon. gentlemen opposite have started a campaign of denunciation and vituperation, against the most eminent personalities of our party in the House. Even the right hon. Prime Minister, in spite of long and meritorious services in the cause of Canada and the British empire, could not be spared from invective and abuse, from that quarter. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) started the ball rolling, and the man who lives in a glass house, began to throw stones at others, aiming particularly at the right hon. leader of the government, whose unblemished record and political integrity is an unpardonable crime not to be condoned, or overlooked, on any occasion. The rank and file was not slow in following in his foot-steps, and since the unparalleled pronouncement, in point of personal abuse, delivered by the hon. member for North Toronto, we have had other utterances of the same character, the most remarkable of which, have been probably, the philippics of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan). What a contrast, Mr. Speaker, between those reckless deliverances and the dignified and public attitude followed on this side of the House? While we seek to maintain this debate, within the high sphere of reason and facts, most of the hon. gentlemen on your left, endeavour to obscure issues, by appealing to prejudice, to passion.

As a party man, I would feel rather inclined to rejoice over those tactics, for they prove too clearly the bad faith and administrative incapacity of the Conservative party, not to strengthen the confidence of the people of Canada in the Liberal administration

As a Canadian, anxious for the future of my country, I regret them sincerely. As a French Canadian, priding myself upon belonging to the nationality which clams the leader of the government as one of its own. I wish to enter my protest against the undeserved abuse to which he has been subjected since the opening of this debate. I wish also to state how keenly I resent the words uttered againet the men of my race, who fought and shed their blood in the cause of political liberty, and to whose

sacrifices we owe in a large measure, the blessing of responsible government. I desire also to place on record, that notwithstanding anything which has been said, or hinted at, by some hon. gentlemen opposite, and notwithstanding the ill-advised attitude of some of my compatriots of Quebec, on the naval question, the Canadians of French origin are above those infamous suspicions of disloyalty thrown at them, and I say they are to-day just as loyal as they have been in the past, perhaps more loyal than those same hon. members who are asserting so loudly their attachment to England, but who might be found wanting should the test of loyalty involve any personal sacrifice of their own.

I do not purpose replying to those attacks of the leader of the opposition and the apostles of extreme imperialism. I will merely point them out to my fellow citizens of the province of Quebec as the best answer to the arguments of the Nationalists.

In fact, should the pretensions of the leader of the opposition and of his followers on this question prove to be well founded, the position taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and his allies, is quite untenable.

The Prime Minister cannot be found guilty of the crime of treason to British interests, and be convicted at the same time on the charge of disloyalty to his country. As a matter of fact, the right hon. Prime Minister is guilty of neither of these two accusations, both of which have been inspired by extreme party feeling, or personal jealousy, and which every one by whom they have been proffered knows to be false and unmerited. This cannot be otherwise, when to-day, all over the empire, there is only one voice to proclaim that the noble personality, as well as the whole career of the leader of the House, offer the most striking and conspicuous example of what loyalty, devotion and patriotism, combined with eloquence, statesmanship and integrity, have ever done for the building up of Canada and the maintenance of British institutions. Well can we recall, in this connection, the words of the French fable writer, Lafontaine:

> Le dieu poursuivant sa carrière,
> Répand ses torrents de lumière
> Sur ses obscurs blasphémateurs.

However, the indictment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is too formal, to be ignored, and while his attack has been eloquently refuted, I feel that I must return to it again.

I desire, in the first place, to register here the hon. member's significant admission that the naval defence of Canadian soil is not, in itself, a new policy. I will quote his own words:

> The Bill in itself, outside of section 18, does not present to my mind any very striking feature; it is the extension of legislation, if I may use such an expression of legislation, which we had in a diminished form upon our statutes ever since the mother country called us to assume our proper share of the burden of defence. Therefore I think that one may say, with the exception I have just pointed out, this legislation is not in any way extraordinary.

While putting on record this statement of the hon. gentleman, I cannot help contrasting it with the statements which are made to-day in Quebec by the Nationalist allies of the hon. member who says that this naval defence policy, even applied to Canadian territory, is altogether a new one and should never have been originated without consulting the electorate upon this point. I shall not dwell on this difference of opinion between them, because after all it is of no importance in the settlement of this question.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend approve of the decisions of the Colonial Defence Conference of 1909 to which our delegates adhered? Does he approve of these conclusions?

Mr. RIVET. I approve entirely the position taken by our Canadian delegates in London.

The hon. member, then, does not find it strange that one should be busy organizing, from a naval standpoint, the protection of Canadian territory. But he is opposed to our lifting a finger for the defence of the mother country—that step-mother, to whom we owe nothing whom we can do without, who, moreover, sacrificed our interests on all occasions and who persists, despite all that to drag us into the vortex of militarism. Our consent to help Great Britain, despite her unworthiness, seems to be the new policy which that honourable gentleman finds in clause 18, which reads as follows:

> In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

It is loudly asserted that this clause is not permissive, but imperative. I presume, that, when the Bill reaches the committee stage, we shall have ample opportunity to debate that point. Then, I suppose, we shall have the interesting spectacle of learned jurists, on the other side of the House, arguing one way or the other, some claiming that, unfortunately for England, that clause is too permissive, and some complaining that, unfortunately for Canada, it is too imperative. But I shall say

to the honourable member for Jacques Cartier, were Great Britain as unworthy as he seems to think her, we should not bargain with her, when called upon to use the discretionary power embodied in clause 18, especially when it is considered that Canadian as well as British interests are at stake.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend think the clause imperative or permissive?

Mr. GRAHAM. Which wing do you belong to?

Mr. RIVET. I belong to no wing, I belong to the Liberal party which is united in thinking and stating that the clause is permissive. It is not now a time for recrimination, nor to dig up our history to find causes of complaint against the mother country. 'Let the dead past bury its dead', as Longfellow puts it, and let us draw inspiration from the needs of the present and the requirements of the future. It is for us to know if, as long as Canada remains, is satisfied to remain part of the British empire, we should not feel interest in the maintenance of her power and prestige in the world.

As I said before, Great Britain's foreign policy is entirely pacific. Not only does she not seek quarrel for herself with any other nation, not even Germany, but all her diplomacy tends to preserve the peace of Europe, and it has been for this purpose that she has formed new alliances and friendships. And if I am asked for my reasons in believing in England's peaceful policy, I would say that apart from the anti-militarist ideas of the labouring classes to-day well represented in parliament, England has every interest in maintaining the statu quo, the disturbance of which must be of necessity detrimental to her. It is generally said that in Europe to-day there is only one power interested in a change, and that is Germany, which nation would not be adverse to an increase of her colonial possession and of her means of access to the sea. Hence it is that her ambitious and disturbing diplomacy meddles on all occasions with European affairs as was the case in Morocco and is a veritable menace to the peace of Europe. Great Britain, by her position, is the best qualified of all the powers to play the part of peacemaker, and her intervention in this way constantly expose her to attacks from countries less desirous than she is for peace. For my part, I have no belief in the German scare, at least for a time to come, for Germany, despite her projects for expansion, will never start a struggle until sure of success, as was the case of the Franco-Prussian war. But we may rely that the day of that struggle will be all the further away, according as England takes a more determined stand and organizes more completely her defence. But Great Britain is not only a country for peace, but she is essentially, as she has always been, the land of liberty and the refuge for the oppressed of all nations. In this regard, I feel indignant that, in Canada, there may be found at present, men who are heartless enough to disparage the flag that protects that justice and that security which were denied them in their own country. I have, therefore, confidence that in the interests of humanity and of civilization, Great Britain will retain her power and prestige. But if it were otherwise, and war were to come hurridly, just imagine the consequences to Canada of England's loss of maritime power. If the dream of certain nations of locking up John Bull in his island and breaking his colonial empire, were realized, the end of our statu quo in Canada would come, and with it the premature option of selecting between independence and annexation, with all the inconveniences and obligations that either case would impose. Therefore Canada's interest demands that we assist in maintaining British supremacy on the seas, as long as that help would not menace our own liberty of action, or the autonomy of our country.

Our opponents are mistaken if they think this a new policy. I have shown that in 1868 the Canadian government, according to the declarations reiterated by her ministers in England and in Canada, by her Militia Bill, had placed our land and sea militia entirely at the disposal of the Sovereign, independent of the Canadian parliament, to be mobilized in Canada or elsewhere without any restriction as to the extent or duration of the service. We can see that there is a distance between this absolute abandonment of our system of defence and a conditional co-operation, subject to the sanction of parliament, as is provided for in clause 19 that reads thus:

> Whenever the Governor in Council places the naval service or any part thereof on active service, as provided in the preceding section, if parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall issue for a meeting of parliament within fifteen days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

But it is claimed that this guarantee of parliamentary sanction is purely illusory, because in the first place when the representatives of the nation are called together, the vessels will be gone and possibly destroyed in some battle.

Firstly, I submit, that in a like case the Governor in Council should only act with a knowledge of the need and under the pres-

sure of public opinion, as was the case in the instance of the Boer war. We cannot conceive any government being sufficiently careless of public interest and of its own existence, to order the sending out of the Canadian fleet in defence of a manifestly unjust cause or one repugnant to the people. Thus the sanction of parliament would be quite natural and none could complain about it. But were the order in council to be rejected by the legislators, it would be too late to prevent the irreparable, only in the case of a naval engagement taking place near our shores, to defend our coasts or seaports. Then it would be unfair to reproach the ministry with having had more foresight than parliament itself, and with having in time placed the safest shield between the enemy and our territory.

It is urged that no dependence can be naval fleet the government is actuated by parliament ruled by an ignorant and servile majority. This pretention is a miserable calumny that hits not only the members of parliament referred to, but also the electorate of Canada. To judge so harshly of our national representatives one must have a poor idea of the political sense and intelligence of a people incompetent to make better selections; and I am confident that public opinion will reject such a vile accusation. On the other hand, if parliamentary sanction be really effective, if Canada is free to dispose of her fleet as she deems proper, how can our country be fatally bound up in the foreign policy of the empire or engulfed in the vortex of militarism? Logical minds could scarcely conceive it.

Had I the time, or were it worth the time, I would take up the criticisms of the Nationalist faction regarding the type of vessels to be constructed. In reply to the statement that the sole purpose of the navy is to be used in the wars of empire, I would refer to the opinion of the leader of the opposition. He said 'That the ministerial programme extricates itself from the exigencies of the British admiralty, and that the Canadian vessels will have no utility other than for the protection of our coasts and our fisheries.'

I do not purpose to add any contribution to the controversy which has arisen over the class of vessels which will be constructed under the government policy. It is admitted, on all sides, that the only difference between the programme adopted by the government and the one at first suggested by the admiralty, and insisted upon by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, is the building of a Dreadnought which would, according to their contention, complete the fleet unit, which they consider so desirable. In this connection, I wish simply to remind this House that the Dreadnought type is one of a transitory nature, which may be obsolete in a few years from now, when the construction of the other vessels provided for in the ministerial programme will be completed, while the class of ships adopted by the government is one of a permanent character calculated to make our fleet capable to be utilized at any time in the future, both for the defence of our coasts or our seaports, and as a part of the British fleet. The mere fact that our programme of construction has been adhered to by the British admiralty ought to silence the opposition of those of our friends opposite who seem to be anxious to be more loyal than the King himself. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the more I look at the naval policy of the government as a matter of principle, or in its application, I am forced to the conclusion that it is wise in every respect, and ought to commend itself to the Canadian people.

I will, therefore, vote for the Bill for the following reasons:

1st. Because it is based on Canada's traditional policy of providing for her own defence.

2nd. Because the establishment of a Canadian naval service is but the opportune crowning, foreseen by the fathers of confederation, of our system of national defence.

3rd. Because in the establishment of that naval fleet the government is actuated by those principles of autonomy that have ever guided our national life.

4th. Because the autonomy of our country is sufficiently guaranteed by clauses 18 and 19 of the Bill.

5th. Because the mobilizing, under sanction of parliament and for the benefit of the empire, of our Canadian navy is not incompatible with Canada's autonomy, but is merely the execution of a duty of assistance always recognized and fulfilled by our country.

6th. Because the maintaining of Great Britain's maritime power is one of the best safe-guards of our development and security.

7th. Because Canada's independence, or annexation to the United States, advocated as a possible alternative, to maintain the status quo as regards naval defence, instead of lessening, would considerably increase the obligations and sacrifices, thereby sought to be avoided.

I will vote against the Borden amendment—

1st. Because that amendment is the negation of all the principles of responsible government, especially that which is most dear to the English people, 'No taxation without representation.'

2nd. Because the gift of 25 millions, or the sending of the Dreadnoughts to England, is only a temporary expedient and a costly one that in no way solves definitely

our relations with the mother country on the question of naval defence.

3rd. Because that amendment conducts straight to military imperialism and the loss of our autonomy.

I will vote against the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

1st. Because the establishment of a Canadian navy is not a new policy, but simply the carrying out of a tacit and general mandate conferred, in all time by the people upon their representatives in parliament, to provide for the defence of the territory.

2nd. Because since the imperial conference of 1902 the Canadian people have been enabled to give their opinion as to the opportunity to adopt a programme of naval defence.

3rd. Because both constitutionally and legally this parliament has the right and the duty to discuss and settle that important question without consulting the electorate.

Before closing, I desire to state how deeply I deplore the course taken by a certain section of the press and certain individuals in the province of Quebec against this Bill. Daily we find that to all means they have recourse to falsify facts and misrepresent the situation in the eyes of their fellow citizens and to poison public opinion. We learn that influential citizens in all classes, who should be inspired otherwise by their education, their character and their mission labour to turn the people against Great Britain, against the government and to instil disloyalty and forgetfulness of our duties as Canadian and British subjects.

It has been recalled to our minds, that there has been a time in our history, when the voice of the French Canadian clergy, and that of our leading classes, united to maintain British domination on this continent, and to safeguard at the same time the future of the French nationality and that of our country. Is it to be said, that times have changed, and that history cannot repeat itself, when the same principles then fought for, are still at stake in the present measure? Will not to-day the same united effort contribute to enlighten public opinion as to the duties and responsibilities not distinct or separate from those of other sections of the Canadian people, which are incumbent upon the province from which I have the honour to hail, and which in loyalty and devotion to the mother country has never stood behind the other provinces of the Dominion? This is my hope and sincere belief when I consider the marked reaction which is manifesting itself in every part of my province in favour of the present legislation. For my part, I can only repeat in this House what I have already stated elsewhere in

regard to the position which my fellow compatriots of Quebec are in duty bound to take upon this question. As a French Canadian, as a son of the men who on two memorable occasions contributed effectively in upholding the British flag in Canada, and being thoroughly convinced that the course then followed was the right and proper one, I claim that the same motives which actuated my fore-father in 1876 and 1812, ought to dictate to their descendants their full and hearty concurrence with the present policy, and that any policy of isolation on their part would eventually lead to race suicide. May the voices of the great departed leaders of French nationality, on this continent, speak as clearly to-day to my compatriots as they spoke in their own time, and teach them counsels of wisdom and patriotism.

It has been hinted, if not openly declared, that the Conservative party in its present hopeless state of division and discord, would go so far as to frame its policies and programmes upon a basis excluding from all participation in the government of Canada my native province, the province of Quebec. If such is the design of the Tory party it is not the policy of the Liberal party, which on every question of national importance has always stood one and indivisible, and which upon this question is ready to stand or fall. But, as the hon. Prime Minister has said: 'Fall, we shall not'.

We shall stand, in order to complete the grand task of governing this country according to its best traditions, and to establish the fabric of its nationhood upon the permanent foundation of unity, harmony and progress.

We shall stand, in order to show the mother country, and the whole world, that Canada is still quite capable of solving the problems of self-government, however intricate they may be, which present themselves in the course of her national life.

We shall stand, to give evidence that in this great country of ours, prejudice and passion are bound to be overcome by the combined efforts of moderate counsels and patriotic wisdom, and that once for all the Canadian people want to be governed not from a standpoint of sectionalism or sectarianism, but from the higher and nobler standpoint of national interest.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Before I take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, might I ask a favour of the hon. Finance Minister who, I presume, is leading the House to-night? During this debate the House has extended to several hon. members the courtesy of adjourning at an early hour, about half past ten, and invariably to members on the Liberal side. Is

the hon. gentleman prepared to grant that courtesy to-night on this side?

Mr. FIELDING. I think several instances have occurred in which the House adjourned at the request of hon. members at an earlier hour than it otherwise would have. There ought not to be any discrimination in that respect in favour of either side, but if we are to get to the end of this debate, within reasonable delay, we should hardly adjourn at so early an hour. I should prefer that the House should sit a little later, but I quite agree that there ought to be no discrimination.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) adjourned the debate last night at about twenty minutes to eleven, and some nights previous the Minister of Militia adjourned it at quite an early hour. Once or twice in addition, I think, the request to adjourn came from that side of the House and was acceded to.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection that the hon. gentleman should speak for a while and then adjourn the debate.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have listened with a great deal of attention and interest to the speech of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet), and I cannot say that it differed very materially from many we have heard on that side, except possibly that it was a little more academic than some of them. His argument, however, was on pretty much the same lines and inspired with very much the same laudation of the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister. I do not propose to take up the different points which the hon. gentleman made in his address ad seriatim, but I shall, in the course of my remarks, refer to them from time to time.

I feel that I am under a threefold obligation to take part in this debate, however imperfectly I may discharge that duty. I am under an obligation to the county of Frontenac, which I have the honour to represent, I am under an obligation to the Dominion of Canada, whose destiny is in the hands of this parliament; and also to His Gracious Majesty Edward VII, my King, and the right hon. gentleman's suzerain. This question is, in my opinion, too great a question to be viewed from a party or partisan standpoint alone. It is imperial and international in its scope and bearing, and any attempt to settle it as a purely Canadian business proposition must end in more or less failure. We are dealing with a matter pregnant with responsibility for every member of this House, a matter of the greatest importance to the future of Canada, England, and the British empire. I regret, and I believe that my regret is shared by every member of this House and by the majority of the people of Canada, that the Prime Minister should have seen fit to start this debate along partisan lines. And not only that, but it is, in my opinion, more regrettable still that he should have seen fit to entirely ignore the spirit and intention of the resolution which was unanimously passed by this House last March. Sir, I feel that it is my duty to protest, and protest strongly, against the adoption of the policy proposed by the right hon. gentleman to this House, because I feel that if that policy is carried into effect, it will not only retard the development of this young country, but it will shackle the people of Canada like bond-slaves for generations to come. Now, let us start at the beginning of this matter—and I agree with the statement made by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) last night that the beginning of this matter was really the resolution introduced by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) last March, a resolution which referred solely to Canada's assuming a proper share of the responsibilities and financial burdens incident to the protection of her coast line and seaports. On that occasion, the Prime Minister expressed his surprise that any person in this House should think for a moment that Canada had been remiss in her duty in that regard. And what reasons did the right hon. gentleman give? He said: Canada has no quarrel with any one; Canada does not desire extension of her territory; Canada occupies an isolated position and has only one neighbour, with whom she has been at peace for nearly a hundred years. These were the reasons advanced by the right hon. Prime Minister last session. I would ask: If these reasons applied then, if Canada had done and was still doing all that she ought to do in regard to the protection of her coast line and seaports, what has happened since to make it necessary to introduce this policy, involving an expenditure of from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 during the next four or five years and untold millions in years to come, without giving the people of Canada an opportunity to express their opinion on the matter? Has Canada any quarrel at the present time, real or apprehended? Has Canada's position changed? Does Canada now desire territorial expension? Are Canada's relations with the United States less cordial than they were? Last March, the hon. member for North Toronto, near the conclusion of his address, told the Prime Minister that, if the government saw fit to meet the emergency by contributing Dreadnoughts, or money, they would receive the support of the opposition. There was no attempt on the part of the hon. member for North Toronto on that occasion, by that suggestion, to create a political issue; but there was a very evident desire on his part to avoid anything like a politi-

cal issue, and to lift this matter above the plane of party politics, and have it considered on broad and statesmanlike lines. However, that did not seem to appeal to the Prime Minister at that time, and he himself introduced a resolution which was very different from the resolution finally adopted unanimously by this House. Let me call your attention to one or two points in that resolution introduced by the Prime Minister. Take the second clause: It declared against the payment of any stated contribution. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) criticised it and said:

> It tells Great Britain and the world what we are not prepared to do when it seems to me that this is an occasion when we should declare to all men what we are prepared to do.

He said further:

> It seems to me that this is a little inconsistent with the last paragraph of the resolution. The day might come.....when the only thing that we could do in the absence of preparation in this country would be to make some kind of contribution.

Well, Sir, the clause introduced by the Prime Minister was changed to read 'regular and periodical contributions'. Now, I submit to the judgment of this House and to any hon. member who is disposed to look at this matter fairly, that the Prime Minister, when he agreed to that change in that clause, thereby distinctly and explicitly agreed to the principle of making a contribution. And yet, his supporters at the present time denounce the principle of making a contribution as endangering our autonomy. Another paragraph of the resolution introduced by the right hon. gentleman paraded the fact that Canada had relieved the British tax-payer by taking over Halifax and Esquimalt. That clause was struck out also on the suggestion of the leader of the opposition as being trifling and undignified, especially trifling and undignified in view of the magnanimity displayed by the first Lord of the Admiralty, who declared that whether Canada contributed or did not contribute anything to the support of the British navy, England would deem it her duty to spend her last dollar and put forward her last man in defending every portion of the empire including Canada. Well, Sir, that portion of the resolution introduced by the Prime Minister was struck out, as I have said, on the suggestion of the leader of the opposition. In paragraph 4 of the resolution introduced by the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition asked for the insertion of some word which would indicate our intention to act promptly. He pointed out to the House that the Prime Minister at the imperial conference in 1902, had stated that Canada intended to do something along naval lines at an early day, and he called attention to the fact that seven years had passed without any move being made to implement that promise. On the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, the word 'speedy' was introduced into that clause, ahead of the word 'organization'. The premier thereby again, I contend, tacitly admitted an emergency by agreeing to the necessity for haste. Well, Sir, the resolution as finally adopted by this House did not contain very much in common with the resolution proposed by the Prime Miniseter so far as vital principles were concerned. But that did not prevent, and has not prevented, the right hon. gentleman from assuming the full credit for having introduced the resolution which was more the resolution of the leader of the opposition than it was that of the leader of the government.

Now, I propose for a few minutes to consider the resolution of last March. The first clause of that resolution reads as follows:

> This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that clause is not controversial, and I think it may be taken as representing the opinion of the vast majority of the people of Canada. The second clause of the resolution reads:

> The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

Now, Sir, on this side of the House we are just as strongly against regular and periodical contributions as we were last March, and for the same reason, I presume, that hon. gentlemen opposite are against regular and periodical contributions. We regard regular and periodical contributions as partaking more of the nature of tribute or taxation than of voluntary gifts, and that is the reason, I believe, that inspired the introduction of those words by the premier and the leader of the opposition. But that clause is not merely a negative clause. That clause states two things: In the first place, that this House was against the principle of regular and periodical contributions, and moreover, and just as positively, that this House was not prepared last March to say that it would not under any circumstances make any contribution to the mother country. I contend that the use of these words 'regular and periodical' imply clearly that this House was prepared to make a contribu-

tion to the imperial navy in case of necessity. Next, the third clause says:

This House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

Does that clause say anything about a Canadian navy built in Canadian shipyards? Does it suggest anything about a naval college? I contend that I have just as much right to take the view that a naval service means training ships on which we could train Canadians who would subsequently take their place on battleships, if you like, built in Great Britain, as another hon. gentleman has to take the view that naval service must mean, and can only mean, the building of Canadian war vessels in Canadian shipyards. There is nothing definite about the nature of the naval service. But while that clause is not definite, as to what our naval service shall be, it is very definite in other respects. That clause does call definitely for a speedy organization. Is that condition met by this Bill? According to the admission of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia and Defence, this Bill will put the date of this service at least five years in the future. It also calls for co-operation. Is that possible under this Bill? I contend it is not possible. It also calls for close relation to the imperial navy. Is that possible under the Bill proposed by the government, or is it intended by the Bill? The government policy, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more nor less than a gross violation of the principles laid down in the resolution of last March. Is it not the rankest hypocrisy to call for a speedy organization of a naval service and while expressing our full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce and safety of the empire, and peace of the world, and yet permit the commerce of the empire and the world's peace to rest on the unaided sea-power of Great Britain, while we waste millions of money and years of time in building that which will be of no use whatever to protect our commerce or to ensure the peace of the world? Now there is one other clause in that resolution to which I call attention, the fourth clause:

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

What was the purpose and meaning of that clause, if not a plain and unequivocal intimation to the world that Canada was ready to back up the motherland in her hour of need? No mention of the consent of parliament there; no talk of the Governor in Council in that; no appeal to visionary ghosts of autonomy or of taxation without representation; no treacherous use of the word 'may.' Sir, that clause, if re-written in accordance with the policy of this government, should read:

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises, the government of Canada will be found still looking to Great Britain for protection, and working overtime to provide a new and promising field of graft for the party heelers by building a useless tin pot fleet, and while the men of England, Ireland and Scotland and Wales and the other over-seas dominions are fighting to retain Britain's naval supremacy, this government will be found ready and willing to give to the imperial authorities tangible evidence of its separatist tendencies, to dismember the empire and besmirch its honour by calling parliament together to decide whether its borrowed admiral will take our fleet of tubs to Great Britain to be protected by a New Zealand Dreadnought, or engage it in codfishing off the banks of Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the suggestion of the Minister of Finance was a very proper one, and as I have gone a little beyond the hour he mentioned, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the debate go on to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue the debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 23, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIAL.

Mr. GEOFFRION moved that the third report of the special committee appointed to investigate the Lumsden charges be concurred in.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). This report asks that leave be granted the committee to employ counsel for the purpose of assisting them in the investigation of matters referred to them. The question of employing counsel is a very important one, and I propose to offer a few remarks regarding the advisability of adopting this report. We have had in discussion in the committee the question of counsel. Yesterday, Mr. Smith, of Montreal, appeared before the committee as counsel for the commission. The matter to be investigated arises out of statements made by Mr. Lumsden in his letter of resignation. Mr. Lumsden in that letter said that the classifications on the road had not been in accordance with his instructions, and that in effect they were so erroneous that it was quite clear his instructions had been entirely ignored by a certain section of the engineering staff. That statement necessarily reflects upon the manner in which the road is being constructed. The commission appointed by the government is responsible to see that not only competent but thoroughly honest engineers are employed; and prima facie if the engineers have not satisfactorily carried out the work, the commission is to blame. The commission would be in a very deplorable position if it should turn out that, with its connivance, the engineering staff had deliberately conspired to defraud the public, but it would still be in an unfortunate position if the fault was due simply to incompetency or carelessness on the part of the staff. The charge, therefore, of Mr. Lumsden, is necessarily a charge against the commission, and it is important to it that it should clear its skirts by showing that there has been nothing wrong at all. On the other hand, it is in the public interest that this matter should be thoroughly probed; and if any wrong-doing has taken place, that it should be exposed and put a stop to, and that those responsible should be made known. The commission has appointed as counsel, Mr. Smith, to represent it. The commission is appointed by the government and is responsible for its engineers just as the government is responsible for the commission.

So the government are responsible for the acts of these engineers who are now charged with wrong-doing in the letter of resignation of Mr. Lumsden. Therefore we have this effect that we have counsel representing the one side and the one side only. It has been suggested that as Mr. Lumsden does not desire counsel, that is therefore an end of the matter. After discussion upon that matter the committee has come to the conclusion that it will be necessary to have counsel. That counsel is to be a counsel, as I understand it, representing the public and the public alone. Therefore I want to have an understanding before this matter goes any further whether this is, bona fide, a movement on behalf of the people to have a counsel appointed to represent them or whether it is not merely a colourable movement for the purpose of adding another counsel who will fortify the ranks of the commission and in that way the ranks of the government. What is the position now? We have a committee of judges, seven of them, of whom four are the appointees of the government, men in sympathy with the government and with the government alone, interested, as far as politics are concerned, to try and come to the conclusion that this matter has been all moonshine, that there is nothing in it. Now we have the majority of the judges who are to try the government supporters of the government, we have the commission in close alliance with the government employing a counsel at the public expense of course, and without consulting the minority of the committee, and we have a well organized staff, as far as political warfare is concerned in the personnel of the commission and we have all the staff of engineers, who are interested in showing that there is nothing wrong and as against that we have only three members of the opposition to watch that whole matter and try in the interests of the public to elicit the real facts of the case. I therefore, feel that this is only another gold brick added to what we had when this matter was inaugurated a little while ago. If we are not to have a clear and definite understanding that, as has been done on former occasions, the minority of the committee, the persons who are interested in bringing home these charges, the Conservative members of the committee if you like, shall have the selection of the counsel who shall represent the public on this occasion. I have no use for it and no faith in it. I want to make no bones about the matter at all, I want to say that when I make this statement I am not assuming, as I might be quite justified in assuming, that the majority of the committee will force upon the minority. A counsel in in whom the minority have not confidence, but I claim as a distinct right and by reason of precedents which have occurred before as well as upon principle, that the minority necessarily in this case represents the public and the public interests and that the selection should be left absolutely in their hands. Although I might have confidence in this committee, that the majority when we meet would accord to the minority what is manifestly their right and what is manifestly only consistent with fair play, yet as having a public duty

to discharge, I do not feel that I would be right in taking any risks in this matter because we know that risks can be taken in a matter of this kind. Therefore, to put the matter beyond any question, I shall take the responsibility of asking that the responsibility for this shall be placed where it ought to be placed, on the government; I shall ask that the government will intimate at this stage, in order that I shall not have to press this matter to extremities, that the preference of the minority of the committee shall be acceded to and in order that the government may have an opportunity of taking a definite position in this matter, and without referring to cases which have been before parliament on previous occasions and which have been dealt with in the committees, I shall move to amend the motion by adding thereto the following words:

It is further ordered that the members of the opposition upon the said committee shall have the right to select the counsel so to be appointed, and that such counsel shall be instructed to protect the interests of the people of Canada in the said investigation.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. As a member of the committee that was appointed to investigate the charges in question I am very much surprised indeed at the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). The report which has been presented to the House is one which was adopted to-day by the committee unanimously. It was not suggested then by my hon. friend that there should be any amendment to the report. The motion was made, the committee was not even divided upon it and by the unanimous voice of that committee the report was made which was presented to the House to-day and which the House has been asked to concur in by the motion of the chairman of the committee. It seems to me that it is a reflection on the committee, a suggestion that they are not competent to appoint counsel who are entitled to the confidence of the public in dealing with this matter. It is a rather singular reversal of the usual order of things that a minority should govern instead of a majority. If the majority of that committee is not entitled to the confidence of the community, to the confidence of this House, I would submit to my hon. friend that his motion ought to be to substitute others for the majority of the committee instead of reversing the established order of things, that the majority shall rule.

Mr. BARKER. The motion made in the committee that an application should be made to the House for authority to appoint counsel to represent the public was declared to be, so far as it went, satisfactory, and so it was. It was in that sense that we accepted it. It would not have been proper to begin the discussion of who the counsel should be, or exactly how he should be appointed by the committee, until we had got permission from this House to make an appointment. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman making an objection of this kind. One would imagine he thought that the minority of that committee would be quite safe in allowing this appointment to go to the vote of the committee as a whole, trusting that the majority would accept our suggestion. Anybody who has been present at the committee so far knows that the hon. gentleman who has made this motion (Mr. Lennox), is strictly within his rights, and is only acting with common prudence. If the hon. gentleman who has just spoken felt that the suggestion made was a reasonable one, all he would have to do was to say: We concede that much to the minority, we regret that they did not ask for it before. The hon. gentleman has not yet given the slightest intimation of his own opinion as to whether or not we ought to nominate that counsel. What are the facts? The committee met and they notified the commission to appear befor them, as well as Mr. Lumsden. The commission appeared there at once by counsel, a very eminent counsel of Montreal, paid out of the public purse. He is the counsel of the commissioners, and if anybody is charged, or if there is anybody to whom misconduct has been imputed, it is the commission. They, through engineers appointed by themselves, are charged with misconduct of so grave a character that the Prime Minister was compelled to move for a committee upon it. What does this gentleman tell us. He rises and says: I represent the public, we are going to investigate these grave charges reflecting upon the commission, and I, their counsel, am going to act for the public in the investigation. Could anything be more ridiculous, more monstrous as a matter of public interest. The gentleman said to the committee that the instructions of the Commission were to probe this matter to the bottom, and he would do his duty! We have, in days gone by, heard counsel employed, apparently on behalf of the public, make such assertions and we know what was the result, we know that the inquiry, instead of being probed to the bottom, was stifled, and while I do not for a moment impute any thing against the character or probity of Mr. Smith, I do say it is a ridiculous thing to think that in an investigation of this character involving the reputation of the government

who appointed this commission, and of the commission who appointed the engineers charged with misconduct, involving all their positions, that the Commission should appoint counsel to act for the public, and that the majority of a committee named by the government should appoint ing counsel on the other side. I am talking to men of knowledge, business men and politicians who sit on both sides of this House. I ask them if they seriously think that a counsel appointed by the majority of that political committee, politicians on both sides, four on one side and three on the other, will be a counsel who will probe to the bottom questions involving the reputation of the government?

I am surprised that the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke) would stand up in his place and for a moment give colour to such a pretense as that the majority on the committee have any right to make such an appointment. The hon. gentleman knows that we have questions of this kind again and again in committees, and that there is as straight a party vote as there would be in this House. We have on this committee—three on one side and three on the other, the chairman's casting vote deciding the question. It is a foregone conclusion when we go to a vote how it will result, and we must either agree to the proposition made or there will be a vote and the vote is sure to go against us. Why do these gentlemen object? Is it a matter of courtesy or ceremony, that we have not been sufficiently ceremonious to these gentlemen in asking them to let us appoint counsel? We ask here in the House that we, as the minority who are concerned in probing this thing, and are determined to probe it to the bottom, shall name the counsel who shall prosecute the investigation, and that we shall not have appointed another counsel, like Mr. Smith, who acts only for the commission. We do not doubt that an able man would be appointed by the majority, but we would like to know that the man had his heart in the work as well as his head. We want this thing probed no matter what the consequences may be, no matter who may suffer. We have made no charge. This committee was moved not by this side of the House, but by the Prime Minister. Surely he did not mean to go through a farce in moving for this investigation to be not content with a majority of the committee, but must also appoint all the counsel. Through the commission they have appointed Mr. Smith, K.C., and the majority of the committee wish to appoint Mr. Brown or some one else, and we will be told: Oh, you agreed that counsel should be appointed, you have counsel, this is a thorough investigation and the public is represented. I would have expected the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to be the first man to stand up and say: We will hear counsel, we will let you nominate them because you are the attacking parties in this committee. Does any one doubt that the majority of that committee are on the defensive? Are they not anxious, by every means in their power, to find a verdict of 'not guilty' as against the commission and against the engineers? Every man on both sides of the House knows that is the fact.

I do not wish to occupy another moment of the time of the House on this question. I say that hon. gentlemen on the other side who refuse this reasonable proposition, that we who are the investigators in fact should have the nomination of the counsel who is to conduct the investigation, are supporting the government in an evasion of the inquiry.

House divided on amendment, Mr. Lennox.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Arthurs,	Lennox,
Barker,	Lewis,
Beattie,	Macdonell,
Best,	McCall,
Blain,	McCarthy,
Borden (Halifax),	Meighen,
Boyce,	Middlebro,
Bradbury,	Monk,
Bristol,	Nantel,
Broder,	Owen,
Burrell,	Paquet,
Campbell,	Reid (Grenville),
Chisholm (Huron),	Rhodes,
Clare,	Roche,
Cowan,	Russell,
Crocket,	Schaffner,
Crothers,	Sexsmith,
Currie (Simcoe),	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Daniel,	Sharpe (Ontario,
Doherty,	Sproule,
Donnelly,	Stanfield,
Edwards,	Staples,
Elson,	Stewart,
Fraser,	Taylor (New
Gordon (Nipissing),	Westminster),
Haggart (Lanark),	Thoburn,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Thornton,
Herron,	Wallace,
Hughes,	White (Renfrew),
Jameson,	Wilcox (Essex),
Kidd,	Wilson (Lennox &
Lake,	Addington),
Lalor,	Worthington,
Lancaster,	Wright.—66.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	MacNutt,
Aylesworth,	McAllister,

Beauparlant,	McCoig,
Béland,	McColl,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McIntyre,
Brown,	McKenzie,
Bureau,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carvell,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Cash,	Martin (Regina),
Chew,	Martin (Wellington),
Chisholm (Inverness),	Mayrand,
Clark (Red Deer),	Meigs,
Clarke (Essex),	Michaud,
Congdon,	Miller,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Molloy,
Delisle,	Neely,
Demers,	Oliver,
Devlin,	Papineau,
Douglas,	Pardee,
Dubeau,	Pickup,
Ecrément,	Proulx,
Emmerson,	Prowse,
Fielding,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Rankin,
Fortier,	Robb,
Fowke,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Roy (Dorchester),
Geoffrion,	Roy (Montmagny),
Gervais,	Rutan,
Girard,	Savoie,
Gladu,	Schell,
Gordon (Kent),	Sealey,
Graham,	Seguin,
Guthrie,	Sinclair,
Harris,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Hodgins,	Smith (Stormont),
Hunt,	Sperry,
King,	Stratton,
Kyte,	Talbot,
Lachance,	Templeman,
Lafortune,	Tobin,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Todd,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Tolmie,
Lapointe,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lavergne,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Law,	Turgeon,
LeBlanc,	Turriff,
Lemieux,	Verville,
Lovell,	White (Victoria, Alta.),
Macdonald,	Wilson (Laval).—100.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

CREW OF DREDGE NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Were any of the officers or crew of the dredge 'Northumberland' given leave of absence from their work at East river, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, for the purpose of going to vote at election in Lunenburg county on November 24, 1909?

2. If so, what are the names and positions on dredge of each person who obtained such leave?

3. On what day did each leave the dredge and on what day did each return?

4. Was the dredge working as usual while such persons were absent from duty?

5. Was the work of the dredge carried as efficiently without the persons in question as when they were on board and working?

6. Were the said persons or any of them provided with free transportation over the Intercolonial railway, or otherwise provided with free transportation from their place of work to the county in which election was being held, or for any part of the distance?

7. Were the said persons paid or will they be paid usual wages for the time they were absent to said election?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. J. A. Ledingham, engineer, absent from 20th to 30th November; G. H. Hunter, oiler, absent from 23rd to 30th November.

4 and 5. There was no cessation in the operation of the dredge.

6. The department has no information.

7. The parties above-mentioned have been paid for the month of November.

Mr. RHODES:

1. What is the name, place of residence, occupation on ship, and wages of each member of the crew, officers and men, of the dredge 'Northumberland,' while employed at East river, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, in the year 1909? When did each of such men go to work on said dredge in 1909, and how long was each employed on said dredge during 1909?

2. Are any of the officers or crew on wages at the present time? If so, are they on the dredge? If not, where are they, and what are their names?

3. What was the total expense of operating said dredge in the calendar years of 1908 and 1909, respectively?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

Name.	Occupation.	Wages.	Time employed.
		$	
U. H. Lyons	Master	100 00	January 1 to December 31.
J. A. Ledingham	First engineer	90 00	" 1 " 31.
H. Allen	Second engineer	80 00	" 1 " 31.
F. Rush	Operator	80 00	" 18 " 31.
C. Harmon	"	40 00	September 26 to December 31.
E. Nickerson	Mate	65 00	April 22 to December 31.
W. Abbott	Steward	40 00	" 15 " 31.
M. Rafuse	Cook	30 00	" 22 " 31.
H. Oaks	Fireman	35 00	January 1 to May 14.
W. Oaks	"	35 00	April 22 to December 31.
W. Hopkins	Deckhand	30 00	" 30 to May 15.
"	Fireman	35 00	May 16 to December 31.
G. Hunter	Oiler	35 00	January 1 to December 31.
E. Mardin	"	35 00	April 25 to December 31.
H. McKinnon	Boatswain	35 00	" 22 " 31.
A. Rafuse	Deckhand	30 00	" 22 " 31.
J. Montague	"	30 00	" 26 " 31.
B. Abbott	"	30 00	" 25 " 31.
H. Mills	"	30 00	May 17 " 31.
G. Little	"	30 00	June 22 " 31.
F. Wood	Nightwatch	30 00	April 22 " 31.

The department keeps no record of the places of residence of men employed on its dredges. The men at present on dredge 'Northumberland,' whose names are given in answer to part 2 of this question, are at Pictou, Nova Scotia.

2. (a) Yes; (b) Yes; (c) U. H. Lyons, J. A. Ledingham, H. Allen, F. Rush, C. Harmon, W. Abbott, W. Oaks and W. Hopkins.

3. In 1908, $25,299.18; in 1909, $30,405.92.

WOOD FOR FUEL IN TOWNSHIP 50, RANGE 27.

Mr. LAKE:

1. Has the Minister of the Interior received a petition from the residents of township 50, range 27, W. 2nd M., relative to the difficulty of getting dry wood for fuel, etc., and asking for permission to obtain it from timber berth No. 876? If so, what assistance is he able to give them?

2. Are permits to cut wood being granted to these settlers on any government land? If so, where and to what extent?

3. Is the minister aware that on several sections comprised in timber berth No. 876 there is said to be not sufficient timber to make them commercially valuable? If so, will he take steps to withdraw them from the berth and throw them open for settlement? If not, will he cause inquiries to be made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. Yes. Berth 876 was acquired at public competition, and the department is not in a position to issue settlers' permits thereon.

2. Permits to cut wood for fuel are issued by the local Crown timber agents, without reference to the department, and the department, therefore, cannot state, without communicating with the agent, whether or not permits are being granted to these settlers on vacant Dominion lands.

3. This statement was made in a communication recently received at the department. An inspection has been ordered, and if it is found that any of the lands do not contain merchantable timber to such an extent as to make them commercially valuable, they will be withdrawn from the berth.

HOMESTEADING ON SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 12.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. Is the northeast ¼ of section 34, township 12, range 21, west 3rd meridian, province of Saskatchewan, open for homesteading? If not, why not?

2. Has it been entered for homesteading? If so, by whom, and when?

3. Has there been any settlement duties done on it? If so, what is the nature of the duties?

4. Is it subject to cancellation, and will it be open for settlement?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Not open for homesteading at the present time. Already entered for.

2. Taken as a homestead by Howard A. Moore, October 27, 1908.

3. According to a declaration filed here by the homesteader, the following duties are claimed: Residence—Was on homestead part of June, August and September, 1909. Improvements—26 acres of breaking,

1909; 300 fence posts cut and ready for fencing in spring.

4. Cancellation proceedings were instituted on the 23rd of November, 1909, and the homesteader has been notified that by the 1st of April next he must satisfy the local agent that he is in residence with the intention of remaining there and completing the required duties, failing which the agent will cancel his entry summarily and dispose of the land in accordance with the regulations.

R. E. A. LEECH.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. Is R. E. A Leech in the employment of the government? If so, what position does he hold?

2. When was he first employed by the government, and for what purpose?

3. What years has he been in the employment of the government, and what doing each year?

4. What salary and expenses has he drawn each year, respectively?

5. What is he engaged in at the present time?

6. Is the government aware that he is said to be spending all his time at Liberal headquarters at Winnipeg?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes; inspector of Dominion lands agencies for Saskatchewan.

2. On the 1st January, 1905, as inspector of Dominion lands agencies.

3. From 1st January, 1905, to the present time. Engaged in inspecting Dominion lands agencies, except in 1908 when he was employed for part of the year in connection with seed grain distribution.

4. Salary: 1904-5, 6 months, $1,000; 1905-6, $2,000; 1906-7, 9 months, $1,500; 1907-8, $2,000; 1908-9, $2,666.66; 1909-10, 10 months, $2,500. Expenses: 1904-5, 6 months, $840.60; 1905-6, $3,676; 1906-7, 9 months, $2,736.02; 1907-8, $3,403.59; 1908-9, $2,766.53; 1909-10, 10 months, $3,350.

5. Inspecting Dominion lands agencies.

6. No.

W. L. McQUARRIE.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What position does Mr. W. L. McQuarrie hold under the Department of the Interior at Prince Albert, and what is his salary?

2. Is he required to devote his whole time to the performance of the duties of his office? If not, may he properly accept another position of a public nature?

3. Under these circumstances, does the minister consider that the department has a claim only upon a part of the time of Mr. McQuarrie?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. W. L. McQuarrie is senior assistant in the Dominion Lands Office at Prince Albert, and his salary is $1,200 per annum.

2. Yes, his whole time during office hours.

3. The department claims Mr. McQuarrie's whole time during office hours.

THE ROSS RIFLE AT BISLEY MEETING.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Has any Ross rifle mark II., double star, or any other mark, been submitted to the National Rifle Association of Great Britain, for its opinion as to the eligibility of the rifle for competition at the forthcoming Bisley meeting? If so, with what result?

2. If no rifle has yet been submitted to the National Rifle Association, will such a course be adopted? If so, when?

3. Have inquiries been instituted as to whether the Ross rifle will be eligible at the next Bisley meeting? If so, what reply has been received?

4. Has any rule or regulation for the admission of rifles for competition in the various national or other contests at Bisley been recently adopted by the National Rifle Association?

5. If so, what was the nature of the resolution and when was it adopted?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is a matter which pertains exclusively to the Dominion Rifle Association, and will, I have no doubt, be dealt with satisfactorily by the executive council of that association.

WHARF AT PORT DUFFERIN.

Mr. CROSBY:

1. When was the government wharf at Port Dufferin, Nova Scotia, built?

2. When was the wharf repaired?

3. Is the government aware that the wharf is reputed to be in a bad condition, and unsafe for traffic?

4. What is the present condition of the wharf?

5. What revenue has been derived from it each year since it was built?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. In 1898-99.

2. In 1904-5.

3. The department is informed that repairs are required.

4. The resident engineer has been asked to report.

5. In 1899-1900 .. .. $ 211 50
1900-01 .. .. 295 14
1901-02 .. .. 36 00
1902-03 .. .. 54 07
1903-04 .. .. 50 37
1904-05 .. .. 33 76
1905-06 .. .. 35 50
1906-07 .. .. 19 86
1907-08 .. .. 28 38
1908-09 .. .. 16 96
1909-10 .. .. Nil.

Total .. .. $ 781 54

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

Mr. BOYCE. Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to ask the government if it is the intention this session to introduce any legislation with a view to a renewal of the bounties on iron and steel?

Mr. FIELDING. At the present moment, we have no such intention. I am not prepared to make any statement more than that.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). When the House adjourned yesterday, I was considering the resolution unanimously passed by this House last March. If you examine carefully each clause of that resolution, you will find that the position taken to-day by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is absolutely consistent with every one of those clauses. The amendment moved by the leader of the opposition does call for speedy organization, for co-operation, for close relations with the British navy and for active participation. I also contend that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has gone back on every principle embodied in that resolution. Sir, the Bill before us is not a policy of speedy organization, but one of delay; it is not a policy of co-operation, but one which makes co-operation absolutely impossible; it is not a policy of naval service in close relation with the British navy, but a policy designed to keep our fleet of vessels separate from the British navy; it is not a policy of active participation, but one of useless inactivity; it is not a policy to render our commerce and the empire more secure, but a policy of graft and ingratitude, a policy to breed another flock of political vultures to add to those that have followed in the wake of this government since 1896 and have grown fat on what they have stolen from the people of Canada. This is not an imperial policy; it is not a Canadian policy, but it is, in my estimation, a policy of rank and brazen hypocrisy which waves the British flag before the eyes of the Canadian people as the talisman of liberty and plots the disintegration of the empire behind its protecting folds. Never in the history of the British empire has any statesman occupied so pitiable a position of weakness and vaccillation as that now occupied by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this House. It is difficult to follow the right hon. gentleman in his political gymnastics on any great question, but, on this question, I contend he has well earned the title of champion political lightning change artist of the continent of America.

What has been his course? Speaking in this House last March, the right hon. gentleman gave pledges of sympathy and loyal support. Last November, he said that not a ship should go without the consent of parliament. Last December he modified that somewhat by saying that we might help if England were severely pressed. Early this month, he said that if England is at war, Canada is at war. And later in the present month he modified that again by saying that he meant that when England was at war Canada was at war, inasmuch as Canada formed part of the empire and was liable to attack when England was at war, but he did not mean that Canada was necessarily involved in taking part in all England's wars. I was somewhat amused, the other evening, at the effort of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) to reconcile the positive and negative statements of his leader. Any such evolutions and contortions as the hon. member went through in order to reconcile the two positions of his leader would give a snake lumbago. On this great question, involving the future destiny of Canada and the empire, we see the premier of this country suspended in mid air, like Mahomet's spirit between heaven and hell and fit for neither place, wobbling about like a Chinese kite answering to the sentiments of whatever popular audience he happens to be addressing—one day uttering sentiments for the ears of British Canadians, and furnishing headlines for such papers as the Toronto 'Globe,' the next day uttering sentiments for those French Canadians whom he has carefully schooled to look in the direction of his highest aspirations. Sir, the right hon. gentleman has become an expert in the manipulation of the English language. The people of Canada have become somewhat accustomed to the right hon. gentleman's lingual inconsistencies; but on this great question I think the people of Canada would like from the premier of this country, definite, clear-cut and unequivocal statements. The right hon. gentleman, speaking a few days ago, and referring to the conquest of Canada by Wolfe in 1759, made use of these words:

> My ancestors lost on that occasion, but it simply transferred their allegiance from one sovereign to another. They lost the battle, but they did not lose their independence, their liberty, their rights and privileges; and to-day the sun in his daily career does not shed his light upon any people on the face of the earth enjoying more liberty than my fellow countrymen of French extraction. And my last words to the doubters is that

freedom is worth fighting for and worth dying for.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these words are true. And yet, Sir, time and again it has been impressed upon us in this House that there is an anti-imperial sentiment in the province of Quebec which has to be reckoned with when any great political question comes before this House and country. There is no getting around this, and there is no use in mincing words in dealing with it. We have heard it stated in this House within the last few days that if one should undertake to criticise an estimate for a wharf or a post office in the province of Quebec he is liable to be misrepresented in that province as being antagonistic to the French Canadian people. We know that, time and again, we have been cautioned to be very careful how we considered any question on which the people of Lower Canada have an opinion which differs from ours. In the consideration of the French treaty it was almost as much as a man's position was worth to express an adverse criticism, no matter how honestly he might hold that view, for fear of being misrepresented as an Anglo-Saxon bigot. In the case of the hanging of Louis Riel, who was judged to be a traitor, it was represented as due to his French origin. In the matter of dealing with the Manitoba school question, the people of this country were given to understand by one leader that Manitoba must submit to the will of Quebec, while the other leader took advantage of the position to gain power in order that he might use that power to coerce the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and, subsequently as has been made apparent to everybody in this country, has given Manitoba to understand that she must remain the 'postage stamp province' until she is willing to bend the knee to the will of Quebec. While we recognize the fact that there are people in this Dominion of French origin, I wish to remind hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do it in all kindness, that there are also people of English, Irish, Scotch and Welsh origin, and that the interests of the English-speaking people must receive more consideration in the future than they have in the past. I maintain that the English-speaking portion of this country has been held up before the eyes of the world by the premier and his delegates at different imperial conferences as being indifferent and callous to the calls of their kindred across the sea. That is the only conclusion we can come to from the position taken by the right hon. First Minister and other delegates at different imperial conferences. It seems that the uppermost thought in the mind of the government is: What will Quebec say or think? Ontario and the other provinces, they seem to conclude, can be relied upon to be fooled as usual with a few sentences having an imperial ring, but really as empty as sounding brass. I have not one word to say against the French Canadians of this country. I believe they are an energetic and intelligent people. I, myself, think that they are an exceptionally intelligent people, because, Sir, if what the hon. member for Hochelaga said yesterday, that there is no feeling of disloyalty among the French Canadians of Quebec is correct, I say it speaks very highly for the intelligence of the people of that province, for if there is no feeling of disloyalty in the province of Quebec it is not for lack of teaching by hon. gentlemen opposite. Battleships and cannon are very necessary implements of war, but a country's strength does not depend on these alone. It does not depend on these so much as on the men behind the guns. We cannot measure the military and naval strength of Canada by the calibre of our cannon or by the number of Bristols. But, if we are honest with ourselves and honest with the people of the country, we have to take into consideration, in viewing this question, the sentiments not only of Canada as a whole, but of each part of Canada.

The hon. member for Hochelaga challenged any one in this House to say that there is a feeling of disloyalty in Quebec. I do not like to use the word disloyalty, but I do believe we have ample evidences in this House in the expressions which have fallen from the lips of different speakers that there is in the province of Quebec an anti-British, or, if you like it better, an anti-imperial sentiment. I propose to deal with that matter squarely and to place the blame for that sentiment, which I do not consider in the interests of Canada, where it justly belongs. Is there an hon. member in this House who will deny my assertion that separation from the empire is preached in the province of Quebec? Is there an hon. member in this House who will deny my assertion that public money of the province of Quebec has been used to buy books to disseminate such doctrines in that province? I will challenge any man in this House. I will challenge any man in the province of Quebec to deny that assertion. I say that that separation from the empire has been preached in the province of Quebec not only on the platform but through subsidized books.

An hon. MEMBER. What book?

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman asks me what book, and I will tell him. The following statement was made by the Winnipeg 'Telegram' some time ago:

> The Quebec element opposed to aiding the navy of Great Britain, is also the element which talks seriously of the disintegration of confederation.

The late Mr. Tardivel's book, 'Pour la Patrie,' advocating the organization of a French republic on the northeast corner of the American continent, which book was designed to imbue the rising generation in Quebec with the idea of separation from the English-speaking portion of Canada, is still the subject of very general comment east and west. Three hundred dollars was spent by the Quebec government to distribute this book as prizes among the children of the schools of Quebec.

Mr. E. ROY. Where is the wrong-doing?

Mr. EDWARDS. There may not appear to be any wrong from the hon. gentleman's standpoint and in that respect he and I will have to differ, but from the way I look upon it, it is decidedly wrong not only for any man in this House but for any person in this country to preach the separation of Canada from the empire. In my estimation the wrong is accentuated when the legislature of the province of Quebec votes, as it did vote, $300 of public money to buy these books to scatter that treason throughout the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman may not see any wrong in that but I do.

Mr. E. ROY. I asked what was the wrong, because I have read that book. The true meaning of that book is not that which is given to it by the 'Telegram'.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the hon. gentleman rise in his place in this House and tell us that that book does not advocate the establishment of a French republic in Quebec?

Mr. E. ROY. Not at all. That is only the workings of the hon. gentleman's imagination.

Mr. EDWARDS. I assert that $300 of the public money of the province of Quebec was voted for that purpose, and the proof of my assertion will be found in the Votes and Proceedings of the legislature of Quebec for December 3, 1896. Nor is that the only instance. Mr. Tardival's idea has been elaborated by Rev. Father Hamon who advocates the formation of a federation of the French Canadian societies of Canada and the United States. Father Hamon's work received the approval of Archbishop Taschereau. At chapter 18 of the book you will find these words:

> See what will happen when the French Canadian race shall have completely occupied the space relatively restricted and found between the north shore of the St. Lawrence and the American boundary, that which we call the eastern townships. It will not probably take more than another generation to accomplish this work. Then the grand invasion (of the republic), will commence. When the French Canadians shall have arrived in mass at the American boundary line they will find more than half a million of their compatriots awaiting them who have the Canadian parish organized as absolutely as in Quebec, and are very decided, while discharging their duties loyally as citizens, to remain everywhere French. The French Canadians in the United States will soon be too numerous and influential for any political party, whatever it might wish to do, to dare to dispute their privileges. The American union is too big to be managed successfully. It is within the range of the possible that there will be a break-up when Quebec, New Brunswick, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and, possibly, eastern Ontario, will constitute a distinct republic, French and Roman Catholic, Quebec giving a spirit and character to the new republic. Thus it may be, in the order of Providence, that there will be regained, by the observance of nature's laws of increase, and religious fidelity and love of country that which, in September, 1759, the sword wrested from the French Canadians on the Heights of Abraham.

I have not one word to say against the aspirations of Father Hamon to extend his religion as far as he possibly can. That is a worthy aspiration from his standpoint. But I do object to the preaching of any doctrine in any part of Canada which means the disintegration of this country and the separation of it from the British empire.

Mr. BELAND. Will my hon. friend allow me one question. Will he tell me in what year the book he refers to was published by the Quebec government?

Mr. EDWARDS. I have already stated it was in 1896.

Mr. BELAND. I may say that in the year 1896, in the province of Quebec, the party in power was the Conservative party; the party which is to-day led in the province of Quebec by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. EDWARDS. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is just about what I expected. I stand here to say that I do not care whether it was done by the Conservative party in Quebec, or by the Liberal party in Quebec, I object to this as un-Canadian.

Mr. BELAND. My hon. friend will not find that in the Liberal ranks.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was just as well aware as the hon. member was, what party was in power in Quebec when that book was prepared. This seems so interesting to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that I want to give them a little more of it. Let us see what some of their great politicians and statesmen have done; let us see the stand that the Hon. Mr. Mercier took in that province. I might remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beland)

that Mr. Mercier was one of the lights of the Liberal party. He was premier of Quebec from 1887 to 1891, and he was an advocate of cutting the tie with Britain and of declaring Quebec a great French Canadian nation, to which the Canadians who had gone to the New England states would return. Let me give you a quotation or two from his great Sohmer Park speech. On that occasion Mr. Mercier said:

Taking everything into account French Canadians owe nothing to England. If they had prospered, it was in spite of England, not because of her, and if England had done them any good, it had also done them still greater harm. On the whole we owe nothing to England, and we may separate ourselves from her when the majority constitutionally decides to do so without any pangs of conscience and without any shedding of tears. I advise my compatriots to ask for independence for four leading reasons. From necessity, from patriotism, from the natural advantages of independence, because we are capable of existing as an independent people. As a free man, on this free soil of Canada, I defend the sacred cause of my compatriots, whatever may be their race or their religious belief, and I demand for all, men, women, and children, colonial emanciption and liberty. You have colonial dependence; I offer you independence. You have ruin and misery; I offer you fortune and prosperity. You are now only a colony, ignored by the entire world; I offer you the opportunity of becoming a great people, respected and known by all free nations. Men, women and children, it is for you to choose. You may remain slaves in the colonial state, or become independent and free, in the midst of other peoples, who, by their all-powerful voices, are inviting you to the banquet of the nations.

Mr. PAQUET. Mr. Mercier was not Prime Minister of Quebec in that year.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not say he was.

Mr. PAQUET. He was turned down by his province for that language.

Mr. EDWARDS. I said that Mr. Mercier was a very prominent Canadian.

Mr. PAQUET. Not at that time.

Mr. EDWARDS. Oh, yes, he was prominent even at that time. I say he was sufficiently prominent that he in the course of time occupied the position of premier of the province of Quebec from which position he was turned out by the people of Quebec in 1891. Later on, when addressing a meeting of the French Canadians of New England, at Fall River, he said:

You who were driven out of the province of Quebec by the constitution and non-progressive policy of that country, as she is ruled by the English, have been more than able to hold your own in another country which is a free republic. I appeal to you to always be ready 'to assist your compatriots in Canada who are struggling for liberty; and the only thing wanted to release them from their present bondage is independence.'

Now, it has been objected that Mr. Mercier was not at that time a very prominent man. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the same gentleman of whom the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada said:

Mr. Mercier is the greatest Canadian since the time of Papineau. I believe with Mr. Mercier, and I am here to make him prevail.

And Mr. Speaker this is the same man, Hon. Mr. Mercier, to whose memory the legislature of Quebec voted $10,000 to erect a statue.

Mr. BELAND. Will my hon. friend allow me to say that he should add to that statement this: Mr. Mercier is the same man who obtained from the legislature of the province of Quebec——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member for Frontenac, having the floor, cannot be interrupted without his permission.

Mr. BELAND. I have asked his permission.

Mr. EDWARDS. Did the hon. gentleman wish to ask a question?

Mr. BELAND. Yes. Does the hon. member know that it is the same Mr. Mercier who obtained from the legislature of Quebec a sum of $10,000 to help the Toronto university, an English institution, after it was destroyed by fire?

Mr. EDWARDS. I was not aware of that fact, and I wish to very cordially thank the hon. gentleman for his information. It is most interesting but I really cannot see what bearing it has upon my argument. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that to vote money for the purpose of erecting a statue to the memory of Mr. Mercier is to publicly endorse the cause which Mr. Mercier advocated, and if he asked the legislature to give the university of Toronto or any other university a million dollars it does not alter that circumstance at all. It is nothing more nor less than public endorsation and approval of one who taught sedition and scattered the seeds of treason. That is my position and I object to that sort of thing. And I say, Sir, that it would be equally consistent for this House to erect a statue to Louis Riel on Parliament Hill as it was for the legislature of Quebec to erect a statue to a man like Mercier who advocated these views.

Mr. E. ROY. You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. EDWARDS. I say to my hon. friends that it would be as consistent for them to erect a statue to Louis Riel, because although he did incite two rebellions he had at least the courage to undergo himself the risk that he induced other people to take. Now, Mr. Speaker, did the right hon. gentleman who leads this House exert his powerful influence at that time to try and stop that sort of thing. In Toronto, a short time ago, the right hon. gentleman said: That if he had any success in this country he owed it to the fact that he had told his compatriots in Quebec to lay their prejudices and preferences on the altar of their country. But let us follow the course of the right hon. gentleman and see about that. On the 22nd of November, 1885, there was an immense gathering assembled on the Champ de Mars, Montreal, for the purpose of protesting against the execution of Louis Riel. At that meeting a telegram was read from the open and undisguised foes of Great Britain in New York city. That telegram read:

> We tender you our warmest sympathy and assure you of our earnest support against Orange brutality and English tyranny.
>
> (Signed) J. B. MURPHY,
> A. E. FORD.

Did the right hon. gentleman, the leader of this government, arise to protest against that? Did he rise and protest, and appeal to the people there assembled to lay their prejudices and preferences on the altar of their country? No, Mr. Speaker, but as soon as the cheers that had greeted this telegram had subsided, the right hon. gentleman got up and said. If I had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan when the revolt broke out, I would have taken up arms against the government. Is this an isolated instance of such expressions on the part of the premier of this country? No. The very next year after that when he had full time to consider and deliberate, the very next year at Chambly he repeated that assertion and added:

> We are now on the classic ground of Canadian liberty. In the graveyards of this country are to be found the bones of those who were not afraid to face British bullets.

Mr. Speaker, I have no faith in the Prime Minister of this country when he gets up in Toronto and tells the people there, and tells the country through the press, that he has told the people of his province as patriots to lay their prejudices and preferences on the altar of their country. I say that his whole career shows an entirely different course. If you follow the right hon. gentleman's career a little further what do you find him doing? Four or five years later you find him trying to persuade the people of Canada to adopt a policy which Edward Blake said meant nothing more or less than annexation. And, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman at that time did not seem to be at all concerned about Canadian autonomy either. In 1892, page 1142 'Hansard', he said:

> I hold out to my fellow-countrymen the idea of independence.

Again, 'Hansard', page 1144, he said:

> I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada.

In Boston about the same time he was declaring that it was a fatal mistake to make allegiance—that is British allegiance—the basis of trade; that the present position of Canada to Great Britain could not last, and that separation must take place; that the conduct of Canada and of Great Britain had been unworthy of the civilization of Canada and Great Britain during the American civil war. And, mind you, Mr. Speaker, that in face of the fact that thousands of Canadians assisted the North in that war and that our records contain the published thanks of the American government to the government of Canada for the wise and neutral course they pursued on that occasion. And, as to the position of Great Britain in connection with that historical period, let me give you the words of the right hon. W. E. Gladstone, who in writing to an American friend said:

> I can state that the British government never at any time dealt with the subject of recognizing the southern states in your great civil war, excepting when it learned the proposition of the Emperor Napoleon III., and declined to entertain that proposition without qualification, hesitation, delay or assent.

The whole political career of the Prime Minister is marked by utterances designed to weaken Canadian respect for and loyalty to the motherland.

Mr. PAQUET. Will you allow me a question? Do you think that all French-Canadians to-day are not loyal to the British Crown?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I stated some time ago, very clearly and distinctly—

Mr. PAQUET. Please answer.

Mr. EDWARDS. Just sit down now; I stated very clearly and distinctly that I accepted the position taken last night by the member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) when he said that the people of the province of Quebec were not disloyal. I am not charging, and I have not said one word to charge the mass of the people of the province of Quebec with disloyalty; I have not said anything that could be construed into such a charge. On the contrary, I have said that the people of the province of Que-

bec have shown a more than ordinary intelligence in resisting the political leaders who for political purposes essayed to lead them from their allegiance, and I do not propose to allow any hon. gentleman from the province of Quebec or from any other province sitting on that side of the House or this to pervert my language. I repeat, Sir, that, by the leader of this government history has been perverted; I say that British diplomacy has been misrepresented by him on more than one occasion. I am not going to enter into details with regard to British diplomacy. But, Sir, I believe the time will come when British statesmen will receive more of credit and less of adverse criticism for their diplomacy in connection with Canadian affairs than they have received in times past. I want to say this more: That it comes with very bad grace from any member from the province of Quebec to attack British diplomacy, because the people of the province of Quebec have more reason to be grateful to British diplomacy than any other people in the Dominion. I say, Sir, it comes with exceeding bad grace from the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. for. Sir, if Canadian diplomacy as represented by the right hon. gentleman himself and his party had succeeded in 1891 we would not have any Canada to-day—we would be an annex of the United States. When trouble broke out in South Africa, Australia and New Zealand responded with alacrity; Canada held back. Now, supposing in the case of the item that came up in the House the other day for a vote of $50,000 for the sufferers in Paris, any hon. gentleman in this House had got up and opposed it, saying: I do not believe that there is any distress there; I believe that all this talk is the talk of a lot of scare-mongers; I think you should wait a while and if, after careful investigation, you find there is real distress, then instead of sending the money to France to help these people you should buy Canadian wheat and have it ground in Canadian mills and send the flour over to France. Now, Sir, if we had taken that position, we would have taken an absolutely ridiculous position, and any French Canadians in this House who would have supported any such proposition would be justly branded by their people as having not much regard for their own flesh and blood over in France. And yet, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the position that the right hon. gentleman has taken in this House and that his delegates took at the imperial conference; that is the position they placed the British Canadian people in, branding them before the people of the world as being callous and indifferent to their own flesh and blood. I have good reason for my lack of confidence in the professions of the Prime Minister. I want to make the application more general; I want to call the attention of this House, and especially the attention of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to the kind of literature his party circulated in the province of Quebec just prior to the elections of 1896. In the Liberal campaign literature of that year you will find strictures respecting the expenditures by the Conservative government for the better equipment of our soldiers, and notwithstanding that under the Conservative regime the expenditure on militia was about $1 for every $7 that this government is spending now. This is the kind of stuff that was published in the pamphlet:

> Why all the armaments if we are not to have war, and why fight for England.

That is the very question that some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are asking to-day.

> Why all the armaments if we are not to have war? And why fight for England? The electors will recall that these big and little chiefs who are always most anxious to demonstrate that they are more patriotic than anybody else, more loyal, and ready to throw us into war for the benefit of others are not those who carry the burden.
>
> These carbines, these guns will be used by the electors. They are considered good enough to be chained to the cannon. Tupper, Angers, Taillon, will be in their ministerial offices, not surrounded by death but with joy in their hearts and a glass of champagne in their hands. Once more why all these rifles, these bayonets, if the good Tupper and company do not meditate some coup?
>
> They would send our children to Africa, to Asia, from where they would never return.
>
> If you vote for the blue candidate you will approve of these warlike preparations. . . . . Vote for Laurier and his candidates, if you would have your country enjoy peace, and not expose yourself to be sent away some fine morning to some other country, leaving your wives, your children and all that is dear to you.

When the hon. member for Pictou gets up in this House and charges the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) or the representative of any other constituency with raising the race cry, he is exhibiting an unmitigated gall and a cheek which cannot be compared to anything on the American continent except the Rocky mountains or the prairies, for it is as collossal as the one and as boundless as the other. If you want further evidence, let me give you one or two. The hon. A. G. Jones, who was Minister of Militia in the Mackenzie government, used this language in the speech he made at Halifax: 'When the British flag is hauled down from Citadel Hill, I will take off my hat and cheer.'

Mr. FIELDING. I was present at the meeting and I know that Mr. Jones did not use any such words.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what words he did use?

Mr. FIELDING. No, and it is not necessary that I should. Mr. A. G. Jones was the son and grandson of United Empire loyalists, and never in his life uttered any sentiment at variance with loyalty to the British Crown.

Mr. EDWARDS. I hope that the hon. gentleman's statement is correct. This is not the first time this charge has been made, and, if I am not much mistaken, it has hitherto been unchallenged.

Mr. FIELDING. It has always been denied.

Mr. EDWARDS. Take the case of Mr. Ellis. Mr. Ellis was a Liberal candidate in New Brunswick in 1896. In 1884, he said:

> Nothing could be more unfortunate for Canada than the British connection.

Mr. Ellis has since been made a senator by this government, and is, I believe, spoken of universally as a very decent fellow indeed. Probably his views have since changed. Another instance is that of the Hon. Louis H. Davies, now Sir Louis Davies. Speaking of the Canadian Pacific railway, that gentleman said:

> It is a contract from which there is no escape, politically or commercially, except one, and that is annexation to the United States.

Sir Louis Davies occupied a seat in the Liberal cabinet formed in 1896. Another instance I might give is that of Senator Choquette, who was the member for Montmagny, and one of the Grit whips in the parliament of 1896. In the Montreal 'Witness' of July 28, 1897, Senator Choquette is reported to have said: 'I would vote for annexation to-morrow if it were to come before the House.'

Hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to believe that there is no reason to apprehend any danger from Germany. They ask what motive has Germany to go to war with England? Well, it is the old story of lust of power and domination.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. Might I ask a question? The hon. gentleman spoke a great deal about a pamphlet circulated in the province of Quebec, I would like to have his opinion of a pamphlet circulated in Ontario and the western provinces, called the 'Duty of the Hour.' To my mind it is one of the worst publications ever circulated.

Mr. EDWARDS. I never had an opportunity of reading that pamphlet, and so am not in a position to speak concerning it; but inasmuch as I believe it was circulated by the Liberal party and paid for by them, that party may have a few in stock yet, and I would ask my hon. friend to be good enough to send me one. Germany is not without ambition. She has the same spirit that actuated Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome and Carthage in the olden times; and which later impelled Spain, France, Russia and Japan to do and dare. Her population is increasing at the rate of nearly a million a year, and she requires colonies for that rapidly increasing population. Her army is the largest, the best equipped and the most thoroughly disciplined in the world. There is only one thing that stands between her and the domination of all Europe, and that is the British navy. There is only one thing which prevents her being the greatest power in the world, and that is the British navy. You will find therein sufficient motive to excite the ambition of such an ambitious country. But if you are looking for motives, I would ask you what motive Germany had in 1864 in attacking Denmark. What was her motive for attacking Austria in 1866, and France in 1870? From France she took the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine and exacted an indemnity of $1,000,000,000. Yet in 1868 and as late as November, 1869, Napoleon III assured General Lebrun that the relations between France and Prussia were as good as could be desired, and as late as June 30, 1879, Emile Olivier said that never was peace so cordially assured. And within two weeks Germany and France were at war.

I think there is ample evidence of an emergency impending. I am not going to give many quotations. That has been done very well indeed by those who preceded me, but I want to read one or two very short ones. Lord Charles Beresford said quite recently:

> We have arrived at a great crisis in our history when, if we do not ourselves put things right we shall be too late.

Sir Edward Grey said:

> When the German programme is completed, Germany will have a fleet of thirty-three Dreadnoughts. The fleet will be the most powerful the world has ever yet seen. . . . That imposes upon us the necessity of rebuilding the whole of our fleet. That is the situation. . . . If we fall into a position of inferiority we should cease to count for anything among the nations of Europe, and we should be fortunate if our liberty were left, and we did not become the conscript appendage of some stronger power. That is a brutal way of stating the case, but it is the truth.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Asquith) echoed these sentiments, and described the situation as 'most grave, and to us not only unforeseen but unexpected. . .the falsification of one of the hypotheses on which we had hitherto proceeded.' He gave the fol-

lowing figures for the respective strength of Great Britain and Germany in the 'critical month' of April, 1912:

British—
16, certainly,
20 (with extra four ships).
German—
11, certainly,
17, if the acceleration of the programme continues.

Mr. McKenna gave the following estimate:

	British.	German.
December, 1910..	10	9
July, 1911..	14	13
April, 1912..	16	17

That is without counting the extra four ships to which I referred a moment ago. Now, as regards this question of emergency, let us see for a moment the position of the British government in that regard. The British government, in March, 1909, had in their programme four Dreadnoughts and possibly four more if, on considering the state of affairs, these latter four were found necessary. They looked carefully into the matter, considered what other nations were doing, and, on the 26th of July, 1909, Mr. McKenna said that the other four, which had been spoken of in March of that year, would certainly have to be built. Now, Sir, add to that, some words taken from the speech from the Throne delivered no later than last Monday:

The requirements of the naval defence of the empire have made it necessary to propose a substantial increase in the cost of the navy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend that when we on this side of the House claim that there is an emergency impending, we do not deserve to be styled 'scaremongers.' But, if you would have even further proof, allow me to give you still another authority, and one who, I have no doubt, will appeal to every hon. member on the other side of the House—no less an authority than the right hon. premier of this country. Speaking in this House last March, the right hon. gentleman uttered these words:

This brings us to something which is in the air at present and which no British subject can ignore. For a hundred years and more the naval supremacy of Great Britain has been unquestioned—nay more, British supremacy on the seas has been so absolute that no one supposed it could ever be disputed. But this is an age when events happen very fast. We have learned lately that the foremost military power of the world at present is contemplating perhaps to cope with Great Britain on the high seas. We have, perhaps, reason to believe, as we have just been told that Germany is building more ships than Great Britain and building them more rapidly. Possibly there is a conclusion to be drawn from this, and the only conclusion is that Germany intends some time to do with Great Britain on the high seas what she has done with France on land. Everybody knows, it is a matter of history that Prussia had for years been silently preparing to cope with France, which, up to that time, had been the greatest military nation in the world, that Prussia waited its opportunity, and when that opportunity came, delivered a mortal blow. If it be true then that Germany is organizing on the seas, no British subject can afford to be indifferent to the prospect.

Well, Sir, we on this side are not indifferent to that prospect, but I contend that hon. gentlemen opposite, in the present policy, are indifferent to the prospect referred to by their leader. And, if you take these words of the premier and place them before any audience in the Dominion of Canada and ask the members of that audience what these words mean, I believe that every man will say that these words were meant to indicate that the situation was grave, and that the premier apprehended danger to Britain and to the empire from Germany. And, if any man in that audience should need anything further to confirm him in that view, he could take these further words of the premier, spoken a little later on the occasion already referred to:

Vigilance and eternal vigilance must be the watchword to-day, not only in England, but in Canada and every other part of the British empire.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, including their leader, now tell us that there is no emergency, and that we are 'scaremongers,' who believe that there is an emergency impending. Sir, not even Robert Blatchford himself has used language more significant or more pregnant with alarm than that used by the leader of this government last March. If there is no cause for apprehension on our part, what is the necessity for the plunge into this new policy? If no danger is to be apprehended from Germany, why not submit this policy—involving, as it does, the expenditure during the next four or five years of $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 and, in the near future, an expenditure running into hundreds of millions—to the mature consideration and decision of the people of Canada?

Well, Sir, will this proposed flotilla of unarmoured cruisers add anything to the strength of the British navy or be an effective and complete defence for Canada itself? Is it not true that we shall have still to depend on England to protect us from the vital thrust of war, while we toot our tin horns and provide a toy fleet against possible and improbable pin pricks. We pretend to assume insignificant minor risks from stray raiding cruisers which we very well know would not dare to take the risk of going three thousand miles from their

base of supplies, but we leave it to England to provide our real protection. If England provides such protection, no large vessels can get at us. This government is assuming that Great Britain will still retain her general command of the seas. If the right hon. Prime Minister had any intention of strengthening the empire on the seas, he would have supplemented the British navy where the British navy needed supplementing. Where is the British navy weakest, according to the expression of opinion of her best statesmen? It is relatively weakest in Dreadnoughts. And where is it strongest? Figures show to us that it is relatively strongest in cruisers. And I contend that if there were any real desire on the part of this government to strengthen the British navy, they would give assistance where the British navy was relatively weakest, and not where it was relatively strongest. On the 3rd of the present month, the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) proposed this question to the leader of the government:

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. May I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? The interpretation clause of the Bill says that 'emergency means war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended.' If it requires one year to construct the plant and four years to construct the navy, what would he do if such an emergency arose in the meantime?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think, Mr. Speaker, we are getting pretty far from the question we have in hand just now.

Surely, that was a very proper question to ask. And surely I am right in saying that from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from one end of Canada to the other, there are thousands of Canadians who are asking that question to-day, and who want an answer. That was the answer given by the Prime Minister, who introduced this policy to the House. Then, take the position of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). He was asked some questions by the hon. member for West Algoma:

Mr. BOYCE. Has the minister any proposal to make in regard to providing for an emergency in the meantime?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Our friends of the opposition are doing that?

A statesmanlike answer, was it not? A nice way of crawling out of a hole.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I have to ask my hon. friend if the proposals of the opposition are satisfactory to him?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware that the members of this side of the House have treated any of the opposition speakers, particularly leading members of the opposition, in this way. I can stand any amount of heckling or nonsense, but I did not come here for that purpose to-day, and I think perhaps I might be allowed to get through with my statement and allow somebody else to follow.

Mr. BOYCE. I must beg the minister's pardon; I had no desire whatever to embarrass him in his speech. I asked him a question, and had it not been for his answer, nothing further would have been said.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the question he put as to an emergency is not a proper question to interject.

Mr. BOYCE. I can understand that, if the minister did not want to answer it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty position for any cabinet minister to put himself in. A question as to what this country is going to do if England and Germany, or England and any other country, come to blows in the next few years, is, in the estimation of the Minister of Militia of Canada, utter nonsense, and should never have been asked at all; and when the question is put to him he almost sheds tears, and pleads to this side of the House not to ask such questions, that he is a leading member of the House, and therefore, should be respected because of his high and mighty position, and because of the gold braid he wears on his clothes once in a while. Now, Sir, I am sorry the Minister of Militia is not in his place at present, but we have two or three other ministers here. I want to ask the hon. the Postmaster General, who may be regarded, I think, as one of the leading men on that side, certainly one of the leading men, if the Minister of Militia counts himself as one—I want to ask the Postmaster General if he is prepared to say to-day what this government will do in the event of an emergency occurring in the next few years, before their fleet is completed. Will the Postmaster General answer that question?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert, but I can tell my hon. friend what I believe would be the duty of any self respecting government in case of emergency overtaking the mother country. I think that Canada should certainly lend her navy to the mother country, and assist in the defence of the mother country.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Postmaster General did not understand my question. I am asking him what the government would propose to do in the event of this emergency occurring before their navy is constructed, that is within the next four or five years. The Prime Minister says it will be five years before their fleet is ready; now I am asking the hon. gentleman what the government would do if an emergency occurred before that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no hesitation in saying that in case of an emergency occurring before we had a navy, Canada as a whole would support the mother country.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman has given us no intimation how they would

support the mother country; they will have nothing to support her with.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We would support her with our assistance.

Mr. EDWARDS. In what way?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Substantially.

Mr. EDWARDS. In what way substantially? Would it be done by a contribution, or would it be done by stumping Quebec and Ontario and the other parts of Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by his question. I may tell him this, that Canada did her duty at the time of the South African war. I may go a little further, since my hon. friend has addressed this question particularly to me, and say that, as he spoke a moment ago of the attitude of the province of Quebec on this occasion——

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to let even so great a man as the Postmaster General interject a speech here. If he is prepared to answer my question, I will let him do so with pleasure, but I do not propose to let him take up my time by making a speech.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was going to say to my hon. friend that the mother country would naturally expect that help would come to her as it did at the time of the South African war; and I may add for his own information, since he seems to take me as a target in the present instance, that a brother of mine served in the South African war for his King.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am not impugning the loyalty of the Postmaster General, I am asking him a very simple question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And I gave a simple answer, I think.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, exceedingly simple in one sense of the word, much too simple for a gentleman occupying the position of the Postmaster General. I would expect from him an answer that was not quite so simple, one that contained more information. Well, it seems impossible to get a definite statement from the Postmaster General. I am not picking on the Postmaster General particularly. I might have asked the Finance Minister the question, but I asked the Postmaster General because he has spoken in this debate, and has given a long and eloquent address, and I asked him in the absence of the Prime Minister and in the absence of the Minister of Militia and Defence. I hope he will not think that a humble member like myself would think of picking on the Postmaster General. Now, sir, we are in this position. The Postmaster General says that in the event of an emergency Canada would do its duty as it did when the South African war broke out. Well, when the South African war broke out it was the people of Canada that sent the soldiers and not the government. Now I think every man in this House, no matter on which side of it he sits, will agree with me that the emergency, if it does occur, the battle, when it does come, will be on the sea, and we will not have an opportunity to send soldiers if the fight is on the sea. Now, Sir, we want to be in the position of being able to render assistance to the motherland in case of an emergency. That is the way I feel about this matter, that is the way I feel as a Canadian, as a descendant of the United Empire Loyalists, since other hon. members on both sides have declared themselves to be of that stock. I may also mention that I am of United Empire Loyalist stock, and I take pride in it. Now, as a Canadian I feel, that if a war should break out between England and Germany, and if New Zealand and Australia were represented on the firing line by their Dreadnoughts, and Canada was the only daughter nation which was not so represented, I would feel, as a Canadian, very sorry indeed, and I believe that sentiment is shared by the vast majority of the people of Canada. They would geatly regret the occasion. And I feel it is too great a risk to take. As Canadians we do not wish to run the risk of being unable to render assistance if the need should occur.

There has been something said here about imperialism. The hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Rivet) seemed to think there were two kinds of imperialism. There is only one kind of imperialism so far as I know. I have no hesitation in subscribing to the words: When England is at war, Canada is at war'. I do not want half a dozen interpretations put on those words either, I want them literally. I believe there are no statesmen to-day in the world who better appreciate the horrors of war than English statesmen. I believe that, I have full confidence in the humanity and the judgment of the statesmen of England. I firmly believe that Great Britain would not go to war with any country except it were to maintain the honour and integrity of the British empire. So I say there is only one kind of imperialism for me. Believing that Great Britain will only go to war to maintain the honour and the integrity of the British empire, I say that when England is at war, Canada is at war. That is my sentiment, and I do not attach any rider to it at all. The matter of cost has been referred to by some hon. members. On this side of the House the leader of the opposition proposes two Dreadnoughts at a cost of $20,000,000. The right hon. the First Minister proposes an expenditure during the next

four or five years of $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 and an untold expenditure in the future. If hon. gentlemen object to the principle of sending Canadian money out of Canada over to England to buy Dreadnoughts why do they proceed at once to violate that principle by sending $2,000,000 over the seas to buy a Rainbow and a Niobe? They violate their principle although they talk for hours about it. Now, one word with regard to the protection of trade routes. It has been said that this navy is necessary for the protection of our trade routes. Our principal trade is with Great Britain. I think that no member of this House will contest my statement when I sav that at the present time there is only one European nation whose activity along ship-bulding lines could be taken as a menace to the trade route between Canada and Great Britain. That country is Germany. I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, to take a glance at the map of Europe and see what the position of Germany is. Is it not true that Germany, in order to get her war vessels to the Atlantic to attack our trade routes, would have to defeat either the British Channel squadron or else defeat the British squadron in the North sea? There are only two ways in which any German war vessel could attack our trade route.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Would not the boats of the German-Hamburg-American line blockade the whole of the Atlantic coast of Canada?

Mr. EDWARDS. How are the boats of the Hamburg or any other line going to get into the Atlantic ocean to attack our trade routes?

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Out of New York.

Mr. EDWARDS. Are they all going to be in New York?

Mr. D. A. GORDON. They ply between Hamburg and New York.

Mr. EDWARDS. And your claim is that this fleet you are going to build will be able to handle anything of the kind?

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Beyond any question of doubt, so the best authorities say.

Mr. EDWARDS. I differ from you on that. In my judgment common sense and prudence would dictate that the proper thing for Canada to do would be to strengthen the British navy in the North sea where the test of strength is most likely to occur.

Now, let us consider our position with regard to another country. Let us consider the position of Canada with regard to the United States and see what this government has done. The Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817 has been openly violated by the United States ever since this government came into power. There is not a fort along the American frontier which existed previous to 1817. All the forts have been replaced with modern up to date structures, and behind these forts are 6,000 American soldiers. The Lake Champlain and Niagara districts are fully equipped with cavalry, infantry, and batteries of artillery. Cleveland has a training school for naval purposes. There are naval corps at Buffalo, Cleveland, Rochester, Chicago and Duluth, and a post has been established in Dakota—this, I contend, is in violation of the compact or agreement entered into in 1817, and without one word of protest from this government. On the lakes the United States have a large force of cutters armed with quickfiring guns, and lately this government permitted the United States to place war vessels on all the Great Lakes, thereby deliberately placing central Canada absolutely at the mercy of the United States. Yet, they talk of defending the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Not one move has been made to prevent the United States from violating that treaty, no protest on the part of this government. The United States have gone on, and I claim that they would absolutely control all central Canada in case of a difficulty arising between Canada and the United States. Our forts do not amount to anything. Take the fort at Barriefield, for instance—what is it? If you took a modern cannon and fired it off there, the whole thing would fall to pieces. A good lusty crowd of boys might attack that fort with every confidence, with nothing better than snowballs and pop-guns. They have a rickety old bridge across from Barriefield to Kingston, and they dare not take a cannon across that bridge at a trot, notwithstanding the fact that they pay $1,400 a year rent for it for military purposes. While the fort at Kingston is crumbling into decay, they have something else there which, of course, would be a great protection to Canada in the event of trouble—$6,000 cottages for men drawing $20 a month salary. Fancy the position of Canada with British naval supremacy gone. We would simply be at the mercy of any country that saw fit to attack us. The right hon. gentleman who leads this House says that independence is Canada's ultimate destiny. I entirely dissent from that view. Situated as we are, in my judgment, it would simply mean ruin for Canada. A country with 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 people would be a small affair in this day of giant nations and great armaments, and independence would make us practically helpless. Not only that, but if the imperial tie was broken, Canada would have no weight or influence whatever in the world. The government and railways of Canada now owe over $800,000,000 to Great Britain. That represents nearly the whole of their bonded

debt. In addition to that, vast sums are owed there on account of municipal and other bonds. As regards our indebtedness to England, I wish to place on 'Hansard' a statement of the well know writer, Mr. J. Castell Hopkins:

What Great Britain has done for Canada.

When Canada was in its birth-pains of United States revolution, invasion, and attempted conquest, Great Britain was unstinted in her supply of blood and men and money; when our youthful nation, that was to be, needed soldiers to support its growth and maintain its interests and hold its territory, British troops and fortifications were maintained here at an expenditure of $300,000,000 during the nineteenth century; when our growing commerce became a matter of international concern, as our vast, unbroken territories had so long been an object of international cupidity, they rested securely within the scope of Britain's naval supremacy; when British dignity and Canadian feeling were shamed by the Trent affair, 10,000 British soldiers came to Canada as fast as ships could bring them here; when the Fenian invasion illustrated the helplessness of a country like ours, lying alongside the territory of a great power, Britain paid the damages rather than risk war with a country stirred to fever heat by passions of the moment, which have now, happily, disappeared.

If Canadian settlers needed roads and canals and bridges in early days British money supplied them; if the Indians for half a century required expensive coddling and yearly gifts and payments, the money was provided by Great Britain; if our churches wanted vast sums for pioneer work and continued development, British voluntary societies contributed some $100,000,000 during the nineteenth century; if railways, such as the Intercolonial, had to be constructed, at a period when provincial credit was poor and interprovincial unity a dream, Great Britain guaranteed the loans to a total amount of $25,000,000; if in recent years countless enterprises, private and national, required money, it has been freely accorded in London up to a present total of $1,500,000,000 which is invested in the Dominion; if we wanted to build canals, or construct a Canadian Pacific, or a Grand Trunk railway, or a Canadian Northern, or a Grand Trunk Pacific, we have readily obtained the money in London at a rate of interest and with a facility which no small nation not under the British flag, and not having British power and stability to guarantee its position, could possibly have commanded; if, since confederation, our trade upon the seas of the world, totalling over $6,300,000,000, has never been disturbed by even a threat, or a shadow of a fear, it was due to the protection of the imperial navy; if the French Canadian people to-day have the full and free exercise of their religion, their laws, and perfect racial equality, it is due to British guarantees of liberty in the beginning, with British constitutional instincts in the rest of the Canadian people since that time; if all Canadians can now most fully recognize that the greatest privilege in the world—that of being a British citizen—and the most vital world-force in promoting and ensuring peace and advancing the progress of our common civilization, are alike bound up in British power, they cannot but also recognize that these things depend upon a colossal expenditure which is drawing upon the life blood of the British nation, and which must be maintained on behalf of the empire at large, as well as of the British people.

Some practical considerations and temporary embarrassments may advise limitation in our help at this juncture; every consideration of manliness and national instinct and Canadian honour seems to demand action.

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

Toronto, March 24.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the only position for Canada to take is one of continued unity with the empire. I contend that the policy proposed by the premier in regard to this navy is a policy making for separation, and I want to express my own opinion flatly, that in view of the right hon. gentleman's record in this country I am not prepared to trust him with the power of saying whether or not that navy shall go or shall not go to the assistance of Britain. That is my own opinion and I want to express it freely. I dissent from the view that Canada's destiny is independence. I am proud of my British citizenship; I am proud to belong to an empire which comprises one-third of the earth's surface and which contains probably one-fourth of the people on this planet. Eminent philologists tell us that during the last 100 years the people speaking the French language have increased sixty per cent, that the people speaking the German language have increased 110 per cent, and that the people speaking the English language have increased 600 per cent. The same eminent authorities also estimate that at the end of 100 years there will be in this world some 96,000,000 people speaking French, 124,000,000 speaking German, and over 800,000,000 speaking the English tongue, of whom some 80,000,000 will be in the Dominion of Canada. That estimate of 80,000,000 for the Dominion of Canada is not so very different from the estimate of the great Canadian, Lord Strathcona. And, Sir, whether these figures are correct or not, they express the idea of eminent authorities, and they certainly go to show that the Anglo-Saxon race is to continue to be the dominant race in this world. Sir, in the course of time the Dominion of Canada must have a population larger than the population of the British isles. I do not look forward to independence as Canada's destiny. I believe in a higher and nobler destiny for Canada. I look forward (though of course I will never live to see the day) to the time when Canada will have a larger population

than Great Britain, and still be a portion of the British empire. I look forward to that day when Canada will be the dominating and controlling factor in the affairs of our empire. I say, Sir, that for Canadians that is a grander and nobler destiny to look forward to than independence or annexation either. The late Principal Grant whom everybody recognized as one of Canada's brightest and brainiest sons, said that he believed the day would come when the Dominion of Canada would be the link that would bind the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race together; meaning the Anglo-Saxon race within the confines of the British empire, and that other great branch of the race which inhabits the United States, Well, Sir, I think we can look forward with pride and hope to the time when Canada, because of her population, because of her vast resources, and her great wealth, may occupy a dominant position in the British empire, and be the link which will join that empire to the United States—not politically, but in an alliance which will be able to say to the world: Henceforth there shall be no more war, no more Dreadnoughts; no more forging of cannon; henceforth devote your energies to the amelioration of the condition of your peoples and advance the arts of peace I believe that is the noblest destiny for us to look forward to. I believe that the time is reasonably near when Canada will occupy that position, Are we of the Anglo-Saxon race in Canada so poor in national spirit that we shall quietly submit to be led like vassels by any political party, or any political leader to our own humiliation and shame? This policy enunciated by the Prime Minister, and by his government, is, I firmly believe part of a plan to bring about separation. Canada's destiny is in our hands; the issue for us to decide upon is not one as between giving Dreadnoughts and building Bristols; the issue we have to decide now is as to whether we shall turn in the direction of separation and independence, or rejecting that, turn ourselves to a closer unity between Canada and the empire at large. Our fellow citizens appeal to us from across the sea to stand by them and co-operate with them in the upholding of the British empire; in the language of the great poet of the empire they say to us:

"Sharers of our glorious past,
Brothers, must we part at last?
Shall we not through good and ill
Cleave to one another still?
Sons be welded each and all
Into one imperial whole,
One with Britain, heart and soul!
One life, one flag, one fleet, one throne!
Britons, hold your own."

Now, Mr. Speaker, to my mind the question is simply this: Shall we stand for the one flag, one fleet, one empire, or, shall we forget our race and blindly follow the right hon. the Prime Minister in his policy of separation? If, we should pursue the latter course then in time to come it may be truly said that Canadians:

Living shall forfeit their fair renown
And doubly dying shall go down
To the vile dust from whence it sprung,
Unwept, unhonoured and unsung.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member for Frontenac takes his seat I would like to ask him if he would be kind enough to allow me to put him a question. He has raised quite a doubt as to the loyalty of the French Canadian Liberal leaders in the province of Quebec; would he be good enough to tell me the nationality, the political allegiance, and the object of those who burned down the parliament buildings in Montreal in 1848.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker. There is no member of this House to whom I would be more glad to impart information than to the hon. member (Mr. Talbot) because I recognizes the fact, as I am sure every hon. gentleman recognizes it, that there is no gentleman in this House who stands more in need of information. But inasmuch as I cannot hope to fill up the void which exists in the cranium of the hon. gentleman in the short space at my disposal, I will leave that question which he has asked me for further consideration.

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce) (Translation)—Mr. Speaker, I am taking up this important question of the naval defence as a citizen of the greatest, most populous and most prosperous self-governing colony of Great Britain. True, I belong to the French Canadian minority, but, following on the footsteps of those eminent countrymen of mine who for a period of sixty years have been the leaders of the race, Lafontaine, Cartier, Laurier, I should in dealing with a question which interests Canada as a whole view it from a Canadian standpoint, and not lose sight of the fact that, being a Canadian, I am a subject of the King of England.

The quality of British subjects carries with it inestimable advantages and privileges, but also on the other hand implies duties and obligations which it is not permissible to ignore. Under every clime the British subject commands respect and finds his interests protected. And while I do not wish just now to go more deeply into a consideration of that subject, I think I am justified in stating that there exists no country under the sun where the word 'liberty' is better understood and put to more constant use than England, whether it be in religious, civil or political matters. All of these British dominions have hence-

forth enjoyed the greatest security against outsiders, under the protection of that navy the most powerful which has navigated the seas in the course of centuries. It is indeed a matter of pride for every Canadian to proclaim himself at all times and in all countries a British subject.

On the other hand, there is no precious boon but has as its counterpart certain duties and obligations. In the present emergency, the creation of a marine presents this especially happy feature that it evidences our loyalty to England while at the same time promoting the best interests of the Dominion.

When Sir George Etienne Cartier, in 1862, introduced his militia Bill, and in 1868 his fortification Bill, he was working in the true interests of Canada. An experience of fifty years has shown it. In supplementing our means of defence on land by providing means of defence on sea—a still greater necessity in view of our growing sea-going trade—the government is carrying out the idea of the man who may be termed the father of confederation. Loyalty to Canada, loyalty to England, such are the facts evidenced by the measure submitted to the House.

The discussion of that important Bill, which for the past few weeks has monopolized the attention of this parliament, has been the occasion of excesses of speech which cannot be ignored or left unanswered. And despite my anxiety, following on such a prolonged debate, to take up your time and that of the House for a few moments only, I should not forego the task of referring to and refuting certain charges brought against the French Canadian members of this House.

One cannot help wondering how charges so utterly contradictory can be proferred by two hon. members both occupying side by side prominent positions within the ranks of the Conservative party, and who for nearly twenty years have had a hand in its management, who were political mates yesterday, and who although apparently divided are still allies for electoral purposes, and will to-morrow be even closer allies, you may be sure. I refer to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). In the eyes of these two hon. gentlemen we are disloyal; disloyal to the province of Quebec, according to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, because we are doing too much for England; disloyal to England, according to the hon. member for North Toronto, because our Bill is too Canadian, too much in the interest of the province of Quebec, and not enough in the interest of England.

It is hardly necessary to attempt a refutation of such a childish charge. We acknowledge that this measure for naval defence is of a nature to greatly promote the prestige of England; but I may say to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that it is in providing for the defence of Canada primarily that we are helping to enhance the prestige of England, and that in so doing, we are contributing to the upbuilding of the nation, inasmuch as we are promoting our interests as Canadians. We are living within an empire, we recognize that it is an estimable advantage for Canada to be part of the greatest empire of the world, and I have no hesitation in stating that the province of Quebec has a greater interest in remaining under the protection of the British Crown than any of the eight English-speaking provinces which together with ours make up confederation.

England safeguards the religious and national interests of French Canadians. In helping to uphold its prestige, we are not such improvident trustees or such disloyal representatives as others would fain picture us to be, but we are working indirectly towards the maintenance of these special privileges or rights, if you prefer, which the province of Quebec enjoys from the national and religious standpoint.

Accordingly, associated as we are with eight English-speaking provinces which apparently are unanimous in favouring the idea of a contribution of some sort, I maintain that far from showing disloyalty, we are taking the only stand of a nature to promote the development of the province of Quebec, in peace and harmony with the remainder of Canada. Any other position would be likely to isolate it, and prepare for it a very dark future in the Dominion.

As regards the hon. member for North Toronto, his attitude is very different from that of his friend from Jacques Cartier. In his eyes we are disloyal to England. Why? Because we refuse to abide by the policy of the Conservative leader, which provides for the establishment of a Canadian navy entirely at the disposal of the British Admiralty, besides giving away 25 millions to Great Britain. On that account, we are taxed with disloyalty to Great Britain. Here again it is indirectly against the province of Quebec that the hon. member for North Toronto directs his blows when charging Sir Wilfrid with disloyalty. There is nothing to surprise us here; he has repeatedly done so.

Is he not aware of what happened in 1776, when our forefathers indignantly rejected the insidious proposals of emissaries from the United States in arms against England, their mother country. At the time we had not yet obtained from England those privileges conferred by the Quebec Act.

Does he not know with what patriotism, what courage and what success a further generation of our forefathers repulsed the

American invaders of 1812 and thereby retained Canada to the British Crown.

Is he not aware that from the time of Bishop Plessis in 1794 down to the present archbishop of Quebec, all the leading dignitaries of the Catholic clergy have on all occasions advised the French Canadian people to show the greatest loyalty and remain unswerving in their atachment to Great Britain.

Does he not know that it was Sir George Etienne Cartier, a French Canadian who introduced and carried through the House the Militia Bill and that relating to fortifications, measures like the present one having for their object to relieve the mother country of part of the burden of Canada's defence? Does he not know that his old-time leader, Sir John Macdonald, in London, on a memorable occasion stated that Queen Victoria had no more loyal subjects in Canada than those speaking the French language and professing the Catholic religion.

Is he not aware that the first preferential tariff clauses in favour of British products coming into our market were introduced by a French Canadian, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that same man whom he has attempted to injure in the eyes of the English-speaking people of this country by imputing to him disloyal motives on account of the so-called inadequacy of the naval service Bill. Surely, he is aware of all those facts. But the object which the hon. member for North Toronto has evidently in mind, is to develop an ill-feeling towards Sir Wilfrid Laurier, by making him pass for a disloyal subject of the King. The Conservative leaders have divided the task between themselves. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, unable to find any solid ground for attacking the provisions of the Bill, tries to frighten the French Canadians with the scarecrow of militarism, and purposely exaggerates its tenor; the hon. member for North Toronto, on the contrary endeavours to minimize its purport with a view to working on the feelings of English-speaking Canadians; the same old dishonest and disloyal tactics which will be exposed to light before long, on the part of two political leaders who seemingly divided for the present will be seen to-morrow hugging one another after the the elections are over.

Mr. Speaker, before discussing on its merits the Naval Defence Bill now submitted to parliament, it is in order that we should consider the proposal emanating from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and set forth in some newspapers, of submitting the measure to the people for their approval, under that fallacious pretense that the question is a novel one.

Numerous reasons and facts, which cannot be controverted, stand in the way of such a proposal. In the first place, there is the stand taken more than seven years ago, that is in 1902, by the delegates of the Canadian government at the Colonial Conference in London. At that conference, our ministers stated that our government had decided on establishing a Canadian naval service. They spoke in unequivocal terms. They stated in the first place that the time had come for Canada to relieve the mother country of part of the burden laid on the shoulders of the British taxpayer, through our assuming the cost of defending our coasts and sea ports; and in second place, they asserted the principle of self-government in the matter of naval defence as well as in matters of militia, and the unswerving attachment of Canada to that country.

I shall now read to the House an extract from the report of the conference of 1902 on this subject; it forms part of the memorandum submitted by the Canadian ministers:

> At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well. On the sea coasts of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, ant it is hoped that at an early day a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.
>
> In conclusion, the ministers repeat that, while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the inscreasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which he now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of experienced imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

It will be seen by the above extract that the question which it is proposed to submit to a plebiscite is not a novel one. It was discussed in London before the two delegates of Canada, and it is in the presence of representatives from all parts of the British Empire that the opinions just quoted was expresed.

Mr. MONK (Translation). Will the hon. member allow me to ask a question?

Mr. BELAND. Certainly.

Mr. MONK (Translation). The question brought up before the conference of 1902 related solely to the defence of the coun-

try, and in the same way at the conference of 1907 the question of the defence of the empire was not to any degree discussed. It was in 1909 only that the question of the defence of the empire as a whole was brought up, and that was, of course, after the general elections of 1908.

Mr. BELAND (Translation). The question which the hon. member wishes to put turns out to be a speech on a small scale. I for one cannot perceive much difference between the questions discussed at the conference of 1902 and subsequently at those of 1907 and 1909.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the facts which I am bringing forward just now occurred in August, 1902. At the opening of the ensuing session of parliament, that is on March 13, 1903, the speech from the throne referred to the Colonial Conference in London, and to the part taken therein by the Canadian delegates in connection with naval defence. The discussion which then took place in connection with the moving of the address in answer to the speech from the Throne clearly set forth the feeling of the House. 'Hansard' shows that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, leader of the government, Mr. R. L. Borden, leader of the opposition, and Mr. Bourassa, spoke on that occasion, and these three gentlemen, in my humble opinion were supposed to voice the opinions of all parties and sections in parliament as well as outside of it.

Nevertheless, favourable comments only were forthcoming as to the outcome of the Colonial Conference. Therefore I say it would be childish and hardly fair to contend to-day that the principle embodied in the policy submitted to the House was adversely commented upon. No, Mr. Speaker, not a single voice was raised in this House to apprise the government that their representatives in London 'adopted a nefarious policy,' no parliament was unanimous in approving of the stand they had taken. Henceforth, the question was before the country.

Then the elections of 1904 came on. Will any one state for my information in what locality of Canada, in what electoral division, the opponents of this policy advocated their views? I, for one, remember very well having contended before my constituents that it was a matter of common prudence to provide for the safety of our coasts, of our sea-going trade, by protecting the British market. I remember having emphatically stated that the upholding of the British empire as a whole was indispensable towards ensuring the material progress of Canada, as also towards safeguarding the national and religious interests of the province of Quebec; and among the men of all shades of political opinion who opposed me at the time, there was not a single one to raise his voice in denunciation of that so-called naval policy, of imperialism, of that backdown or sacrifice of all that honour holds most sacred.

Five years elapsed, five years of unprecedented prosperity. Meanwhile population increased, the West made further leaps in the way of development, the volume of trade doubled, new railways were built in all directions; Canada, in short, after being for a long time a mere colony evolved into a nation in the eyes of the world, enjoying new privileges and bearing new responsibilities.

It was then that one of the leaders of the Conservative party in this House, the hon. member for North Toronto inserted in the order paper the following proposal:

> That in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self help and self respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

When that resolution was discussed, that is on March 9th, 1909, its lack of precise meaning prevented the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition from agreeing to it, especially for fear it might put our country under the necessity of a direct contribution to the British exchequer, a contingency which did not appear acceptable to either party. So, it was thrown aside by mutual agreement, and another, of which I need quote a part only to the House, substituted therefor. For the purpose of this debate, it will suffice to quote the following paragraph which is essential:

> The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.'

That resolution was discussed, but when I say discussed, I wish to be well understood. Not a single voice was raised against it, comments from both sides of the House were invariably favourable. Where were the men who are to-day opposing the government, and why did they not raise their voices in condemnation of the proposal? And if they did not wish to speak out, why did they not vote against the measure, which in principle and in its essential features is the same as that submitted to parliament to-day. It is of primary importance that the people of this country,

and particularly of the province of Quebec, should be made aware that it was then unanimously adopted, without even the hon. member for Jacques Cartier dissenting.

Now, I ask again, what is it that carried unanimously at that time? In the first place, the asserting of the unswerving fidelity of Canada towards the mother country; in the second place the disproval of the principle of a direct money contribution to the British exchequer; in the third place, our hearty approval of the establishment of a national navy. So then, the colonial conference held in London in 1902, the stand taken by the Canadian parliament in 1903; the general elections in 1904 and 1908; the resolution unanimously adopted by parliament in 1909, these circumstances, it would seem, are more than sufficient to set aside the contention of those who allege that the question has never been brought up in the past and should take the form of a plebiscite.

Besides, what would be the outcome of a plebiscite on a question of that kind? Have those of my hon. friends from the province of Quebec who advocate a plebiscite pondered over the probable results of a consultation of the people? Is it not self-evident that the Anglo-Saxon blood would be stirred up by those who have accepted the tenets of the policy of imperialism as advocated by Mr. Chamberlain, and that through the kindling of prejudices by expert hands through the intense political feeling aroused, and appeals to racial and religious passions, a majority of electors might pronounce in favour of the nefarious principle of a money contribution to the British admiralty. I, for one, would fear having recourse to a plebiscite, as it would result in dangerous appeals to prejudice, and thereby be a menace to the maintenance of our institutions.

A plebiscite, I readily conceive, would afford extremists a fine opportunity for abetting popular passions, awakening old racial enmities, setting up one against the other the two great races living in harmony in this country from the national and religious standpoint. It is hoped that thereby the two sections of the Conservative party would affect a step in advance, by representing in Quebec the Prime Minister as sacrificing Canada to England, while in Ontario and the west, he would be held up as the sworn foe of England, because the Bill gives Canada control over its navy. As a matter of fact, it should not be forgotten that this is the very reason given by the leader of the opposition for demanding a plebiscite.

The stand taken by the leader of the opposition should not cause too much surprise. It is one among his many shiftings of which we have had the spectacle in the course of the last year. Indeed, we have seen a moment ago that on March 29th, 1909, that is less than a year ago, the House declared unanimously in favour of the establishment of a Canadian navy. At that date, the leader freely chosen by all sections of the party opposite, not even excepting the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, proclaimed the principle of self-government in the matter of the navy as well as in matters of militia, urged the government to build forthwith, and to carry to rapid completion, a national naval service, and repudiated the idea of a direct money contribution to the British exchequer. On January 12, 1910, about a month ago, from his seat in this House, he spoke as follows:

> It has been suggested that instead of the organization of a Canadian naval force, there should be a system of annual contributions from this country to the mother country; and I am free to admit that, from the strategical point of view, that I would be inclined to agree with the view of the admiralty that that would be the best way for the great self-governing dominions of the empire to make their contributions. But, Sir, from a constitutional and political standpoint, I am opposed to it, for many reasons.

As all may see, he had not yet performed that famous somersault, that most laughable bout-face ever recorded in the parliamentary annals of this country. But after a stormy caucas during which, if rumour is to be credited, the Quebec Conservatives and those from the English-speaking provinces, came to hands, he emerged with a new policy. Then, Sir, he discards all his great principles hardly twelve months old; what he now advocates is not the building of a national navy with wisdom and prudence, kept under the control of the Dominion government and parliament. Not by any means. To-day, he comes before parliament, and in the name of the great Conservative party, he says: Let us give $25,000,000 to England, as a gift pure and simple; let us let the country be invited to pay an amount equivalent to three dollars for each man, woman and child; let us make that gift to England, without reserving the right of ever requiring that these ships built with our cash will be used primarily for the protection of our coasts and our trade. That is on the part of the leader of the opposition an overt step in the direction of imperial federation and the complete abandonment of our autonomy. I, for one, shall oppose, with all my might that dangerous proposal of a money contribution.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier demands a plebiscite, and his leader demands the same thing, but is it with the same object in view? Let us see. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, if I understand

him aright, is of opinion that the government measure effects a radical change in our relations with Great Britain; and in support of this contention, he points to clause 18 of the Bill which enables the Governor in Council, that is the Dominion government, to put in a case of emergency the Canadian navy at the disposal of His Majesty. To my mind, that reservation which is incorporated in the Bill on behalf of the Dominion government, is the mere conferring of a discretionary power, is nothing but a further assertion of our autonomy, especially if read in conjunction with clause 19 which states that no such decision will take effect unless it be ratified by the Dominion parliament, that is, by the representatives of the people. In the opinion of the hon. member (Mr. Monk), there is no necessity for protecting our coasts, our sea ports. To his mind, the situation in Canada has not changed for the last twenty years, or within the last decade. To his mind, our sea-going trade is too insignificant to require any protection on our part. His policy is one of expectation, but not one such as is termed in medical practice, 'armed expectation,' but an expectation without preparation or foresight. Should he have his way, and our trade is harassed at sea, and our vessels loaded with food products sunk by the enemy's warships, our only recourse would be to fold our arms and call on England to protect us. And if England was not in a position to relieve us, her ships being kept busy on the German ocean or in some other quarter, would the hon. member suggest that we invoke the Monroe doctrine, that is to say, the protection of the United States? Surely not, for my hon. friend as a Canadian would be too proud to remain inactive awaiting the protection of a foreign country.

On the other hand, the leader of the opposition, that is to say, the leader of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, would be in favour of a plebiscite, for this reason, that the Bill provides that the proposed navy will remain under the control of the Canadian paliament. He is in favour of a navy, even of a stronger navy than the one proposed, and if he demands a plebiscite, it is with a view of obtaining from the people authority to place it as soon as completed at the entire disposal of the British admiralty. If England and Canada were to be attacked simultaneously, the leader of the opposition is willing that our fleet should be against our will summoned to the mouth of the Thames, the coasts of England, or elsewhere, at the sweet will of the British admiralty. That is a second breach to the principle of autonomy, a second repudiation of his statements of a year ago, of a month ago.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party is actually identified with the leader of the opposition. It is all very well for the member for Jacques Cartier to seemingly break away from his leader on that question; it is all very well for him to rouse the province of Quebec and acquire cheap popularity; but whenever Sir Wilfrid Laurier relinguishes the reins of power and gives way before an expression of popular will throughout the Dominion, it is the leader of the opposition who will be summoned to take hold of the government, and the Conservatives of the province of Quebec, who to-day condemn the prime minister on account of his policy of a Canadian navy kept under our control, would be the first you may be sure, to acclaim Mr. Borden, though he is in favour of a larger fleet put entirely at the disposal of Great Britain, and besides of paying over a money contribution of $25,000,000.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier may be sure that this old trick will fail as did the others and that the people will understand the duplicity of the Conservative party who is attempting to attain office by the worn-out tactics of crying: 'too much' in Quebec and 'not enough' in Ontario. The excellent people of Quebec are told: Laurier, your fellow countryman is a traitor, he becoming too English, and in Ontario it is proclaimed that Laurier is disloyal and a traitor to England because he refuses to pay over $25,000,000 in money and to place the Canadian navy unrestrictedly under English control.

There exists in the country, both in Quebec and in the English speaking provinces, a party of moderate opinions, rejecting all extremist and dangerous views. This majority has on every important occasion, decided the issue in such manner as the true interests of Canada required. In the present case common issue will prevail against all wild statements, false accusations, insults and denounciations whether they be uttered by ultra loyalists or by demagogues.

The Bill now submitted to parliament is essentially a Canadian measure and the methods of those opposing it are decidedly dangerous from a Canadian point of view. I cannot understand that men of the parliamentary standing of the hon. member for North Toronto and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier should devote themselves to a task calculated to strain the harmonious and friendly relations existing between the two great races who inhabit this country.

The measure is neither extraordinary nor even absolutely new. I say this advisedly, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who opposes it so strenuously and with so little justification, has admitted it himself. I say that this measure is nothing more than an adaptation to the navy of the Mili-

itia Act now in force since several years. Should the hon. member for Jacques Cartier question this, I will quote his own words from 'Hansard' of the 3rd February instant:

> The Bill itself, with the exception of section 18, does not appear to me to contain anything very striking; it is the re-enactment of those statutes which exist since the mother country requested us to assume the responsibility of our own defence. It may therefore be said that, with the exception I have pointed out, it is by no means extraordinary.

If section 18 were withdrawn, the hon. member would not object; the arguments he set forth before a great public meeting against the expenditure to be incurred for a navy, necessarily useless and premature, no longer hold any place in his mind.

Now what is the true meaning of this Bill? Canada having attained a stage of development which enables her to take her place among the nations, naval defence is nothing more than the rational and natural result of the evolution that has been going on since fifteen or twenty years. Those who oppose the measure and reject all idea of a navy ask us how it happens that Canada having continued so long without a navy should now require one. The explanation is easy. Twenty years ago Canada had not yet entered into the period of rapid development. Her population of 3,000,000 has now grown to 7,000,000. Her trade has increased from $200,000,000 to $600,000,000. Her ocean trade, insignificant twenty years ago, is now at least $300,000,000. Our trade with England, in farm produce alone, has grown from $21,000,000 to $105,000,000. Canadian farmers used to export $8,000,000 worth of butter and cheese, to-day those exports represent $23,000,000. Twenty years ago the west scarcely produced any wheat; but the last reports estimates the value of our western crop at $125,000,000, the greater part of which will cross the ocean. In short, Canada holds the second place to-day in the commercial progress of the world and the main purpose of the ships we intend to build will be to protect this trade in case of danger and to enable the Canadian farmer to dispose of his produce in all security.

Will it be contended that we shall not protect our export trade? Should we trust to the United States for the conveying of our exported produce in case of a serious conflict between Great Britain and a foreign naval power? Surely not.

Should England be engaged in war with any foreign naval power, the food stuffs she requires and which comprise four-fifths of the Canadian exports in wheat, cattle, meats, cheese and butter, would be considered as contraband of war and liable to seizure by the enemy.

Mr. BELAND.

Mr. MONK (Translation). The hon. member knows quite well that we have no merchant marine.

Mr. BELAND (Translation). It is not necessary that we should have a merchant marine of our own to export our produce.

I am appealing now to those hon. members representing agricultural constituencies where the dairy industry is flourishing and who proclaim everywhere that in opposing the present Bill they voice the opinion of the farmers. They owe it to their constituents to vote for the measure. I repeat it, the agricultural class has a paramount interest in the Bill, because agriculture should in the first place be protected; we must act with prudence and foresight so that in case of war the farming community may not suffer. That cannot be done, as the hon. leader of the Conservative party suggests, by giving over $25,000,000 to Great Britain to strengthen her fleet, but by expending a smaller but a sufficient sum for the building of a Canadian navy able to protect our own fishermen, our coasts, our sea ports and the produce of our farms shipped for export.

This is the weak point in the position of the few Conservative abstainers. My first reason for supporting the measure is that it is essentially Canadian; my second is that the navy so established will become an indispensable factor in the protection of our export trade; my third that it will powerfully help to maintain the integrity of the colonial bond with Great Britain.

Going a step further, I believe I will be able to show paramount reasons why French Canadians should support this measure. Canada is a part of the British empire and they have every interest that Britain should maintain her naval supremacy. If the British empire were to be dismembered it would be an evil day for the French population of this country, not only from a commercial point of view but also from that of their national and religious life.

The fact that all the British self-governing colonies are adopting a policy similar to ours, and protecting, be it even, for the time being, to a limited extent, coasts that have hitherto been unprotected, will produce a most important moral effect upon any nation that may have hoped to be able to annoy Great Britain or weaken her naval prestige, or who may have dreamed of her dismemberment. It is easy to understand that being confronted by the finest navy in the world—I mean the British navy—protecting the sea coast of the North Sea, the Channel and the Atlantic; and also by the colonial navies stationed at the entrance of the respective ports of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and other colonies, those bellicose enemies of the

British empire will speedily assume an attitude of respect, instead of that of aggressiveness which has been theirs of late years, and that British peace which has been maintained on the high seas for over a century, will still prevail. Thus the best means of securing peace seems to be in those defensive measures which we are at present considering.

In my humble opinion no province is more interested than the province of Quebec in the maintenance of the integrity of the British empire. By the beneficial influence of Britain our rights and privileges granted by the British North America Act are protected against the attempts made by demagogues. In the province of Quebec the French Canadian population enjoy the greatest liberty in matters of education and also as to the official use of their language. I know, Mr. Speaker, that those rights are secured to us by the constitution and that our constitution is the result of a conference between Canadian statesmen of different races and religions. But should the prestige of the mother country vanish, should England, after an unsuccessful war, lose the dominion of the seas, that constitution would become a dead letter, and with it the right of using the French language in the parliament of Canada, the privilege of religious instruction in the separate schools of Quebec and Ontario. Have we sufficiently reflected upon the dreadful consequences which might follow the breaking of the bond between Canada and Britain? We would have to choose between independence and annexation to the United States. Independence, apparently the most acceptable alternative, would none the less entail great responsibilities and enormous risks. The risks would consist chiefly in the numerous difficulties to be encountered in inducing the English and Protestant majority, without the preponderant influence of England, to respect the institutions so dear to us. I am quite willing to admit the generous spirit and breadth of view of the English speaking population of Canada, but I would place even greater faith in the protection of England, for since fifty years and more we would seek in vain for any expression of hostility towards us from the lips of a British statesman, of either party, whereas, unfortunately, the same cannot be said of Canada.

I know full well that men there will be in the province of Quebec who will say to the people: 'Perish England and her prestige rather than have a Canadian navy; let us have independence rather than a fleet for the protection of our coasts and commerce.' They will say to us that if by the rupture of the British bond our rights as French Canadian and Catholics were threatened, we might fight as fought our ancestors on the fields of St. Denis, St. Charles and St. Eustache. Those who might be tempted to use such arguments would certainly prove the greatest enemies of the French race in Canada!

For my part, I declare once again that the political state of 'Independence of Canada' would endanger the exercise of our religious and national rights. Let us now turn for a moment to our obligations. If, financially, the establishment of a navy for purposes of protection, as suggested, is too much for our weak shoulders, if there is anything alarming in the expenditure of the twelve or fifteen millions requisite for the establishment of a rudimentary navy composed of four cruisers and a few smaller ships, can we forget that on becoming independent we will lose the protection of the powerful British navy, and that with the hundreds of miles of sea coast on both oceans, we would be obliged to establish a complete one. That would be much more serious. What is the situation of independent nations? Let us take, as examples, some South American republics. Brazil with a population of 17,000,000 has a navy of 15 battleships; Chili, with a population of 3½ millions, has seven battleships; Argentina, with a population of 7 millions, has nine battleships and cruisers. Take the small independent countries of Europe: Holland, with a population of 6 millions, has seventeen cruisers; Sweden, with 7½ millions, fifteen battleships; Denmark, with 2½ millions, 9 battleships.

We find that all those countries, with populations smaller than that of Canada, with the exception of Brazil, have much more powerful navies than that contemplated for Canada; the Bill before the House provides for the building of four cruisers and of some torpedo boats.

I remember having read quite recently a speech delivered at the Monument National, Montreal, in direct opposition to the idea of a national navy, by an eminent speaker well known in this House, Mr. Bourassa. In his speech, he developed this strange contention that Canada, in case of danger, might apply for protection to the United States and require the application of the Monroe doctrine to our case. I humbly submit that for a country like Canada to rely upon the protection of its neighbour would be a position of the deepest disgrace. It would mean something more than disgrace. Does anybody suppose that the United States would consent to a breach of neutrality towards any enemy of England without requiring compensation? Certainly not, and the compensation, in this case, would take the form of territorial and trade concessions; perhaps it might also affect our allegiance.

From a national and religious point of view the annexation of Canada to the

United States would be almost as disastrous to the province of Quebec as independence. It will be immediately seen that the French population, instead of being in a proportion of two to five as in Canada, would stand in the proportion of one to thirty in the United States. We would be delivered up to the almost irresistible assimilating power of the American people. Americans would never permit the use of any language but English in Congress. It is quite reasonable to suppose that no exception would be made in favour of the province of Quebec as to education in the public schools. Annexation also would entail taxation for the support of the United States navy—one of the most powerful in the world—and such taxation would be much heavier than any that may be imposed for the creation and maintenance of a navy under the present Bill.

It is clear, therefore, that from a financial point of view as well as from commercial, national and religious considerations, we have every interest in firmly dismissing all idea of independence or annexation; nay more, that we should be ready to submit to heavy sacrifices for the maintenance of the British bond.

Mgr. Plessis understood this when, in 1807, he said to the Catholic population of Quebec: 'You have understood that your dearest interests are inseparable from those of Great Britain.' He also said that 'his flock would be unworthy of the name of Catholics and Canadians if they showed disloyalty or even indifference in the accomplishment of their duty as subjects devoted to their sovereign's interests and defenders of their country.'

The same advice was given at different times by Bishop Panet, by Bishops Signay and Lartigue, in 1837-8, by Bishops Baillargeon and Taché, and later by Archbishop Begin, of Quebec, who some years ago, declared in a sermon delivered in a cathedral of France: 'We are happy to live under the British flag and our country is essentially a land of freedom.'

As I do not wish to make my speech too lengthy, I will now close with the remark that in this matter the Liberal party has avoided extremes; the proposal submitted is moderate and consists in a Canadian naval establishment calculated to protect our coasts and cities, our fishermen and our foreign trade.

The Navy Bill now before the House is the result of eight years of study; it provides for an exclusively Canadian navy, inasmuch as it will be built in Canada, that all the necessary expenditures will be paid into the hands of the Canadian people and that the whole will be under the control of the Canadian parliament.

A plebiscite would become the occasion of unwise apeals, would inevitably result in rousing the English-speaking population, which holds the majority in the country, against the province of Quebec, thus forming an English party or a French party, a most serious and dangerous situation.

The Bill, moreover, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier said the other day, consists in nothing but a greater scope given to legislation already existing in our statute-books in a less extended form; and this legislation, according to his statement, is by no means extraordinary.

It is the inevitable sequel of our marvellous industrial, agricultural, commercial and political development.

The effect of the establishment of this national navy will be to secure peace and harmony between the races; it will clearly demonstrate the loyalty of the Canadian people towards the motherland, who has granted to us and more especially to the people of the province of Quebec, national and religious privileges which neither independence, nor German allegiance, nor yet annexation to the United States could ever secure.

The measure entails no forced service on the part of the people of this country, nor the imposition of any new taxation, our ordinary public revenues being sufficient to meet the expenditure under this head.

All this is infinitely more akin to the Canadian ideal than would be the contribution of $25,000,000 proposed by the Conservative leader, inasmuch as it safeguards our autonomy and opposes the principle of imperial federation which appears at the root of that proposal.

Instead, therefore, of joining the standard of Mr. Borden, who proposes first of all a contribution of $25,000,000 and then the building of a navy at our own expense, but the control of which would remain with Great Britain, the people of Canada will prefer to continue in their support of the eminent statesman who has been guiding our policy since fourteen years, securing at all times the greatness and prosperity of our country and who, in the present instance, is following in the footsteps of Lafontaine and Cartier.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (Montreal, St. Anne). Mr. Speaker before entering upon anything in the nature of an answer to the very able and eloquent address to which we have just listened with very great pleasure, whether we may have agreed or disagreed with the conclusions reached, I crave your permission to make a very brief reference to an incident that occurred this afternoon, and to some observations of my hon. friend the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). I need not say that I have no concern with anything that the hon. member from Frontenac has thought proper to say reflecting upon the confidence which should or should not be reposed either in

the right hon. the leader of this House or any gentleman either on the other side or this side of the House, but I did listen, I have to say, with a great deal of pain, to some observations which that hon. gentleman found it proper to make. It was with very particular pleasure that I noted that at the conclusion of these observations the hon. gentleman very emphatically repudiated any desire whatever to reflect upon the loyalty of the French Canadian population of the province of Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER. Rats!

Mr. DOHERTY. Some of the citations, however, which he thought proper to make, it seems to me should not be allowed to pass unanswered. I give him credit for not intending to reflect upon the loyalty of the population of Quebec.

Mr. GAUVREAU. You are too good.

Mr. DOHERTY—but I think that enough was said to make it quite proper that something should be said to do away with any false impression on that subject that might be created by the citations which the hon. gentleman thought proper to make. I take upon myself the duty of doing that with the greater pleasure because of the fact that I am not a French Canadian, and therefore am not directly concerned, and of the further fact, which is a fact, that from other points of view I may regret that I have not been able to reach precisely the same conclusions on the question which is formally before the House as have been reached by either my French Canadian friends who sit on the other side of the House or by the French Canadians, or some of them, who sit on this side of the House. Thus in what I am about to say I am not speaking on either one side of this question or on the other. I have said I am not a French Canadian. I have, however, had the honour and the advantage to be born in a province largely French Canadian.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I do not know whether I quite understand the hon. member's remarks, but does he not think it in the public interest that the words that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) this afternoon, should be reproduced all over the country and in the 'Hansard,' at first?

Mr. DOHERTY. I am not in a position to take upon myself to answer a question of that kind. I do not think it is for me to decide to what extent those words ought to be reproduced. For my own part, I think it is vastly more important that any false impression that might have been based on them should be wiped away at once, and that then both the words and the false impression should be forgotten. However, it is for the hon. member for Laval (Mr. C. A. Wilson) to exercise his own judgment as to whether he thinks that good will between the different races in this country would be furthered by the reproduction of words that seem to have given offence notwithstanding the fact of the declaration of the hon. member for Frontenac that he intended none.

However, I do not wish to be led into a discussion upon that question. My desire is to say this much in correction of any false impression that might be derived from the citations made by the hon. member. I was about to say that although I am not a French Canadian, I have the honour and advantage of having been borne in a province largely populated by French Canadians. I have had the pleasure and the advantage of living with and among French Canadians all my life. I think I can claim to know the French Canadian population of the province of Quebec as well as any man who is not of their race, and I am here to say that everything that I have known of them has been of a nature to create the most absolute confidence in their most unrestricted loyalty to their country and to the Crown under which we all live. I have had the advantage not only of knowing them and living among them in civil life, but I have had the pleasure and the honour of serving with them in the rebellion of 1885 in a purely French Canadian regiment, the 65th Battalion, and I can certify that no braver, no more competent, no more devoted soldiers went out to maintain the cause of this country in that rebellion, than my French Canadian fellow countrymen.

The matter to which I wish especially to refer is a work and what purported to be a citation from that work. I had the pleasure and advantage of knowing Reverend Father Hamon whose work purported to be cited here this afternoon. I would point out in the first place that Father Hamon was not a French Canadian. I do not want to say that to his discredit, because he was a friend of mine, a gentleman for whom I entertained the highest respect; but Father Hamon was a Frenchman, and as a Frenchman would have been at liberty, without its reflecting in any way on the loyalty of the French Canadians, to express what aspirations he might choose with regard to the future of the French speaking race on the continent of America. But we need not stop at that, because I have been at pains to send for the work, I have turned to the chapter cited, chapter 18, and I have carefully gone through that and there is not one word in that chapter that is susceptible of being contorted into what was cited as having been written by Father Hamon. With the other work referred to I am not familiar.

Mr. EDWARDS. With the permission of the hon. gentleman I want to say that I quoted what purported to be a correct English translation of that work. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Doherty) says that that was not a correct translation of that work, I gladly accept his assurance to that effect. I do not want to misrepresent any one.

Mr. DOHERTY. I wish to say not only is it not a correct translation, but that there is nothing, absolutely nothing, in the language to warrant the interpretation given to it. I do not pretend to have read all the book, but I have read the chapter from which this purports to be taken, and I have found that it has been distorted in such a manner in the translation as to give a false idea of what it contains but of course we cannot hold my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) responsible, and he no doubt gave his citations in perfect good faith. So far from there being any suggestion in these chapters of the formation of a French republic, the writer showed the most careful reserve against expressing any opinion regarding the future from a political point of view of the French Canadian race, either in the New England States—and it was of these the reverend gentleman was writing—or in the province of Quebec. With regard to the other work mentioned, I have not read it, but I certainly have never seen any reflection or re-echo of its effects among the French Canadians of the province of Quebec, such as one might expect, if the work were as extreme as is suggested; but if my hon. friend is relying on a translation, my experience of a perusual of the other book which he quoted may possibly set him right with regard to the last one. I do not wish to push that matter further. We have had some reference to another question—the speech of a late leading political man in the province of Quebec. But, however, people may view the politics or life work of that man, it was after that work had been completed and after he had been, rightly or wrongly, swept from power by the almost unanimous vote of his fellow countrymen that he gave expression to the views my hon. friend from Frontenac has just cited, so that I do not think any possible inference can be drawn from the expression of those views whereby they might be supposed to represent the sentiments of the French Canadian population. I must apologize for having gone into this matter, which of course is not pertinent to the subject before us for discussion, but I felt it was incumbent upon me to do what little lay in my power to prevent any misconception which might give rise to any feeling of prejudice as between the different races occupying this country.

Having disposed of this little matter and knowing it would be quite impossible for me to do justice to the important subject before the House, on which we are called to express as fully as we can our views, I would respectfully beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 24, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 146) respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

QUESTIONS.

NEW YORK CANALS—USE BY CANADIANS.

Mr. PERLEY:

Have Canadian vessels carrying freight the right to use the canals of the state of New York? If so, what statute authorizes it? If not, what statute or regulation prevents it?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH. By the treaty of Washington the government of the United States engaged to urge upon the state governments to secure to British subjects, the use of the several state canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by, or contiguous to, the boundary line on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, but this government is not aware that such urgency has, up to the present time, been productive of any practical result.

The matter is, of course, not governed by Canadian legislation, and the government is not in a position to answer as to the legislation on the subject (if any) there may be in the state of New York.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY COAL SHED AT RIVIERE DU LOUP.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

To whom did the Department of Railways grant permission, if any, to erect a coal shed on the property near the Intercolonial railway at Rivière du Loup. Who gave the permission, and when?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM. In August, 1908, Mr. Doucet met Mr. T. C. Burpee, engineer of maintenance, of the Intercolonial railway at Rivière du Loup, and suggested that he be allowed to shift his coal sluce from

where it was originally (that is from the west side of the dump to the east side) stating, that he could unload and release cars much quicker if he were allowed to do this. Mr. Burpee consented to Mr. Doucet making the above change, as it would be in the interest of the railway, but no authority was given to erect a coal shed at the place mentioned.

PETAWAWA MILITARY REVIEW.

Mr. GERALD WHITE. I am sorry the hon. the Minister of Militia is not in his seat, as I wish to draw his attention to an article in last night's 'Journal' as follows:

The arrangements for the great review of Canadian troops at Petawawa military camp when General Sir John French, one of the idols of the British public, visits Canada, are becoming more definite.

The expectation is that Sir John French will be here next June, and that the occasion of his visit will be utilized to have a review of as many troops as it is possible to gather together at one time at Petawawa.

It is likely that all city and rural corps from Toronto on the west, and Quebec on the east at least, will be assembled, during June, and be reviewed by the famous commander. This will mean, if the arrangements are perfected, that there will be no camps at such places as Rockliffe or Brockville this year.

The question of transportation of the troops is one of the chief problems, but it is learned that the railways have been consulted, and that this portion of the arrangements will be negotiated with thoroughness.

It will be remembered that last year when the 'Journal' made this announcement first, its contemporaries rushed into fierce denials, based on interviews with unnamed 'high officials' of the Militia Department.

I would like to ask if this statement is correct, and if so, when this review will take place and how many troops will take part in it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry my colleague is not in his seat, but I will see that the question is put to him, and he will probably answer it to-morrow.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (Montreal, St. Anne). May I be permitted, in opening, to express the gratification, which I am sure is felt by all the members of this House, on seeing the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in his seat, thus indicating my right hon. friend's complete recovery from his recent indisposition, which we all regretted and in which we all sympathized with him. But, to my regret, I have to follow that expression by the admission that I felt somewhat pained that my right hon. friend should, so soon after his return, be called on to listen to my contribution to that dissonant cacophony, which emanating from this side, has had such a jarring effect on the right hon. gentleman's musical ear. That euphonious expression, by which he characterized our contribution to the discussion of this subject forms part of a scolding which the right hon. gentleman thought necessary to bestow on hon. members on this side with perfect impartiality when he introduced the Bill under discussion. He scolded us for talking and producing thereby a dissonant cacophony; he scolded us also when we were silent, because our silence gave rise to all sorts of apprehensions in his imagination with regard to the thoughts that were passing through our minds; but he scolded us most severely because, when we proceeded to deliberate upon this important question, so fraught with serious consequences to our common country and the empire of which we form a part, he found that we had gone quite beyond anything he could be expected to forgive. I am, therefore, at some difficulty to conceive precisely what line of conduct would, under the circumstances, have won for us my right hon. friend's approval. And it occurred to my mind that he might perhaps have expected us to follow the line of conduct, followed in his parliamentary career by a certain great naval hero, who once occupied the position and played the role of the First Lord of the Admiralty in the British cabinet, and which is aptly described in that great naval composition, familiar to most of us in the days of our youth, entitled, 'Her Majesty's Ship Pinafore.' That very distinguished gentleman, as he strode his deck in all the pride and pomp of power, was wont to tell admiring audiences of his previous parliamentary career, and how he specially prided himself that throughout that career—

He had always voted at his party's call
And never thought of thinking for himself at all.

But the right hon. gentleman should not have expected that line of conduct from us, even if he had expected us to live up to the record of that great naval hero; because he should have remembered that that distinguished man went on to add the reason and explanation of his conduct, and to tell his aforesaid admiring audiences that:

I thought so little they rewarded me
By making me the ruler of the King's navee.

On this side we could look forward to no such enticing consequence of our following the example of that very great man. I do not mean to insinuate, because I desire to refrain from any insinuation that might be in the slightest degree offensive, I do not mean to insinuate that, in consequence of that natural human feeling prevailing among all my distinguished and hon. friends who sit on that side of the House, they may hope, by following the example, to attain the reward that came to that distinguished man, and all find themselves rulers of the King's navee—or, perhaps, I ought to say, under this Bill, of the Governor in Council's navy.

After the right hon. gentleman had administered to us that powerful castigation in the course of which, with his rhetorical bludgeon, he came down heavily on the phylacterial foreheads of the Pharisees whom he saw sitting opposite him, as well as on the bare brows of the unrepentant publicans whom he also suspected of taking a view adverse to the measure he was introducing, he seemed to be in the humour which is sometimes attributed as peculiar to my own fellow countrymen, namely, whenever he sees a head to hit it. And so he hit all those bobbing up heads on this side of the House with perfect impartiality; and then, I have no doubt, he looked round on his own side of the House, to see if there was not an odd one that he could give a whack to, and as he did not find it, why, he evoked the ghost of our dear old friend, that holy man, Peter the Hermit. I have been wondering ever since whether that holy man has had time to get his halo on perfectly straight since the right hon. gentleman came down so heavily on him. But, Mr. Speaker, my reference to this scolding, which ended by a contrast which the right hon. gentleman drew between the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House and himself in particular, and those who entertain the same opinions with him, was merely to point out that so far as that scolding applied to myself, I have nothing to say but to plead guilty to the reproach that was levelled at me. Fortunately for me, I was not among those who had spoken, I had not as yet, at that time contributed to the dissonant cacophony he complained of. If I had had that misfortune, I do not know that I would have recovered as perfectly as I have from the effects of that scolding. I have wondered how the gentlemen to whom it was applied had managed to recover so completely. I do not know anything that could be more awful than to be so accused of creating this dissonance, unless indeed it were that one should find himself in the awful predicament of having been named by yourself, Mr. Speaker; and even then, I have the most absolute confidence that if you ever found yourself under the painful necessity of naming, say, myself, your kindness of heart would prevent you from calling me any such awful names. But, Mr. Speaker, I was among the men who ventured to think; there were many others, I think I may say all those on this side of the House, who were entitled to share the right hon. gentleman's scolding for having thought. We deliberated in the morning, and we deliberated in the evening, and I am not quite sure that some of us did not even lie awake at night thinking about this great question. For my part, I confess my share of guilt in that respect, and I say it with that legitimate pride that a man may take in the conscientious performance of as solemn a duty as any member was ever called upon to fulfil in his capacity of a representative of the people of this country, and as such to take part in the decision of probably the most momentous question that has presented itself for decision by this House since this House has existed.

Having said so much with regard to what was said in opening this debate, it is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to go into any other matter that might rise to a difference of opinion upon any question, either of party politics or personal conduct. We are in face of a question that is quite beyond any considerations based either on the past personal conduct of any individual in this House, or the past record of either of the parties who sit face to face before you. It seems to me that the question before us imposes on each and every one of us the duty of approaching it so far as possible free from the influence either of party feeling or of race feeling, or of those feelings that may be engendered in the human heart by difference of creed, or by differences resulting from points of view of the different sections in the community to which he belongs.

We are the parliament of Canada. It is as such that we are called upon to deal with the momentous questions that are involved in the project of the government and in the amendments to it that are proposed. What Canada has a right to expect from us is the calm, the most judicial exercise of the best judgment which Heaven has conferred upon each one of us. We are here as the parliament of Canada, charged, in the first place, so far as we are a legislative body, with the making of laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada. But we are here also as the parliament of Canada charged with something that is more important than that—charged with the protection, the preservation of the rights of this great country, whose destinies an all-wise and beneficent

Providence has committed to our hands. We are charged with the defence of the interests of that great country; but charged —and this is even more important still— with seeing to it that the duties of that great country are so performed as to preserve before the eyes of the world intact and above suspicion, our country's honour.

Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), after he had condemned others for standing in the temple and claiming, Pharisee-like, to be the only right exponents of the true doctrine of what our duties are toward the empire of which we are a part, and for having take to themselves credit for possessing alone the true incense of loyalty, proceeded, as it seemed to me, to almost out-Pharisee the Pharisee as he thanked God that he and others who thought with him were Canadians—and consigned all the rest of us to outer darkness, where, though there be not weeping and gnashing of teeth, yet, according to him, there is nothing but ultra-loyalty, ultra-imperialism, and, above all, the most fierce hostility to the autonomy of this country. Mr. Speaker, I desire to protest against the drawing of the line which the right hon. gentleman thought he could draw between those who support him and those who find it their duty to object to the measure that he has proposed. I claim no special quality or virtue for myself when I say that I, too, am a Canadian in as full, as complete, as wide a sense as the right hon. gentleman may seek to give to the expression. I think that we in this House are two hundred and twenty-one Canadians, each of us realizing with pride what it means to be a Canadian, and none of us forgetting what it means to be a Canadian. Because, Mr. Speaker, when I say that I am a Canadian, I say it with the memory clearly in my mind of the answer that was given, about a hundred and fifty years ago at the capitulation of that great city in which I had the honour to be born, and a portion of which I have the greater honour to represent in this House. When to the general representing the conquering army was put the question as to what was to be, in future the status of the inhabitants of the territories which then constituted the province of Quebec, his answer was: 'They become subjects of the King,' Sir, that means that from that day, to be a Canadian, while it implied the right to profess oneself a son and devoted citizen of this country, also carried with it the right to proclaim oneself a British subject. For my part, I know no dividing line between the two. That answer, when it was given, perhaps fell with a harsh sound on the ears of those who had put the question. But that answer contained in itself the charter of the liberties that we in this country enjoy to-day and that, for my part, I trust we and our children's children shall, through the ages that are to come, continue to enjoy under the same title. No doubt, there were at that time some disabilities that affected certain classes of persons who might be British subjects, but they have long since been brushed away until even their memory has been forgotten, and, to-day, as Canadian subjects of the King, we are entitled to the enjoyment of as wide a plentitude of liberty as is enjoyed by any people on the face of the earth. It is for that reason that I say that the right hon. gentleman was not acting the part of the publican— not confessing himself in all humanity a sinner—but playing rather the part of the Pharisee, when he claimed as his own, exclusive possession the title of Canadian.

Mr. Speaker, I approach the consideration of this question as a Canadian. At this stage of the debate, I do not think that it can possibly be questioned that the main feature of this measure is that it makes of it a measure for contribution on the part of Canada to imperial defence. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland), in his very eloquent speech of yesterday afternoon, was at pains to minimize what the government propose to do until he got it down to so small a thing that he felt justified in describing it as a maritime police. I do not know what conception the hon. gentleman had of what the functions of this maritime police were going to be. So far as I know, piracy on the high seas is not very prevalent. So far as I know, no great country, or little country, in this world finds itself to-day called upon to establish and maintain a maritime police for the protection of its trade and commerce. Why, Sir, the protection of the trade and commerce of Canada, in common with the protection of the trade and commerce of the world in general, is found in the fact of the existence of the great and powerful navies of the great civilized countries of the world, the very existence of which navies serves to protect the universal commerce against any danger from depredators and malefactors. As far as I know, the function of a police is to attend to people of that character. But in spite of all the efforts which are made for the purpose with a view of affecting—it is not for me to indicate or point out with what view it is done—of making this thing that is proposed appear something which it is not, I feel absolutely safe in saying that this measure comes before us as a measure intended, or professing to be introduced, for the purpose of fulfilling an obligation on Canada's part to contribute to the defence of the empire. Now, with the question of whether what is proposed is or is not effective to that end I do not propose to deal. It has been exhaustively, if not exhaustingly dealt with, I think,

already, but I say as a basis of what I desire to present to the House, that to my mind it is an uncontrovertible proposition that this Bill is before this House because it purports to be the first step on the part of Canada in the direction of establishing a permanent policy of participation in and contribution to the maintenance of an imperial naval force and of sharing in the naval defence of the empire as a whole. I wish it to be well understood that I do not desire to object to this measure because of that fact, but because, to me, it is absolutely clear that that fact carries with it consequences—I desire to correct myself, because that fact implies—necessarily implies—compliance with conditions precedent to the carrying out of this proposed policy, to which conditions the right hon. gentleman and his government, who pride themselves on being in a very special and particular manner the guardians of the autonomy of this country, have never given a thought, at all events, so far as we can hope to trace the result of their thoughts in their actions. Mr. Speaker, a navy is essentially a force that finds its field of operations on the high seas. To talk of a purely defence navy, that is a navy that is always to stay at home, is to speak of a navy whose usefulness is to be reduced, if not abolutely, almost to the vanishing point. A navy, since it does not seem to me that in times of peace we need it for that police duty which looms up so large, and forms such an important part of the measure in the eyes of the hon. member for Beauce, is a something that is to be used in war, and a something that is to be used in war upon the high seas. I do not pretend to speak with any authority upon this subject, but I think I may invoke in support of the proposition which I have laid down the testimony of as competent an authority as is known by any hon. member, or members, of this House, and an authority which is invoked in support of their respective contentions by hon. gentlemen advocating the one or the other of the propositions which are before the House. I mean the British admiralty. We find a memorandum on sea power submitted by them to the colonial conference of 1907, in which they set forth the principles which are involved in sea power. After a long disquisition upon the different functions of the navy, we read the following:

> In the foregoing remarks the word 'defence' does not appear. It is omitted advisedly because the primary object of the British navy is not to defend anything——

We are evidently going to have a navy that is not going to be on the plan of the British navy, and still the British navy has to its credit some successes.

> But to attack the fleets of the enemy, and, by defeating them, to afford protection to British dominions, shipping and commerce. This is the ultimate aim.
>
> To use the word defence would be misleading, because the word carries with it the idea of a thing to be defended, which would divert attention to local defence instead of fixing it on the force from which attack is to be expected.
>
> The traditional role of the British navy is not to act on the defensive, but to prepare to attack the force which threatens—in other words, to assume the offensive. On one occasion England departed from her traditional policy, and acting on the defensive, kept her ships in harbour unrigged and unmanned, with the result that the Dutch fleet sailed up the Medway and burnt the ships of war at their moorings.

I think that justifies me in saying that the navy is not a weapon of defence, it is a weapon of offence. And I think there is something almost prophetic in the declaration of these distinguished gentlemen that to use the word 'defence' would be misleading. But, Mr. Speaker, the word 'defence' is used by hon. gentlemen on the other side with redundant reiteration and repetition, as an excuse for the creation of this navy. I need only say, in the words of the Lords of the Admiralty, that the use of the word 'defence' is misleading. I shall not take it upon myself to say for what purpose or with what intention hon. gentlement opposite say that this navy is for defence. I am not concerned in this or in any other discussion with mens' motives. If a measure a man proposes or the thing a man proposes doing commends itself to my mind as a desirable thing to be done, I shall support it no matter how bad his motives may be. On the other hand, if the measure proposed, or the thing suggested as a thing that ought to be done, does not commend itself to my judgment I shall not advocate it no matter how good may be the motives of him who proposes it. I am, therefore, not concerned in the slightest degree with what may be the motives that underlie either the terms of this measure itself or the terms in which it is supported and defended. But I do say, and in that sense I do not think my language can be taken as offensive, that the word 'defence,' as applied to this navy is misleading. One might properly apply to naval warfare, and indeed to any warfare, the theory which that very shrewd and very entertaining Yankee horse trader, David Harum, found of direct application in his own business. True, it is a very unscriptural rule, but after all war is a very unscriptural thing—and so is horse trading. David Harum said that the one rule to which you must always adhere when you went out to trade a horse was to do unto the other fellow as the other fellow would like to do unto you, and do it first. Mr. Speaker, the navy that is going to be

exclusively for defence and to wait until the other fellow comes over to do it first won't do very much second. In the very nature of things, therefore, it is impossible to conceive of a navy that is purely for local defence. The field of a navy's operations, the very purpose of its existence and that which is necessary in order that its operations should be effective puts the idea of mere local defence out of the question. And, when we propose to establish a naval force—call it what we like and talk as much as we like about absolute and exclusive control of it, and about keeping it absolutely for ourselves and about letting nobody else get any good out of it unless this parliament says in each particular instance what it shall do—unless we are going to condemn it to absolute uselessness we shall find that we shall have to submit to its going from beyond the control of the governing authority of this country and taking its share in whatever operations may be necessary in war time upon the wide field of the ocean. If these operations are going to be carried out effectively at all they must in the very essence of things be carried out under one central control. I am not advocating that this ought to be so or that it ought not to be so, but we are face to face with the fact that if we are going to have a useful navy we cannot have a stay-at-home navy. And, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a useless navy, why, we might a little better keep our money. Therefore, Sir, the overshadowing feature of this measure by which we intend to create a naval force is that it of necessity leads us into the situation that we cannot avoid participation in the wars which may result from the foreign policy of the mother country, and, by that foreign policy we are absolutely bound because the mother country exclusively—and under our existing conditions absolutely rightly—has control of the foreign relations which pertain not only to herself, but to all her colonies. After all, a navy is a weapon that is used to enforce the respective rights of the different nations, to vindicate the rights of one nation may consider that there has been a violation of its rights. It seems, therefore, to follow as clearly as can be that the control of a navy force is a function of the power which controls the foreign policy—the policy that governs the conduct of the nation towards other nations — that a navy is called upon to enforce. From that it would seem to me fairly to follow that the condition precedent to our undertaking to participate in the naval defence of the empire is that we should be given an effective voice in the governing and determination of the foreign relations of the empire. When I lay down that proposition I am not saying something merely on my own authority. You will find repeated statements of very distinguished British statesmen recognizing the absolute correlation of participation in naval defence and participation in the control of the policy which the naval forces of the empire are called upon to defend. In the conference of 1907, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, a statesmen whose memory I am sure is revered on both sides of this House, expressly declared, in language which was perhaps not the most elegant in the world, although it was essentially forcible:

> It is, of course, possible to over estimate the importance of the requirements of the oversea dominions as a factor in our expenditure; but however this may be, the cost of naval defence and the responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs hang together.

The language, though not very eloquent, could not well be more concise or forcible. Then we have the declaration of Lord Tweedmouth, in which, speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, and quoting words which he attributed to the right hon. leader of this government: 'If you want our aid, call us to your councils', his lordship expressly recognized that that was a perfectly proper requirement, that the two things corresponded absolutely, and expressed the readiness of the United Kingdom, if the dominions asked for it, to call them to her councils. Now, I want to say that I do not share his lordship's views in pointing out how that calling to the councils could be done. I am not here to propound any theory or to lay down any plan by which what I consider the condition precedent to our undertaking the policy which is proposed may be carried out. What I desire to do is simply to make clear that the finding of a way by which we may have a voice, and a real voice, in the control of the foreign policy of the empire, is an essential condition precedent to our embarking upon any permanent policy of participating in the maintenance of naval forces, that that is an essential condition precedent, if our autonomy, to which the right hon. gentleman attaches such great importance, and to which I may say he does not attach one whit greater importance than I do, is to be maintained. Again, we find that the government of so small a colony as Cape Colony in presenting her resolution found it necessary at the conference of 1907, to point out that 'prior to accepting the burden and expenditure of such a responsibility (participating in the naval defence of the empire), the colonies would require to be represented on an imperial council at which questions concerning, inter alia, the peace of the whole empire be discussed'. And, finally, I may cite an authority which I may say, with me, carries very considerable weight. It is a work written by Professor Lawrence Lowell, pro-

fessor of the science of government at Harvard University, and, if I am correctly informed, its present president. It is a work written in a spirit which certainly no one can suspect of being hostile, which on the contrary is manifestly most friendly to both the mother country and all of her colonies, and a work which evidences a careful study of the principles and operation of British institutions, which entitles the conclusions reached to the acceptance of any one who has carefully read the premises upon which they are based. Dealing with this question of the relations between the mother country and the colonies, Professor Lowell, says:

While, therefore, the tie with the self-governing colonies might conceivably be put to a severe strain by war, that is highly improbable so long as England maintains a sufficient navy. But, in spite of her wealth, the burden of holding the seas against all the world has grown so heavy as to make her want the colonies, for whose joint benefit she conceives that she carries it, to bear their share, and this cannot be done without giving them a real voice in the foreign policy which the navy may be used to enforce.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not using this argument for the purpose of reaching the conclusion that we should never do anything to contribute to the maintenance of England's naval forces, or that we should never do anything to so contribute by means of a navy which we would provide ourselves. I am not seeking to invoke this principle as a ground upon which I would desire to see Canada, my country, shirk any duty or any obligation which the highest sense of honour might lead her to feel was incumbent upon her. What I desire to point out is that, under our constitution, there is no obligation on the part of Canada, legally or constitutionally speaking, to contribute to the naval forces of the empire, and that position will continue to exist so long as the United Kingdom alone has exclusive control of the foreign affairs of the empire. It does not follow, however, that there is an insuperable obstacle in the way of our ever doing anything to aid the naval forces of the empire; but what follows is that there is an obstacle to be removed before we do that, if we are both going to aid the imperial navy and continue at the same time to enjoy our own autonomy. It is most essential, right and proper, that the portion of the empire which charges itself exclusively with the burden of general imperial defence, and more particularly the naval defence, should have exclusive control of its foreign policy. To the hand that wields the sword of empire essentially belongs the right to wield the sceptre of empire. But it is represented that time has come when we should begin to take our part in the general defence of the empire, particularly the naval defence, and it is because this is recognized by the present government that we have before us the Bill that we are now considering. I have no desire to controvert that proposition. I am quite prepared to recognize that whereas Canada, up to the present, has been in the position of a protected colony, while she has been in the position of a child in the nursery or a youth just emerging from the nursery and therefore entitled to look to its parent for protection, or at most had reached that stage where it might properly be expected that she should take care of herself, she has now advanced to the position of a young man who has reached a certain maturity, who has gone out and established his own home, but is still under the advice, guidance and protection of his parents, and who has amassed for himself a certain competency and power. I am quite willing to concede that under those circumstances, it is perfectly proper that the parent should say to him: It is time that you should aid me in carrying the burdens which I have to bear; it is time that you, as a man, should aid me in the difficulties that may be created for me by troublesome and litigious neighbours; it is time that you should stand by me and aid me, even at the expense of some portion of your wealth, and that you should bear your share of the consequences of the enterprise in which I am engaged—enterprises which, as they redound to my benefit and advantage directly, must indirectly redound likewise to yours. This proposition I would be quite prepared to accept. But it seems to me that the youth who, on reaching maturity, is asked to share in the consequences of the operations of his parents, should also have the corresponding, inseparable right to have his say in the control of the operations for which he is to be held jointly responsible. Should he take that position, I do not think it can be urged that he would be going beyond his rights. But it may be argued that even although that be Canada's right, she is within her right if she should choose to renounce it. I question that proposition. I have said that that was Canada's right, but I think I would have described the position more correctly had I said that that was Canada's duty. I realize that Canada, in taking upon her shoulders her share of the responsibility for the control of foreign affairs would be assuming a burden possibly more onerous even than a contribution to the forces of the empire. I recognize that she would be taking an immense responsibility from which, I can well understand, men might shrink to the extent of saying that Canada had better take her share in the defence of the empire, had better contribute to that defence in one way or the other, had better

contribute her share in aiding the mother country in the wars of the empire without asking for any voice in the control of foreign affairs, that it would be better for her to have nothing to do with assuming any such grave responsibility. That would be easier for Canada. I do not deny that proposition. It certainly would be easier for Canada, but we, in this parliament, are charged with something that is of vastly greater importance than the interests or even the rights of this country. We are charged with seeing to the performance by this country of its duties; and I say that for us to undertake to create a force to be used in war, and to declare at the same time that we divest ourselves of any responsibility, with regard to the wars in which this force might be used, is not simply to renounce a right, but it is to shirk a duty.

And, of all the things that we should not stand by and see our country do, still less so conduct the affairs of our country as to place her in the position of doing, I know of none that we should guard ourselves more absolutely against than that of either acquiescing in or aiding in her shirking of her duty. I have said that the autonomy of this country is as precious to me as it can be to any gentleman in this House. I include, however, in the autonomy of this country something more than the exclusive control of her material resources and the exclusive holding on to and retaining for ourselves of her money. There are things that, to a man as well as to a nation, are of value far surpassing worldly goods, far surpassing wealth, whether it consist of the ostensible wealth of money or of those other things which go to constitute the real wealth of the world. If we are to have our autonomy, it seems to me that not only the control of our own internal affairs must be our own, not only must we keep it in our hands, not only must we retain for ourselves the administration and direction of the affairs of this our country, our particular portion of the empire to which that country belongs, but we must retain for ourselves and for our nation the right to claim that her soul is her own, that her conscience is her own. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not wish to have it concluded that, because I say this, I am expressing any distrust in the authorities who now control the foreign affairs of this great empire. I do not wish to have it supposed that I desire to imply that there is reason to apprehend that they will try to call us into war that shall be absolutely unjust and inequitable. Nothing is further from my mind than that. The proposition I lay down is this: I may have the most implicit, the most unbounded, confidence in another man—I am glad to say that I count friends in whose honour and spirit of rectitude I have as unwavering confidence as in my own—but I have no right to hand over to the most trusted of these men the keeping of my conscience. And I say that this country has no right, however great, however implicit, however absolutely complete and perfect, her confidence may be in the imperial authorities, to hand over to their keeping her conscience. And there is no question which can present itself for solution to a nation that more closely and immediately touches its conscience than the question of when, and why, and against whom, her armed force is to be used. So, I say, I am not standing here merely claiming that we should not take our share in the burdens of defence because we are not given the right to a voice—because it is not recognized we have the right to a voice—in the control of the foreign policy; I am here to say that, when this duty is presented to us of our taking a share in the maintenance of the naval forces of this empire, there is necessarily presented to us at the same time another duty, the duty of our taking our share in the heavy burden of the control of the foreign affairs of this empire. And I say that we are not at liberty to choose to do the one duty and refuse to do the other, because these two duties are inseparably bound up together. I have said that I am not arguing this proposition as a reason against the passing of the Bill, which is submitted to us and which purports to commit us to a policy of permanent participation in the maintenance of the naval forces of this empire, because I seek to make use of it to evade any duty that is incumbent upon us in the way of aid to the empire from the point of view of what an honourable man or an honourable country ought to do; I had rather err—much rather err—on our country's behalf, as I had much rather err on my own behalf, in doing a little more than honour would require of men than run any risk of doing less than honour would require of me. Mr. Speaker, it is not an impossible thing that our relations should be so adjusted with the different nations that are comprised in this empire as that the doing of both these duties should be possible for us. As I have said, I am not here to propound a plan; I am not here to advocate a plan. I am here simply to point out what is a duty inseparably bound up with the duty which the government are asking us, by means of this Bill, to implement. And I say that it is for those who present this duty to us for our fulfilment to suggest and present, at the same time, a plan and a means by which we be enabled to fulfil the duty that goes with it.

I say that until that plan has been found, and presented, and adopted, we are failing in our most imperious duty

from the point of view of the maintenance of the autonomy of this country, in undertaking to commit ourselves to the performance of that other duty involved in the project that is now submitted to us. It is proposed that this country should have no autonomy in its own soul. It is a poor man, Mr. Speaker, that cannot call his soul his own. It seems to me that with all her wealth, Canada will be a poor country indeed if she is not to be allowed to call her soul her own. I am not saying this by way of trying to raise an insuperable obstacle in the way of the performance of this other duty. I concede that there are immense difficulties in the way of constituting a system that will make it possible for us to have a voice in the councils of the empire, so far, alone as foreign relations are concerned, and at the same time leave to us our present autonomous position. This I concede, and I repeat again that I have no more desire to sacrifice one tittle of our autonomy than any other man in this House, or in this country. I concede that it is a difficult problem. But, Mr. Speaker, the statesmen of the mother country and the statesmen of this country have faced difficult problems before, and have overcome them. I concede that the problem is difficult, and I concede that it is immensely difficult precisely because I, for one, would insist that that problem must be so solved as to take from us no power of control over our own affairs that we have to-day. I have no more desire, I would no more consent to the intervention of any other power in the government of this country as we have a right to govern it to-day, than I would seek on her behalf a right to interfere in any way with the government of the United Kingdom, or any other of the nations of the empire. But it does not seem to me an impossible thing that the foreign relations of this empire should be guided and controlled by a body composed of representatives of all the different nations that constitute this empire; and it does not seem to me an impossible thing to find a means whereby to determine to what extent each one of those nations is properly entitled to a voice in the determinatin of the questions to which those foreign relations give rise. All these things are possible. If what I have said is true, that this participation in the control of foreign affairs goes hand in hand with the performance of this other duty that we are asked to fulfil to-day, then it is necessarily true that means can be found whereby that duty may be performed. There is no duty incumbent upon any man or any nation that providence has not made possible of fulfilment; and I believe myself thoroughly that without any sacrifice of our autonomy as we have it to-day, a means can be found of so adjusting our position and the position of other nations of this empire, as to create a situation where it would be quite right and proper that we should take over the burden of our share of the maintenance of the fighting forces of the empire, because then these fighting forces will be an instrument to enforce decisions which we have reached, and for which we shall have to share responsibility. So I say that we should not enter upon a course which means participation in the naval wars of the empire without first seeing to it that the means are provided for the performance of our part of this other duty from which, to my mind, it is absolutely inseparable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I contrast for a moment this, as it seems to me, necessary method of the protection of our autonomy with what is offered to us by the government as the means of that protection. The method by which the government proposes to protect our autonomy consists simply, as it claims, in the fact that under the provisions of the Bill the government would be at liberty in time of emergency, that is when war is on, or there is immediate apprehension of war, to withdraw absolutely from any participation in the war. Now, Mr. Speaker, just let us look at this for a moment from the point of view of a man who is trying to guard Canada's autonomy. What does it imply, Mr. Speaker? We are proceeding to build a navy as the consequence of and following upon a conference to which our representatives were invited, which was a conference concerning imperial defence. We went to that conference by our representatives. They have returned to Canada, and they have brought us a plan prepared by the imperial authorities as being a means whereby we should contribute to a greater or less extent to imperial defence. The government proposes to go on and carry out that plan under the direction, with the guidance, with the advice, with the assistance, of the imperial authorities and their representatives.

The imperial authorities, or perhaps it is more correct to say the authorities of the United Kingdom, are entitled to expect that when that force is required for the purpose for which they have joined in helping to bring it into existence, namely, the imperial defence, it will be available. That force, whatever it may be, is to go on through all the piping times of peace with, as its commander in chief, His Majesty the King, floating the flag of the empire. This government takes credit to itself that by the creation of this navy it is making a contribution to imperial defence. It is only when the war is declared, it is only in face of the enemy, that this government proposes that Canada should decide whether its navy is going to fight or not. Mr.

Speaker, I said in opening that I wished to treat this question with as little feeling and with as calm and judicial a judgment as I possibly could, but I have to confess that when that is proposed to me as the method of protection of the autonomy of my country, I find it difficult to keep to a calm and judicial discussion of the question. Can it be pretended for a moment that when there is war actually on, or when there is a grave apprehension of war, that is the time that this country should take it upon itself to sit in judgment upon the action of those in whose hands this country, under the system of the government, proposes to consent to leave absolutely the control of all foreign affairs? When war is on, and when this navy, created and maintained in the name of imperial defence, is called upon to bear its share that is the moment this government choose for this country to sit down calmly and quietly and pass judgment upon the actions of the men in whose hands it has left the control of her interests as far as they are concerned with foreign affairs, determine whether those men have acted wrongly and then determine whether our fleet shall stay at home. I do not believe that the government mean to exercise that power. My feeling of partisanship does not go so far as to lead me to believe that the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues mean to exercise that power under the circumstances. If they do not, I ask them where is the protection of the autonomy of which they profess themselves the sole and exclusive protectors, defenders and maintainers against all the world? If, on the other hand, the right hon. gentleman and his government propose under those circumstances to exercise that power, then I ask where is the one thing in this world that is more precious to me and more precious to all Canadians even than Canada's autonomy—where is Canada's honour? The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland), told us yesterday that this measure was the result of seven years of study. Of course, I cannot doubt and I do not question the absolute truth of the hon. gentleman's statement. There have been seven long years of study given to this measure and the result is what I have indicated. I can only say that this is the most unfruitful seven years of study that it has ever been my misfortune to observe. The hon. gentleman, was very severe on the result of our deliberation in the morning and our deliberation in the evening. Those deliberations only lasted after all three weeks, and I think that they did result in the propounding of views, which, while they may have differed, bore upon their face the stamp of the consideration given by manly men to the problem, with honour, with courage and with calm judgment. That result will at least bear comparison with this policy of the government that is going to lead us to choose, which compels us practically to choose between our autonomy and our honour. We may have one, but under the right hon. gentleman's plan we cannot have both. I think that the right hon. gentleman will find that the people of Canada are determined to have both. But the right hon. gentleman has a remedy that avoids all that. There is not going to be the slightest trouble. When the difficulty comes there is going to be a wave, the right hon. gentleman is going to be carried off his feet by that wave, and these little cruisers which will show the flag in time of peace are going to be wafted over to Great Britain's assistance on the crest of that wave. The right hon. gentleman attributed to some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House a desire to sacrifice responsible government. I would ask: Since how long has responsible government been carried on by waves? Evidently the right hon. gentleman, or whoever succeeds him, will have no responsibility for what our navy may do, because it will have been done by the wave and the right hon. gentleman, or whoever succeeds him, will have no responsibility for what our navy may perhaps not do; well, because there was not any wave.

And then possibly the right hon. gentleman, or some successor of his not as skilful as he, in determining just precisely and exactly what the wild waves are saying, may make a mistake as to what they are saying, and our navy may, perhaps, go when it ought not to go or stay at home when it ought not to stay at home, and it all depends on what the wild waves may say, and this—this from a government that claims a monopoly of the protection of responsible government in Canada, But, Mr. Speaker, there is a more serious side to that. No doubt we all believe that if there were serious menace hanging over the mother country or for the matter of that hanging over any nation of the empire, the people of this country would in all normal conditions—I might almost say in all possibly conceivable conditions—be at readiness so far as was within their power to give their aid, including of course the aid of this navy. But while that is true, and while we may feel that confidence we must also realize that we cannot with satisfaction make the determination of the future conduct of this country absolutely dependent upon that particular thing happening whenever there might be a real cause for us to act. After all I do not think I am doing any injustice to the people who are to come after us or possibly to ourselves. when I say that looking at it calmly and reasonably, there might possibly coincide with the moment of urgent necessity some

passing irritation in this country that might keep the wave down. And, the wave does not require to be kept down very long, for if you have a few days of disinclination at the critical moment, the usefulness of the navy may be gone when the disinclination has disappeared, and the wave has come to a head. I say, Sir, that for a project submitted to a serious and a thinking people, for a project presented as the result of seven years of thought and meditation and contemplation and study, as the work of men desirous of seeing that this country does its duty to the other nations of the empire and to itself, this project, I have to admit, passes my comprehension. To my mind the policy of this Bill, if it has a policy, can be described as nothing else than a policy of drift. It is a policy of men who, faced with serious problems, do not choose to decide in the one sense or the other. The right hon. gentleman in introducing the Bill, prided himself that it was a measure that would meet with the approval of all moderate men, and then he looked out over this country and he described to this House the people of Canada as being in large measure composed of immoderate men to whose views no attention could be given, of men who were so separated by race feelings, local feelings, feelings of all kinds, that they never could be expected to come together and pronounce a rational judgment on a question of this kind. I think, Sir, that the right hon. gentleman unduly depreciates the people of this country. There may be and there are differences of opinion amongst the people, and I sincerely trust there will always continue to be differences of opinion on public questions as complex and as important as this, because I would despair of the intelligence of the people of this country if it were possible that they, following the glorious example set by the hon. gentlemen who sit on the government side of the House, could be of one mind on this question, without time, without thought, without consideration or examination.

I said that this policy is a policy of drift. My hon. friend the Postmaster General—I think I may say my very good friend the Postmaster General—

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY. I hope I may be able to call him such even after this debate is over.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY. My hon. friend the Postmaster General described the government as engaged in steering between the shoals. It is a most excellent accomplishment to be able to steer between the shoals, for it is a very unfortunate thing when the vessel of state runs upon the shoals on the one side or upon the other. And, I have nothing but commendation for the hon. gentleman for the carefulness with which he steers between the shoals, so long as he stays in such very shallow water as this government persists in navigating the ship of state in. But, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that when the pilot's attention is exclusively centred on steering between the shoals he may forget just where the ship is going. It is well to avoid the shoals on your way, but it is well also when you are on your way to know where you are going, and if I had advice to offer to this government it would be that they should gather their courage together and try to face like men the consequence of the course upon which they are entering, and which at its beginnings at all events they find so beset with shoals. I believe that the people of this country are looking for men and a party of men that will come out with courage and face this difficult problem with all the difficulties that surround it; face it like men and solve it like men. I believe that what this country is looking for is not successful navigators between the shoals, but men whom they can trust to take their barque out on the wide ocean of the world and guide it through in safety. While the chart which the government is following may perhaps keep it off the shoals, I for my part do not see where it is going to lead Canada to. At the beginning of these remarks I referred to some observations of Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman upon the relations existing between the different nations of the empire. Among other things, that right hon. gentleman said:

> We found ourselves, gentlemen, upon freedom and independence—that is the essence of the British imperial connection; freedom of action on the part of the individual state; freedom in their relations with each other and the mother country. Anything which militates against that principle would be wholly contrary to the genius of our race and our political ideals, and would sooner or later be disastrous. . . . Gentlemen, freedom does not necessarily mean letting things drift.

Mr. Speaker, statesmanship does not necessarily or conceivably mean letting things drift. The right hon. gentleman has said to us, in his most eloquent apology for this measure, that no government can settle questions of this nature according to the ideal view of just what ought to be done. Certainly this government is giving us a most apt particular instance in support of that proposition. But he went on to plume himself of having found a means that was going to satisfy what he calls moderate men. He looks out upon this country and he sees it divided into classes—violent men, who I suppose are seeking to destroy each other, and moderate men, who guide the ship of state in such a

manner as to bring it sufficiently near one shoal to pacify one class of these violent men whose views the government disapprove, and who then take another tack and bring it sufficiently near the other shoal to pacify another class of violent men whose views the government also disapprove; with a result which I fancy the government will find, when the time comes for the people to speak, no party and no considerable body of men in this country will approve. In the course of that scolding to which I have referred, some of us on this side of the House were condemned for being too hot, while others of us were condemned, I think more seriously, for being too cold; and then the right hon. gentleman proceeded to pride himself on that moderate, that lukewarm, course which he described to us. I have been for a long time indebted to the right hon. gentleman for some very good advice which he once gave me, and which sent me to search the Scriptures for a rule of conduct. I took the advice and have tried to live up to it. Will the right hon. gentleman pardon me if I try at this moment to pay my debt by suggesting to him that the next time he goes to search the Scriptures to find therein weapons wherewith to confound the Pharisees and smite the Publicans that sit on this side of the House, he push his study as far as the Apocalypse, where he will find some verses—he cannot take offence from them, because they were written to the angel of the church of Laodicea which read something like this: 'I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert cold or hot; but because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will begin to vomit thee forth'. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that the terminating words are somewhat cacophonous ; they may perhaps be hardly parliamentary. But I have only to say that they are not my words, they are the words of the inspired writer; and I may add that I do not wish at all to apply them to the right hon. gentleman, but rather to the lukewarm dish in the way of a policy that he has set before his followers and that they have succeeded in swallowing and so far as I know have not yet vomited forth, but which I am very much afraid will prove most nauseous to the people of this country.

From all this, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there can be no doubt as to what vote should be given on this Bill. It seems clear to me that the measure, if put into execution under existing circumstances and without proper provision for the performance of the duty it carries with it, is destructive of what is most sacred and holy in the autonomy of this country, and, moreover, it seems to me that the measure is clearly useless as a measure for the defence of the empire. From any point of view I fail to see how any Canadian subject of the King can realize that it is his duty to do otherwise than vote against that measure.

And, now, I propose to say a few words concerning the proposition contained in the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition. As may possibly have been observed, I have not found it necessary, in dealing with the measure, proposed by the government, to deal with the reasons invoked in the amendment. It does not seem to me necessary to go so far as to inquire whether or not those reasons are well founded. To my mind there stands in the way of the measure of the government an insuperable obstacle, as I have tried to make clear. When I say insuperable, I do not mean insuperable at any time; I mean so long as there is no provision for a proper modification of our relations as regards foreign affairs with the mother country and with the other nations of the empire. Taking that position, one is naturally led to the consideration of the proposition made by the hon. leader of the opposition. With regard to the suggestion contained in that proposition, that there should be an appeal to the people, I have very little to say. So far as I am personally concerned, that the measure proposed by the government should be negatived, for the reason I have given, is so perfectly manifest that I would have no need to appeal to the people to ask them whether it ought to be negatived or not.

But as we are told that there are 140 gentlemen who are going to vote for the passing of this Bill, who are determined that we shall enter upon the course laid down in it no matter what may be said against it, then I would say to these gentlemen: If you are not willing to listen to those who have endeavoured to point out why this measure should not be adopted, will you not at least listen to the people who sent you here? But we are told that the people have all along known about it, and that the people sent these 140 gentlemen here expressly to vote for it. We are told that this policy has been under study since 1902; we are told that the representatives of this government gave expression to some most oracular observations in 1902 in the conference in London, and that the Canadian people have been thinking of this policy ever since. We have even been told that since then there have been two elections and that the people, in both those elections, sent hon. gentlemen opposite here with a special mission to build a navy. And that is the reason given us why the people should not be consulted now. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall not waste time discussing such an absurd proposition. If there be anything of public notoriety it is

that in neither of the two general elections since 1902, a single elector in this country was called upon to give or gave his vote, aye or no, on this question.

My hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) told us yesterday that this was an ordinary every day question. Well, to describe a question which involves the most fundamental change in our relations with the mother country and the rest of the empire, as an ordinary every day question, is a flight of the imagination which I fail to follow. Why, if a measure involving such consequences from a constitutional point of view, as well as every other, should be propounded in any other country, no one would ever dream of enacting it into law without allowing the people of pass on it. In the neighbouring republic you could not pass such a law, you could not pass such an amendment to the constitution, without submitting it to the people. But in this parliament, we are asked to look upon it as an ordinary every day occurrence. We are asked to pass a measure that will make a most material change in the relations we have hitherto had with the mother country, which imperatively calls for some new adjustment of those relations, and we are told that the people do not need to know anything about it, but that we have a mandate to deal in this parliament with this as with any other question. And we are told that in face of the statement made yesterday by the hon. member from Beauce (Mr. Beland) that one province, at all events, would vote practically unanimously against it, but he thinks that province should not be allowed to express its opinion. He is one of its representatives, and he thinks that that province should not be allowed to talk, and the reason he gives is that he knows it would talk differently from the others. I do not know what are the sources of his knowledge, but the fact, which the hon. gentleman admitted, that there is a marked difference of opinion among our people on this question is a most conclusive reason why the people should be given an opportunity to discuss and pronounce upon it.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) said that the province of Quebec would almost unanimously vote against the measure now before the Chair?

Mr. DOHERTY. Against this Bill, yes.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the hon. member for Beauce said that in the province of Quebec, the unanimous vote would be against this Bill?

Mr. DOHERTY. Almost the unanimous vote, I think I said.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I did not understand the hon. member for Beauce to say that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. I did not either.

Mr. DOHERTY. I have not the text before me, and if I be mistaken, I am prepared to stand corrected, but I do not think I am. I may not have cited the precise words, but the hon. member for Beauce certainly did proceed to draw a very dark-coloured picture of the sad consequences which would follow an appeal to the people, because such an appeal would have the result of isolating the French Canadian population of Quebec from the other provinces. If by that, the hon. gentleman meant that the French Canadians of Quebec were going to vote for the measure and that the other provinces would vote against it, then he has sources of information with regard to the other provinces which I have not got. For my part, I most heartily concur in the proposition that the people should be given an opportunity to be heard before we adopt a measure involving the most serious constitutional consequences and an expenditure of money of which no man can see the end.

Let me now say a few words with regard to the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in favour of a money contribution. The contribution he suggests has been denounced in the most scathing terms; it has been spoken of in almost tearful tones; I thought that the hon. the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), when he bewailed the departure of our $25,000,000, would almost have broken down. The leader of the opposition has been represented as making a proposition for the establishment of a system of contributions and for the paying of tribute to the empire. It is hardly worth while to take up time to point out that it is not a proposal to pay contributions, to do anything more than make one special offer of our contribution under exceptional circumstances. The amendment itself is the flattest contradiction of that idea. But just a word on this terrible thing called 'tribute,' which, it is said, we are asked to pay to the empire. If we contribute ships and men and money, if we pay for the maintenance of those ships and their crews, and contribute these to the empire to be used in her wars, and do that voluntarily, hon. gentlemen opposite say we are paying no tribute. But if we take the money which we have to spend to build those ships and maintain them and send that money voluntarily to the mother country, we are forsooth paying tribute. I must confess that I cannot grasp the distinction. I have struggled to understand it but cannot. It is just an instance of grasping at an ugly sounding word and attaching it to another man's proposition, to which it is

not at all applicable, and then condemning that proposition because of the epithet attached to it. It reminds me of the old saying about giving a dog a bad name and hanging him. I ask all reasonable people, who understand the English language, how it is possible to say that if the people of this country choose to give to the mother country, by their own free will, a specific sum of money, they are paying tribute? If any gentleman can say 'Yes' to that question, then I would ask him how he comes to the conclusion that, if the people of this country contribute to the mother country, for her use, ships and men and money, this country is not paying tribute? To me, it is absolutely clear that in neither case are we paying tribute. But it is a simple absurdity to say that whether we are or are not paying tribute depends simply upon whether we give in money or whether we give in ships and men. If either of these things is to be called tribute, both of them must be called tribute; and if they are both to be called tribute, then the proposition on one hand would be that we pay the tribute in money, and, on the other hand, that we pay the tribute in things that cost money, and then in the flesh and blood of the men of this country. Now, I know that, if the time came, the men of this country would go willingly. But what I want to make clear is that the difference, in so far as the question of tribute is concerned, between the two policies is the difference between tribute in money and a tribute in money's worth and in the flesh and blood of the citizens of Canada.

Now, in the second place, as to this question of amount—we have had 'twenty-five millions of our money' flaunted before the members of this House, and I have no doubt that 'twenty-five millions of our money' will be flaunted before the eyes of the people of this country ad infinitum, ad nauseam. So far as I have information—and I have the information common to members of this House—that is an exaggeration of just twenty-five per cent. As I understand it, a Dreadnought is bought for £2,000,000. And, according to my arithmetic, twice two are four. But, hon. members on the other side have a species of arithmetic under which twice two is more than four. Now, according to my arithmetic also, £1 is equal to something less than $5. Carrying out the calculation according to the lines to which I have been accustomed, I find that two Dreadnoughts at £2,000,000 each would represent a cost of something less than $20,000,000.

It seems to be conceded on both sides of the House, in the first place, that if there were an imminent necessity and urgency for this contribution it would be quite proper to make it. That statement, if I understand the position of the government, would not be disputed. It has been said, on both sides of the House that the question whether this is or is not a proper thing to do depends upon a question of fact. Well, a question of fact is a question of evidence. I have tried to look at the evidence on both sides as dispassionately as possible, to weigh that evidence fairly and to come to a conclusion, The evidence is of the nature of what may be called expert testimony—some people think that is the extreme of falsity—and also of the evidence which consists not in what people say, but in what they do. Now, in support of this proposition that there is an urgent need of this contribution, and also against the proposition that there is urgent need of this contribution, there are cited the same witnesses. I submit this as showing that the witnesses are regarded by hon. members on both sides of the House as worthy of implicit confidence; the only difference appears to be as to what these witnesses say. I think that the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), speaks with authority on behalf of the government, when he calls witnesses and relies on their testimony. He called certain witnesses; they were, if I remember well, Mr. Asquith, Dr. Macnamara and Sir Edward Grey. These the hon. gentleman put before the House as witnesses absolutely worthy of confidence and belief. I am glad to be able completely to agree with the hon. gentleman in that view of it—I also take these witnesses as entitled to confidence and belief, I take them, moreover, as I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) takes them, as being witnesses who are in a position to know what the facts are concerning this matter. Before we consider the testimony, let us understand clearly the point on which that testimony is taken.

The question at issue is, not whether there is going to be a war to-morrow or whether England is going to be smashed to-morrow, or next week, or the week after; but the question is whether in order that England may be safe, it is necessary to build ships. I think that is the question.

The Postmaster General called his witnesses, and he relied, I think, more especially—it was the strongest testimony—on the statement of Dr. Macnamara. He said, triumphantly: There is no need for money to build ships, because Dr. Macnamara said so, and then he read Dr. Macnamara's testimony. Now, Dr. Macnamara, no doubt, said—I am not giving his exact words—that England is quite safe and was not subject to a scare. And he proceeded to prove it—and how did he prove it? He gave a statement showing that England to-day has so many Dreadnoughts and Germany so many, in 1912 Germany would have so many more, and England should

have so many more, and so on down a series of years. What, then, is the testimony of Dr. Macnamara? It is that England is perfectly safe, provided she build Dreadnoughts enough. Then, there is Mr. Asquith, and there are other gentlemen who say virtually the same thing.

Now, there is the further evidence of what people do. Both parties in Britain have been advocating the imposition of new taxes unheard of up to the present time. Both parties agree that there is call for an immense increase in the revenue; they disagree as to the means by which it is to be got. They agree that the reason why increase in the revenue is necessary is that increased armaments are necessary. Now, it is not habitual for governments, for mere amusement, to impose taxes on the people. Increasing taxation is, as a rule, an unpopular course, and I do not know of any popular government that has found any special amusement in it. I would infer that both parties agree that there is need of increased armaments—they confirm Dr. Macnamara's testimony. Then, there is the fact that Britain is going ahead with this construction as fast as she can, in fact, the declaration put in the King's mouth by the witnesses on whom this government rely, is that a substantial increase in expenditure is absolutely necessary. There, then, is the testimony as I have heard it.

And I have considered it. Now, I want to be perfectly frank; I do not say that it is possible, weighing one thing with another, to say that there is absolute certainty of the necessity of that contribution. What I say is that the situation, to put it in the plainest kind of language, seems to be purely and simply this: Here is Canada, we will say, a man in business in a comparatively small way. Here is the United Kingdom, which we liken to a man in the same line of business in an exceedingly large way. Our two men are friends. The man in business in a small way is so tied up in his business relations with the man in business in a large way that if failure comes to the man in business in a large way, our friend in business in a small way will almost inevitably go to the wall. In that situation, our friend whose business is in a small way and whose success depends largely on the success of his friend in the more extensive business, hears rumours going about that his friend is in straitened circumstances; he hears from one man and another man who are in a position to know, that this friend of his is straining every nerve to meet his obligations. People are talking on the sereet, people are saying, What is going to happen when he goes down? But he says to his creditors: Oh, I am all right; I will be able to meet my obligations, I will pull through. But, would you conclude, as the government asks us to conclude, that because that gentleman does not proclaim from the house tops to his creditors that he is in a position of stringency and emergency, that because he is trying to put the best face possible upon the situation, there is no cause at all for anxiety? Is that very reasonable? I put it to any business man. Now the gentleman who is in business in a small way has, we will say, $20,000 available, and his friend lacks that $20,000.

Now, Sir, Canada is as fond of money as any other nation; we on this side of the House are as fond for her of it as hon. gentlemen on the other side, we think sometimes that if we had her money at our disposal, there are certain classes of people who would not get at it as easily as they do when it is in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. Of course, we may be mistaken in that suspicion. But, as I was saying, our friend in the small business has $20,000 available. He feels that not only would he be sorry to see his friend go to the wall, but he would have to suffer himself from the crash, and he thinks the wisest thing he can do is to write to his friend and say: You know your own situation, you know my situation in regard to you; if there is imminent need you may draw on me to the extent of $20,000. That is all our resolution says. That is the purport of our resolution, which hon. gentlemen opposite declaim against as proposing to throw $25,000,000 across the ocean, forcing it upon the people of England, who don't want it, throwing it into the hands of Mr. McKenna and Mr. Asquith against their will. That is all our resolution says. Let hon. gentlemen read it. The proposal is that we should defer any action with regard to a permanent policy until the people have had a chance to make up their minds upon it. I myself would add until the important rights and duties I have referred to are settled and defined. So we say that inasmuch as action on a permanent policy is to be deferred, inasmuch as what we think ought to be done before adopting such permanent policy means delay, and because danger may come within the delay, because there may come an imminent necessity, we are prepared to say to the men who know whether there is imminent necessity or not, men in whom both this government and the opposition have explicit confidence as to their truthfulness and knowledge, we are prepared to say to them: Gentlemen, to meet the imminent needs of the empire, we put at your disposal this sum of money. Mr. Speaker, if that money is drawn under those circumstances, it will be done by men in whom this government has implicit confidence, and upon their testimony that there is imminent need. Will anybody

here impute to the government of Great Britain the flagrant dishonesty of drawing money that is so put at their disposal when there is no imminent need for it, and that they will take it only to put it in Great Britain's pocket? When hon. gentlemen tell us that we are throwing $25,000,000 across the Atlantic to these people, giving it away as a pure gift, as the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) said—that is an imputation upon British statesmen whose testimony we are willing to accept as the testimony of men who know what the truth is with regard to the question of urgency. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this money is drawn, I say we have conclusive evidence on the most reliable testimony of the need of that money, if it is drawn we have given it when there was imminent necessity; and even the right hon. gentleman and his government say that in case of imminent necessity, of course, we ought to give immediate assistance. If, on the other hand, there be no imminent necessity, we may sit down and rest content with the implicit confidence that the money will not be drawn. So much for this bugaboo of a gift of $25,000,000 of our money thrown at England, money that will never come back again. It was pathetic, as I said, to hear the Minister of Militia and Defence dwell on those words —' that will never come back again.' Why, Mr. Speaker, the offer in this way of this money is a step of the most ordinary prudence on the part of a country whose prosperity, whose autonomy, depends, if not absolutely, at any rate to a very great extent, on the maintenance of Great Britain's naval power. It is the simplest measure of prudence in face of a situation such that no man will accuse me of exaggeration when I say it is at least exceedingly doubtful. If the doubt should turn out to be well founded, we shall have done our little part to avert the catastrophe; and at the same time, if the doubt should prove to be unfounded, why, our $25,000,000 will never come back again, because it has never gone away.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when you get this question down to a plain common sense basis, it must appear clear that before the proposition of the government can be carried into effect, many things will have to be done; many things will have to be done before we can adopt a permanent policy that will meet our duty to our country, to the mother country, and to the other nations of the empire. It is clear also that while we take the time to deal with these important measures, it is wise for us to make provision that the intervening delay shall not entail serious damage to the empire that we are proposing to help at this moment. I shall not only vote with absolute and complete conviction against the passing of this measure under existing circumstances, but I shall furthermore vote with the absolute confidence that I am acting, as far as the power in my hands enable me, as a prudent administrator on behalf of this country when I vote for the placing to the credit of Great Britain, for the purpose of meeting any imminent necessity, this sum of money. Despairing of this House refraining from taking the unwise and deplorable step of passing this measure, I shall, at least, as a supplication to them to stop in their path, involving most disastrous consequences, vote for an appeal to them to at least appeal to the people. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have done. To sum it all up, I am for Canada doing her duty. I am for her doing just a trifle more than her duty, if there is any doubt where the line of her duty is; but I am for Canada doing all her duty, not half. I recognize, as I have pointed out, that there is a half of her duty inseparable from the half we are called on by this measure to perform that does not concern this government in the slightest degree, to which they have not, in all their seven years, given one moment's thought, in so far as their thoughts are evidenced by their actions. Therefore, I shall vote against a proposition that involves the doing of half our duty, or rather, something which in its incompleteness is no part of our duty, but a sacrifice of the most precious right of this country—her autonomy. I do not vote to make the provisions which have been suggested because I can say that it is impossible that I may find myself guilty of voting for Canada's doing a shadow of a shade more than she ought to do, but because, in spite of that possibility I am, in the first place, anxious that it shall be made quite clear that Canada is not looking for the benefit of the doubt with reference to this question of her duty. In the future that lies before us, it may turn out that it is impossible for us to so arrange matters between ourselves and the mother country and the other nations of the empire that whilst absolutely preserving our autonomy we may obtain an adequate and effective voice in the foreign affairs. If it should be that our best endeavours in this direction, in co-operation with the statesmen of the other nations prove futile, then I have only to say that we will be face to face with a most serious situation, but I do not anticipate that possibility. I believe that it will turn out to be possible and when that possibility has been discovered, and made evident, when what is so found possible has been carried into effect, and when we have found a method whereby all the nations that go to comprise this great empire may have

handed over to them the control of what is, properly speaking, the foreign policy of this empire—not the foreign policy of England alone—then shall be our time to fully perform our duty, not only of bearing the burden and responsibility of our share of the conduct and control of that immense foreign policy, but also our share and our fair share, in the contribution that may be necessary to give force, to stand at the back of, to maintain and make effective that foreign policy.

In the meantime, because it will take time to settle all these things, we will have made provision that it shall lie in no man's mouth to say that Canada has endeavoured to shirk her obligations, or has invoked those other things that seem to me bound up with those obligations, merely to put them off. We shall provide that in the interval, if need occurs, our full duty shall have been done. As questions of money are so paramount and so much in the eyes of hon. gentlemen who sit opposite, may I point out that all that will have cost us nothing because, assuming that there is imminent need, and our money be drawn, you have only to suppose that it will take you three years to settle all these weighty questions, and mere fact that we have delayed this policy for three years will have delayed for that period the time when we shall have to begin paying annually the money for the upkeep and maintenance of this navy. If you look at the figures of Admiral Kingsmill who assures us that $3,680,000 will represent that cost of upkeep and add to that sum the interest on the money that these ships are going to cost and a proper allowance for depreciation of these vessels, you will find that the sum of money involved amounts to between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 a year. So, if you delay merely for three years the carrying out of this scheme while you are arranging these essential preliminaries, if I may call them so, and if there should arise imminent necessity and your money is drawn you have saved it for the three years you are not maintaining an existing navy. So that even if you get down to that, where is our sacrifice? I was particularly struck with the pathetic tone of the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) when he spoke about that money going. It seemed that in his mind the great thing was not the autonomy of Canada, but the automoney of Canada. Of all the things we must do we must keep that money at home! That was the substance of Canada's obligation. If that was gone responsible government and autonomy were gone. I thought that he had better sit down, figure it out and see that even if the money had to go we would save so much of that money as to make up. In conclusion I desire to say for myself that I have desired to treat this question as a Canadian, and desired to treat it without introducing any foreign consideration, or any consideration of the personal conduct of any man or the record of any party. I think I have succeeded in doing that. I have criticised such parts of the present Bill as seemed to me most seriously and gravely open to criticism.

I would like to be able to hope that hon. gentlemen on the other side would reconsider this measure, but I suppose that is too much to hope for. At all events, I can feel that I have endeavoured—however imperfect my endeavour—to perform what my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, at an early stage of the discussion of this question, declared to be the duty of every Canadian, namely, to speak fairly and freely and without fear, his real thought and his real opinion upon this most momentous question. That, I have endeavoured to do so far as my limited powers enable me. I would wish that the views I have suggested might prevail, because I believe that if they did, ultimately the duties of Canada would be more perfectly performed than they have any prospect or chance of being performed under the system that is outlined in this Bill. I believe that were the views I have humbly submitted given effect to, we Canadians could look forward to a glorious future for this our country. I believe, Sir, we could feel that in this momentous crisis, we had taken up a position that would ensure the full, unquestionable, absolutely perfect performance of every duty that any man could possibly suggest as being incumbent upon us, and that at the same time we had preserved for our country—the country that we all love, the country that is the land of the birth of most of us, the country that is to be the country of all our children who come after us—every right to which she is entitled, and above all that sacred right of her autonomous existence to which we attach so much importance. We could, then, I believe, look forward with pride to Canada continuing to hold her position as one of the most important in this gathering of nations that is going to make up the British empire of the future, holding her position with honour and with credit, and standing there without fear and without reproach like the knight of old, the pride of all the nations clustered around the United Kingdom, and bound together by the golden link of the Crown, that outward symbol of our common aspirations for justice, liberty, order, and the perfection of civilization. In that great aggregation of nations Canada should take her high rank, doing her every duty, speaking with that strong voice to which she is entitled in the councils of that aggregation of nations so far as the control of her relations with the outside world is concerned, and speaking

with that voice, as I know it would be spoken, in the interests of peace the world over. I believe, Sir, that if we go about this matter thoughtfully and carefully, trying to foresee the future and not letting ourselves drift into the unknown, a result approaching to if not identical with that which I have tried to forecast will follow upon our efforts.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester). No member of this House, Mr. Speaker, has risen to speak on this important subject who has realized more deeply than I do the gravity of the question with which we are called upon to deal. If I do rise at this advanced stage of the discussion to address this House, I do not do it with the expectation of conveying to the parliament or the people of Canada any very valuable new information. But my electors have never known me to shirk a duty, and I consider that I would be failing in respect for their confidence if I neglected to express my views on a subject so grave as the one now before this House. Therefore, I desire, in the few utterances which I shall address to this parliament, more particularly in order that my vote on this question may not be a silent vote, to give my explicit assent to the Bill which the right hon. the First Minister presented to this House on the 12th of January last. I do not hesitate to say that that Bill meets my hearty approval; and I say so, 'in the keeping of my own conscience,' to use the noble expression of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), who has preceded me this evening. The hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is not in his seat, but I beg you, Mr. Speaker, to convey to him the expression of my deep appreciation of the intelligent patriotism which he manifested at the conference in London last summer, where, in obedience to the mandate of this parliament, he arranged for the construction of a Canadian navy for the protection of Canada and the support of the British empire, and was enabled to bring to this country a measure best suited to the future combined interests of Great Britain and Canada. I beg also that you will convey to him my appreciation of the noble speech he delivered in this House a few days ago. I should have imagined that the information he then gave might have been sufficient to satisfy this parliament, so that this country might have gone on immediately and prepare for the construction of a navy which would be the pride of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I regret that our hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) has not been within our hearing during this debate. He shares our confidence and our admiration equally with the Minister of Militia and Defence. We regret that his illness detains him from this House at this time. He has endeared himself to every one who has come in contact with him. Endowed with the virtues and qualities that make a good citizen, he has brought to the public life of Canada a high culture as the guide of his activities, which we deeply regret are not at this juncture available to the country; but we hope that his speedy restoration to health may soon enable him to return to the station for which he is so well fitted.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot undertake to follow my hon. predecessor, the member for St. Anne, in his arraignment of the government on this question, although I shall probably deal with some of his arguments in the course of my remarks. I may take this opportunity, however, to express to my hon. friend from Ste. Anne my sincere thanks and appreciation for the noble manner in which last night, within the walls of this parliament, he nobly performed the noble duty of correcting a misconception of the sentiments of the French Canadian people on the part of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), due perhaps to a lack of knowledge of the things of which that hon. gentleman was speaking.

Mr. Speaker, a few of the people of Canada are against any kind of assistance to the British empire, whether by naval contribution or otherwise, on the mere ground that the causes of war have been left behind this century, and they assert that this policy is barbarous and reactionary. It is precisely owing to my appreciation of the sincerity of these noble people in expressing such sentiments that I wish to pay them the respect of my attention. When they tell us that war on land and on sea is abominable and abhorent, and that all nations should pray Heaven that it may never occur again, I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that their feelings are my feelings, and I stand with them against all efforts to stampede public opinion in behalf of warlike behaviour. But again when they tell us that in the conditions in which we live and under the circumstances surrounding the great empire of which we are a sister nation, the strongest and wealthiest of the family of sister nations in its realm, we should remain indifferent to the fate of that empire and neglect to assume our responsibilities as a part of it, a responsibility created by protection and privileges received, a protection and privileges which will last as long as Britain lasts and will cease the day Britain falls, I must say that their judgment cannot meet my judgment. We are called upon, Mr.

Speaker, to deal, not with a theory, but with conditions. We must take the world as it is before us. We are living in a turbulent world, in which ambitions rise at every moment at one point or another. In days gone by many a great war has been declared to be the last which would take place, owing to its awful consequences. Yet other wars have been waged, and always in the name of justice. Entreaties for peace have taken different forms in different centuries, until to-day they have taken the form of a peace tribunal, a referendum to arbitration with a view to the limitation of armaments. Great Britain, in its wisdom and generosity was the first to propose a reference of the question of the limitation of armaments to international agreement.

Great Britain proposed a limitation of armament by international agreement, but Germany vetoed the proposition, and her veto was closely followed by the announcement of a programme of naval development coupled, of course, with the declaration that all those preparations for war were made necessary by the rapid expansion of her commerce throughout the world and the dignity and greatness of Germany demanded a navy proportionate to the great rise of that empire as a world power. England's language was the language of peace, coupled with an offer of peace, whereas Germany's was the language of peace, coupled with preparations for the future. Germany went on building ships and making guns and still crying out for peace. The old doctrine of the Roman, Si vis pacem para bellum, is still in existence.

Nineteen centuries of an advancing, progressive, christian civilization have failed to bring the human race within the reach of universal peace; and although at times I cherish the hope of our reaching that desired goal, I am afraid that this 20th century may yet close without giving us the realization of that ideal status. With the advancing centuries, civilized nations have increased in population, wealth and ambition. The national, commercial and industrial expansion has forced on them the necessity of providing means for the maintenance of their increasing populations; and when one continent no longer offers such necessities, nations looked across other seas for other lands for their evergrowing land and population. Under that impetus, five nations to-day have acquired the position of world powers. An American authority defines world powers as those which are directly interested in all parts of the world and whose voices must be listened to everywhere. Of these world powers, the British empire is the oldest and most deserving, and the youngest, and not in the least in merit, is the United States. Of these world powers some, either for war or for peace, either for aggressiveness or the protection of their commerce, keep increasing their armaments, and their subjects in all parts of the world, are crying out in unison for further protection of their commerce. Among those powers the British empire holds the supremacy which she swerves over the world in the best interests of humanity and civilization, and it behooves every British subject in every part of the world, according to his means, to work in the defence of the British empire, in defence of the British flag which so gloriously protects the true ideas of civil, political and religious liberty. It is to that power that Canada owes her autonomy, and it is that power which granted the province of New Brunswick the same privileges after many years of manly effort. Ever since the day when England proclaimed Catholic emancipation, she has opened her harbours, her hospitals, her domestic and national sanctuaries to the Catholic priests of France and Spain and the rest of the world; and in this 20th century we find these religious bodies, driven, under the plundering whip of the officials of the government at Paris, from their own homes and possessions in foreign countries, looking to the British empire for a safe retreat and a home where they are to-day giving that country, which they have adopted as their own, the benefit of their labours and their experience.

And, Mr. Speaker, as this great empire, so beneficial to the world at large, cannot get along without ships or guns, it is our duty to share in the expenditure on these things in return for the protection we have received and not depend entirely upon the mother country. We must relieve the empire of a part of the burden in a way satisfactoy to both the empire and Canada. So long as other nations are bending their energies in the direction of providing armaments for themselves, so long must we keep in line and help the motherland. We are looking for peace, and I say that there is no power whose stability today makes for peace more than the British empire. Every one knows that England's supremacy does not mean an expansion of territory. She has all the colonies she can attend to and all the subjects she can look after. Moreover, her strong sea power is not complemented by vast land armies as is the case in other countries, particularly Germany. Therefore, her position to-day is a declaration and a promise of peace and protection of commerce. The world is looking for peace, and British supremacy means universal peace. Permanent British supremacy means permanent peace the world over. The crippling of Britain would mean the destruction of the balance of power in Europe, and this would be a matter of momentous consideration for the

United States as well as Canada and Europe.

Our neighbours to the south, to-day, are, no doubt, watching the course of events in Europe as intently as we are. The voice of the world-power of the western hemisphere must be listened to everywhere, and I have no doubt that, to-day, the United States, with deeply solicitous consideration of events, is earnestly watching the movements of Canada toward the future. Other pressure besides the menace of war may be brought to bear upon a nation. Trade restrictions, wise but firm counsel, diplomacy in many directions, exchange of views —all these appealing and potent factors are in the possession of the United States of America. It may be that the world-power of the western hemisphere will be called upon to speak, and, as I say, there is no doubt that the United States to-day is carefully considering the initial steps that Canada is about to take for the building of a navy of her own with a view to protecting her own trade and sea-coast, and for co-operation with the British empire in time of emergency. The sooner we protect our coasts, and the better protection we give the sooner will the voice of America, in the direction of peace, be heard with attention and authority, with force and magnetism by other powers. The Americans are a nation of great activity and enterprise. They have had regard for their own future. They built a navy, modest in its beginnings, but which has grown rapidly with the growth of the country. It may be said that we might remain without a navy and, for the future, depend upon the protection of the British empire in time of need, or we might look to receive from the United States some protection. It is true, the United States might give that protection as to a neighbour. But would our acceptance of such a position be in keeping with our growth and our increasing importance in the world? Besides, if this protection were given, some day we should have to pay for it, directly or indirectly. Why not, then, pay for it ourselves and protect ourselves, and not depend upon others? How can we do otherwise and entertain aspirations to be one of the great nations of the future?

I stated at the beginning of my remarks that I gave my hearty approval to the Bill. I should have given it just as hearty approval had it been brought in five or seven years ago, for, in my humble opinion, we should have begun years ago what we are beginning to-day. I am not a militarist—I could not shoot a gun even if called upon to do so, though I should be glad to do whatever lies in my power should an emergency arise—but I say that, with the advancement Canada has made, with her immense coasts on the Pacific and the Atlantic, and with a harmonious neighbour to the south, one with whom there is neither expectation or possibility of misunderstanding, I would sooner, for my part, have taken half the money we have spent on our miltia and devoted it to the making of a navy. Had this been done, I believe we should be in a better position to-day. We should have to sacrifice something. That is always necessary. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) spoke about the sacrifices that Britain had to make, at our expense, to conciliate the United States. Whatever we have lost by the diplomacy of England, we have taken our medicine like men and looked to other activities to make up our loss. Our action in building a navy, instead of being distasteful to the United States, will be helpful to them and will be appreciated. We should build a navy which will render further secure all possible interests on our vast sea-coasts. We will build a navy which will, therefore, help to combine the interests of Canada and the British empire, and will help, at the same time, the interest of the United States, for these two countries are bound in harmony for all time to come. American sympathy will always be extended to us as friendly neighbours, as Canadians, as Britishers. The United States would rather have Canada, as a neighbour, a part of the British empire than have it a part of the German or any other empire. The United States is a friendly nation with the British empire, a kindred nation, remindful, boastful of its ancestry. Consider the incident related in the despatches concerning Commander Peary a few nights ago. At a great meeting in New York, he was presented with a cheque for $10,000 in honour of his achievements as an Arctic explorer. In receiving the cheque, he expressed himself as follows:

> This cheque will be deposited to-morrow as a joint contribution of the members of this audience, by the officers and committee of the civic forum and myself towards an American Antartic expedition for the purpose of exploration and scientific investigation, and to enter the Stars and Stripes in a splendid, manly race for the south pole with our British cousins, than whom there are no finer foemen in the world.

'British cousins,' he calls them, and he says, 'there are no finer foemen in the world.' My hope for universal peace is chiefly grounded, in my estimation, on the future combined greatness of Canada and the United States. These countries have common aspirations for all that is good and true, in peaceful service of all human activities, agriculture, commerce, industry, which are bound to create comfort, prosperity and happiness, and have a tendency to the intellectual development towards literature, arts and sciences, the successful achievements of which can only be reached by an independent mind free from worry,

moral or material, in the case of a nation as of an individual.

It had been hoped that the United States, in the nineteenth century, would have taken warning from the ruinous policy of European countries in piling up armaments, and would have followed a more peaceful policy. She has not done so, consequently we enter the twentieth century with more or less apprehension. The twentieth century is Canada's century, that is the utterance of our great premier himself, spoken before an American audience. Time has already proved utterances of our noble leader, as having been made under prophetic inspiration; just as was the utterance of Joseph Howe who, 75 years ago, described the Canada of his day and the country lying west of the great lakes, as constituting the foundation of another and greater British empire in North America. And so, Sir, we see it to-day. And I have no doubt that these words of Joseph Howe will also come true, and prove him likewise to have spoken through prophetic inspiration. Now, Sir, when we consider the combined possibilities of these two great North American nations, Canada and the United States, when we see that one country is the complement of the other in a great many of the raw materials and natural resources which are necessary to happy human existence, able to live side by side in harmony and prosperity for centuries to come, in perfect isolation from the rest of the world This, Sir, is a position which no other country in the world can boast of, and certainly not Germany. By the middle of this century Canada will have a population of 40 or 50 million people, inhabiting a country enormously wealthy in agricultural products, minerals, coal, iron, lumber, water-powers and everything else necessary to maintain a nation in perpetuity, with unbounded quantities of capital from Great Britain, from the United States, and from our own people, with a shipping extending to all parts of the world; and when we take such a country and such a people in agreement with 125 million people in the United States, who will say that these combined interests will not be sufficient to impose peace on the whole world, and will not be a stronger factor for civilization than any other possible device of human genius? We would then see fulfilled the aspirations of Joseph Howe, 75 years ago, a great Dominion of Canada in full possession of all the privileges, wealth and happiness she could desire, and forming an integral part of that great British empire which would make for universal peace. I say all the aspirations of Canadians lie in the direction of building up on this continent a great nation as part of the British empire; and

if there is one element of our people more than another, if there is one province more than another deeply, personally, I might say, specially interested, in keeping up this British connection, in keeping the British flag floating over Canada, it is the French element and the province of Quebec. So long as the British flag floats over Canada, so long will the spirit of liberty protect the minority, the weaker against the stronger. Sir, we need not recount the ambitions of the forefathers of the French people in the province of Quebec. It is not necessary for me to describe the feelings of the French Canadian people towards the British empire. We have heard them expressed in our mother's prayers, we have heard our mothers' prayers rising to heaven for the security of the great British empire, and that the British flag might continue to float over Canada. Those prayers which have risen from Canadian altars towards heaven for the maintenance of British supremacy over Canada were not intended for to-day, or for to-morrow, but were intended for all future time. We hear it said sometimes that our noble leader is not faithful to the British flag. Sir, those who say that have never reflected perhaps on the fact that his own mother has uttered prayers for the maintenance of the British flag over this Canada of ours. When we remember what occurred on three or four occasions when our Prime Minister visited England, when we think of the cordial reception given him by all classes, from Queen Victoria, the greatest woman sovereign that ever lived, from members of the government, from corporations of cities, and from the leaders of the British people, when I remember that our great King Edward VII, on a recent occasion sent a message of felicitation to our Prime Minister on the occasion of his last birthday, I say that in his estimation the British flag still waves proud when it is inflated with the breath of the millions of French Canadian souls that are happy to live under its protection. I say furthat should it be necessary for my voice to be heard in some hamlet of Ontario or in any portion of the western country, I shall not delay, as a French Canadian to advocate the continued supremacy of Great Britain over Canada, and the perpetuity of the glory of the British flag.

Now, Sir, there is another point to which I wish to give some consideration. Some of our friends on the other side of the House and on the other side of politics in this country, separate themselves from the rest of us when they declare that we can do nothing on behalf of the great empire unless we at once contribute a large amount of money for her assistance. In this connection let me explain my own

understanding of the situation between Germany and the British empire, or between Germany and the rest of the world. When I have made plain my position on that question, I shall be in a position to explain why I think the building of a navy is a better means than a direct contribution towards strengthening the British empire. Our friends opposite see a constant menace from the German empire. As they have stated she has been preparing armaments. If so, it was her right to do so. She was not bound to accede to the view of the Hague conference. She may have had different views from those held by other countries, but, for my part I see no danger of German supremacy over British supremacy. The utterances of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would lead us to suppose that they anticipate a crisis in a year or two. In this connection I will quote the words of the hon. leader of the opposition who, speaking in this House on January 12, and referring to some expressions of my hon. friend the leader of the government, said:

> Yet the right hon. gentleman may say: Since then it has passed away and there is no need to take further care. These statements pointed to a crisis and an emergency and a peril which might face the British empire within two or three years at the outside. Has that peril passed? No, Sir, we are nearer to it by nearly a year.

Mr. Speaker, the peril that existed last year has not passed, perhaps, because, to my mind, it did not exist and it does not exist to-day any more than it existed at that time. We have heard on many occasions hon. members on the other side of the House asking for an immediate contribution, before they have had time to go to the people for their verdict upon the proposition, of $25,000,000 to England. England to-day can borrow money at a cheaper rate than we can, at a cheaper rate than Germany can, because she has not been under the necessity of bleeding her subjects for the maintenance of her army as Germany has been. Some hon. members on the other side of the House seem to hold in their hands an emergency which they are afraid they are going to let fall upon us at any moment. I believe that we should take a more sedate view of things and that we should be satisfied with the expressions that are given by these nations themselves. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) gave to the House in his speech some time ago valuable information from German sources. Will you permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote the words of the German ambassador at Washington (Count Von Bernsteroff), who, speaking in November, 1909, at the very moment when we were leaving our homes to come within the precincts of this parliament, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, then meeting in Philadelphia, said:

> The world policy of the German empire is purely commercial and without any territorial ambitions or deep-seated designs against other states and the existing balance of power in the world. We do not strive to acquire further colonies by a redistribution of the empire and are quite content to develop the resources of those colonies we have. It is therefore no part of my purpose to speak this evening of our colonial policy. What we however do seek for, is foreign trade and for this reason we are staunch supporters of the theory of the 'open door,' which is also firmly upheld by the United States.

The German ambassador goes on to explain the enormous increase in the industrial production of Germany, the rapid increase in the population and the necessity of procuring bread to feed such a great number of people. He goes on to explain the means to which Germany must resort to keep together the bodies and souls of her sixty million people, increasing at the annual rate of one million. He points out the necessity that the German people are under of looking abroad for raw materials and multiply their value to the people by manufacturing. Then he continues:

> We are now obliged to have a navy in proportion to our foreign trade and protecting these important departments of our national enterprise, but we do not desire to 'rule the waves,' and the development of our navy need, therefore, not be regarded with suspicion by anybody.

I imagine that these words are very plain. They are uttered by the German ambassador to one of the greatest world powers of to-day. The same ambassador also referred to the cause of these disquieting rumours coming from Germany. He alluded to the agitation of the Pan-Germanists which form the basis of the policy pursued by newspaper editors of the class of the jingo press of the United States, England and Canada, and he declared that these Pan-Germanists have no influence in Germany, that they have scarcely a representative in the Reichstag, and that they do not represent the sentiments of the great bulk of the people or of the German government. Yet, they give the jingo papers of Great Britain, the United States and Canada occasion to unduly foment suspicion against Germany. Then the German ambassador goes on: 'We are now obliged to have a navy in proportion to our foreign trade and protecting these important departments of our national enterprise, but we do not desire to 'rule the waves,' and the development of our navy need therefore not be regarded with suspicion by any body.' Why should we not believe in the sincerity of these expressions by the ambassador of

the German empire? Are we justified in concluding that these men, representing the power of the German empire, would undertake to deceive the world at large by such expressions? If perchance Germany has the intention, which I deny, of deceiving the English people, can we believe that the ambassador would undertake to deceive the people of the United States to whom he was speaking? Therefore, we should restrain our desire to cry out to the world that there is danger to the British empire from Germany. There would be danger to the British empire if Great Britain remained inactive. But, she is not remaining inactive. She maintains her position of superiority. Her position to-day is as strong, comparatively, against any one power in the world, as it was ten or fifteen years ago.

It has not decreased. The only change there is in the world is that Germany has started the construction of great vessels of war, and England is meeting her efforts in that direction. And, inasmuch as the British empire will keep up the construction of warships pari passu with Germany, the British empire five years hence or ten years hence, will have the same supremacy over the German empire that she has at the present day. One would imagine that almost every available quotation had been cited to the House during the course of this debate, but, I would like to refer to the statement of Dr. Macnamara, parliamentary secertary, to the admiralty who said:

Dr. Macnamara, parliamentary secretary to the admiralty, dealt with the 'emergency' argument very recently in a speech at Hastings. The London 'Times'' report of a part of his remarks follows:

In Dreadnoughts we have at present seven, against Germany's two, and, in addition, three more were rapidly approaching completion. In April, 1912, the so-called point of danger, we should have twenty Dreadnoughts to Germany's thirteen.

At the same date we should have forty pre-Dreadnought battleships, under twenty years of age, with an aggregate displacement of 585,000 tons, mounting 656 guns from 6-inch. to 12-inch., including 152 12-inch. guns. At the same date Germany would have twenty pre-Dreadnoughts under twenty years of age, with an aggregate displacement of 241,000 tons, and mounting 384 guns from 5-inch. to 11-inch.

In the matter of cruisers, and leaving out the Invincibles, which I have counted with the Dreadnoughts, we should have in April, 1912, thirty-five cruisers of an aggregate displacement of 416,000 tons, and mounting 470 guns of from 6-inch. to 9·2-inch., while Germany would have eight cruisers, with an aggregate displacement of 78,542 tons, and 112 guns of 5·9-inch. to 9·4 inch.

Of docks big enough to take Dreadnoughts we have to-day twelve in home waters, against Germany's six.

To this should be added the statement made in the 'Navy League Annual (1909-10) giving the personnel of the navy at 128,000 of all ranks. This number does not include the reserves. The same publication gives the German navy's personnel as 53,769.

I call attention of hon. members to the fact that Dr. Macnamara here points out that England has to-day double the power of construction that Germany has. Hon. gentleman on the other side from whom we ought to expect better things, tell us that if we do not have Dreadnoughts built at once the German Dreadnoughts are going to take possession of our coasts. Let me point out to these hon. gentlemen that the German Dreadnoughts are all of small coal capacity, that they can only take enough coal on board to last them four or five days and that consequently they are not intended to travel on distant seas, their mission being to protect German interests in the North sea. Canada need never fear a German Dreadnought coming to her shores, and if such a thing should ever happen that German Dreadnoughts would be sent forward, they would never be able to get back again. Germany will be engaged for the next twenty years in building all the Dreadnoughts she can for the protection of her own commerce as against possible aggression from Russia, in the Baltic sea, or France, if Germany should provoke hostilities with France, or possibly with Italy, because we all know that Italy would side with England rather than with Germany, the triple alliance notwithstanding. The Germans know that they will not have too many Dreadnoughts for the protection of their own commerce in the waters surrounding their own territory. Does it remain for me, a modest member from a modest constituency in New Brunswick to tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that Germany is not prepared to-day to declare war against Great Britain, and will not be prepared for many years to come. My own authority would not have any effect on these hon. gentlemen, but I shall quote to them an article which appeared in October last, in the New York 'Journal of Commerce,' and which was written by one of the editors who had paid a visit to Germany for the special purpose of ascertaining the situation and giving his views. This is what the 'Journal of Commerce' says:

Suppose the German fleet is to be as powerful as the British by 1912, the possibility of a successful German descent on the coast of England would be as distant as ever. As against Germany, the strategical position of England is regarded by most naval experts as sufficiently strong to make it impossible for Germany to send any naval force, large or small, into the English channel by the Straits of Dover, or into the Atlantic by the north of Scotland. The task to which Germany appears to have set herself involves

more than the building of Dreadnoughts. The Kiel canal has to be deepened at a cost of $55,000,000, and this is a work which will not be finished before 1915. So with the deepening of the approaches to the German naval harbours and the construction of new basins and new docks. All of these are rendered necessary by the new type of warship, and without them the offensive capacity of the German navy must remain negligible.

Such is the position of the German navy to-day, and we know that the German ambassador has stated that Germany has no other ambition than that of protecting her own commerce. Whether it may or may not be that Germany has designs on the British empire the fact remains that Germany is a negligible quantity in navy encounters for many years and must remain so. If hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied with the authority I have quoted, I shall cite to them the statement of the Berlin correspondent of the Montreal 'Star,' who, on the 9th of February last, confirmed the opinion of the New York 'Journal of Commerce,' in the following despatch:

Germany's Great Naval Base—When completed will be Finest on North Sea, with Special Harbours.

(Special to the Montreal 'Star').

Berlin, February 9.—Plans for the new great naval base of the German empire at the western end of the Kaiser Wilhelm canal at Bruensbuttel have been finished, and the work will be begun immediately. The total cost will be in the neighbourhood of $7,500,000.

When the work is finally completed, which will require many years, it will be the greatest naval base on the North Sea. It will rank with Kiel. The harbour will extend from Bruensbuttel, northeastward, to a small lake which connects with the canal. It will be divided into harbours for the largest warships and for merchant vessels. Great floating docks and boat harbours will also be constructed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the reasons which actuate our friends on the other side in apprehending an immediate German peril, and, therefore, insisting upon an immediate contribution to England. But they say, should the peril come, what will you do? And then they quote the words of our noble leader, but not in the way of appreciation, when he said that when that time comes a wave of enthusiasm will traverse this country. Yes, Mr. Speaker, when that time comes. I pray that it may never come; but should it come unpectedly, in five years, in ten years or next year, that wave of enthusiasm will certainly spread over the whole country, appeal to the heart of every Canadian, and cause thousands of our young men to go to the assistance of Great Britain. It will rise, Mr. Speaker, to the door of the Canadian treasury, and our patriotic Finance Minister, who thirteen years ago unreservedly gave to the British empire the preferential tariff, will again unreservedly open the doors of the treasury to the British empire according to its need, even if he has in the course of time to convert his surpluses of many millions into as many deficits. But, Mr. Speaker, in time of emergency contributions will be given by whatever government may be in power, though by the expression of hon. gentlemen opposite we would imagine that the present government were to be in power in perpetuity; and it may be that if they are not in power in perpetuity, they may be for a long time. But should the time come when a Conservative government would be in power, I believe a wave of enthusiasm of the Canadian people would then also rise to the doors of the treasury. A contribution, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of a moment. If I understood correctly my hon. friend from St. Anne, he said that contribution does not mean tribute. A contribution for an emergency no doubt does not mean tribute; but if you undertake to-day to help England or the British empire by a contribution, you make it a contribution in the future. It is not a contribution given in a moment of generosity, under special conditions; but when you come to parliament year after year, whether there are good reports or bad reports financially from the country, to have the money voted it certainly becomes a tribute; and under certain conditions, in some particular year, the people of Canada or the members of this parliament might not see the necessity of that tribute, and a difficulty might arise which would not be to the advantage of Canada.

But we are told that a contribution from Canada to-day would give prestige to the British empire. Mr. Speaker, if prestige is required for the British empire, what would give it a greater prestige—a contribution of $25,000,000, of which she has no need, or a contribution of a navy for the protection of trade in this portion of the empire, thus relieving her of the obligation of protecting that trade. We are told that our navy would be of no consideration. It will be of this consideration, Mr. Speaker, that it will have as many ships as England will not require to build for our protection. If every sister nation of the empire can within a few years have a navy sufficient for the protection of its coasts and its trade, England would not be under the necessity of providing for the protection of the commercee of the different nations in her family, and, therefore, would be, like Germany, restricted to the necessity of simply protecting her harbours and commerce in the North Sea and around the British isles. The interests of Canada and those of the British empire are to-day so closely interwoven that we cannot separate

them. Whatever we do for the development of Canadian resources is for the benefit of England as well as this country; and whatever we do to increase the prestige and the commerce of Great Britain and the maintenance of her supremacy is in the interest of Canada as well as of the other nations of the empire. We cannot separate our interests, and, therefore, we should take no step which might divert the exercise of our energies from the development of our own resourcese of land, forest and sea. We should do nothing that would tend to cause a lull in our activity or reduce the revenues of the country, not only in consideration of the material interests of the country, but in consideration of the fact that this development tends to attach more firmly to the country the people of the eastern provinces, and thereby enables us to send more people to develop the provinces of western Canada, where a large proportion of the food of the British empire will be produced in the future. We must never forget, Mr. Speaker, that in the course of a few years—and time travels fast in this twentieth century—Canada may be the only country from which the British isles may obtain foodstuffs, that in the course of perhaps another decade the United States will have no wheat, or a very small quantity, to export, that in a short time that country will have a population of a hundred million people, and may have to resort to new activities in industry and commerce, and find an outlet for its surplus population. It is already asserted that before the middle of this century, owing to the great activities in the iron industry, the iron deposits of Great Britain may be exhausted, and Canada will then be looked to, to provide the iron and steel for the construction of Dreadnoughts or whatever engines of war will then be required.

One of the greatest duties incumbent on this government is to do all that is possible to promote the development of the iron industry and the iron deposits in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Time we know travels faster now than it ever did. It has travelled faster in the last twenty years than in any previous era, and the day may come shortly when we may be called on to produce and furnish that precious metal for English ships, both in her merchant and naval marine.

I thought last year when this House unanimously passed the resolution regarding naval defence, and gave a mandate to our ministers who went to the British conference, that the Conservative party would have remained faithful to their vote, just as the party on this side has done. Last winter I listened with great pleasure to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. the leader of the opposition, as they declared themselves in favour of a Canadian navy and opposed to a contribution. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) then said:

> Then, again, I think this method ignores the necessity and the aspirations and the prospects of a great people such as the Canadian people are destined to become.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of our projected navy. They say it will be too small. But I can quote against them perhaps the greatest parliamentarian on the other side, the member for Toronto again, who said:

> We must have beginnings, this must at first be small, but sometime or other our country will have its naval force for the defence of this country, if for nothing else.

These were the words of the hon. member for North Toronto in March last, when we adopted the resolution drawn by himself and somewhat modified by the right hon. the leader of this House and by the leader of the opposition. On that same day my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, said, see page 3517 of 'Hansard':

> In so far as my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, to-day outlines the lines of naval defence, I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of the opinion, in the first place, that the proper line on which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that. The other experiment has been tried as between Australia and the mother country, and it has not worked satisfactorily in any respect.

These were the words of the hon. leader of the opposition at that time. We were then all in perfect harmony. Our delegates to the British conference left this country under the authority of the mandate, so strongly and eloquently expressed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) and the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It was equally the duty of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) to be faithful to that mandate as it was the duty of the Prime Minister. Our delegates came back with a plan of a navy for the protection of Canada and the protection of the British empire, which was approved by that conference. While they were at that conference in London, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was in London also, and on the 1st of July, at the Canadian banquet in that city, he spoke as follows:

> The resolution in the form in which it was passed, while its terms might not upon the surface seem as significant at this moment as the offer of one or two Dreadnoughts would have been, laid down a permanent policy for the Dominion of Canada upon which both

parties united and which would serve a more practical purpose than any such offer of Dreadnoughts.

Here is the declaration of my esteemed friend, and in saying this I speak sincerely for there is none for whom I have a greater respect personally than the leader of the opposition. He then said we had laid the foundation for a permanent assistance to the British empire which would serve a more practical purpose than any offer of Dreadnoughts. He expressed those views on the 1st of July last, when the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), were in London striving to reach a conclusion at the conference which would carry out the mandate given them. Later on, the leader of the opposition visited his constituency of Halifax. On the 14th of October he addressed his electorate there in these words:

One governing principle at least should control, namely, that out of our material, by our own labour and by the instructed skill of our own people, any necessary provision for our naval defence should be made so far as may be reasonably possible.

He also said on that same occasion:

The House of Commons last session laid down a policy touching naval defence in which both parties united. It may not have satisfied the aspirations of all Conservatives, but it seemed our bounden duty to place, if possible, above the limits of partisan strife a question so vital and so far-reaching.

These were as eloquent words as I could wish to hear from a Canadian. They were words to which perhaps no other occasion could give rise, and I believe that the sentiment expressed in them was felt by my hon. friend at that time. But if I understood well the argument of my hon. friend, who preceded me, (Mr. Doherty) and for whom I also have the greatest respect, he thinks we should do nothing until the people have given us a mandate. But, Sir, we have had that mandate ever since confederation. The Canadian government had a mandate to begin the construction of a Canadian navy when it organized our militia, and I do not consider that my hon. friend reached the height of his dignity when he endeavoured to turn into ridicule the navy which the Prime Minister is proposing now to construct. He said it would be a navy of the Governor General in Council. Well, the militia of Canada, is the militia of the Governor General in Council. The leader of the opposition, as I have said, has not followed the noble expressions he used in London and to his electors in Halifax. What power has caused the hon. leader to change his tone it is not for me to consider or to learn. I can only say that I deeply regret the change he has made. It seems to me there is no ground for his present amendment in so far as it differs from the resolution to which he gave his approval on the 29th of March last. In considering briefly this contrast let me take up his present amendment, dealing with the last paragraph first.

That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

Contrast this with the utterances of the hon. gentleman in Halifax six months before or in London last July. He declared that the policy laid down was better than a contribution of Dreadnoughts, but to-day he wants to give $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 to contribute two Dreadnoughts to the British navy, and in the expenditure of that money we should have nothing to say.

Another paragraph of the resolution says:

That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

Last March, the hon. leader of the opposition, as well as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did not think of appealing to the people on the question of building the new navy. We could not commence it soon enough to suit them. The hon. leader of the opposition added the words 'speedy action' in order that no time be lost. He went to his own constituency in October last, a few days before the opening of parliament, and told the people there that we would build a Canadian navy, but this might not meet the aspirations of every Conservative, but we must raise this question above the level of party politics. And his electors applauded his words; evidently they did not feel that it was necessary to appeal to the people on this matter, but encouraged him to go on as speedily as the government and parliament of Canada could go. Another paragraph says:

The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty and in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war are ill-advised and dangerous.

This proposal I cannot interpret as anything but an attack upon the autonomy of this nation in the disposal of its own money. Sir, the late Joseph Howe, in his

day, persistently maintained our right of autonomy. He maintained that principle for his own province of Nova Scotia in all matters of importance. He wanted autonomy for the people of Nova Scotia in every thing possible. For my part, were I the leader of the opposition, a professed follower and disciple of Joseph Howe, I would hardly venture to express such sentiments as those expressed in this resolution, even if I entertained them; I should be afraid that the shade of Joseph Howe would rise in ire against me. I am sure that as time goes on and history takes a more just view of the course of events in Canada and in Nova Scotia, the figure and the work of Howe will occupy a larger place in our records; he will receive from posterity justice that was denied him by his contemporaries. I say that the language of this resolution I have quoted is most surprising when uttered by one who comes from Nova Scotia.

But we are told, we cannot build a navy. Certainly, we never can build a navy if we never commence to build it. What greater prestige can we give to England to-day than to show the world the spectacle of docks and shipyards—whether at Halifax or St. John or Quebec, it matters little to me—but the world will know that Canada has entered actively on a policy of providing for the future and of being able to render the greatest assistance to Britain should it be required. They tell us that we have not the skill to manage these ships. We will import the skill from England for a while, if necessary. That will not be detrimental to England. We will teach our men, who have the instinct of the sea, how to manage these craft that are new to us. We have a population on our sea-board who have inherited a knowledge of the sea, so that the boys at fourteen years of age are perfect sailors. We have them among the Englishmen and the Scotchmen of the maritime provinces, we have them among the Acadians also—fishermen, seamen, who are already appealing to me for positions in the fleet that is to be built. We have such men on the Bay des Chaleurs, on the shores of the St. Lawrence on both sides. I am sure that my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) and you also, Mr. Speaker (Mr. Marcil), the representative of one of the greatest maritime counties, know of many men who are but waiting the opportunity to board a Canadian ship to be trained under a British commander.

Mr. Speaker, our Acadian people have been as useful to Canada, and contributed as much to its greatness, as any other race or portion of a race in this country. We have contributed to the improvement of the maritime provinces. We have kept our children at home; and I may be permitted to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have rendered great service to the whole nation by contributing so largely to the increase of population in the maritime provinces, particularly in New Brunswick. Every Acadian mother, as she breathes on the face of her child sends up to Heaven a truly Canadian aspiration for Canada and the empire. As I say, there is no aspiration purely Canadian that is not also British, I say that the children of those mothers are to-day waiting for an opportunity to go to the defence of Canada and the British empire.

Now, Sir, we are told that this Naval Bill proposed by the government is not in conformity with the requirments of the British admiralty. Well, supposing I admitted the contention of our hon. friends opposite that this Navy Bill was not in accordance with the wishes or desires of the British authority, is it by offering an amendment to submit the question to the people that we will make it more conformable to the desires of the British authorities? Is it by asking seven or eight million people to express their opinion upon it that we will make it more in conformity with the aspirations, the requirements and the desires of the British authorities? If that is the view of our hon. friends opposite why did they not bring in an amendment proposing, in place of the thirteen ships that the government are to build the fleet unit that was at first suggested by the admiralty at the conference? Then we might say that our hon. friends opposite had some desire to meet the requirements of the admiralty. But instead of offering such an amendment to the Bill, they ask us to make a direct contribution. Now, Sir, I wish to say that in my estimation our representatives at the British conference acted wisely, not only according to the mandate given them by the resolution of the 29th of March last, but in harmony with the opinions of the admiralty themselves. It was first suggested that Canada should provide a fleet unit for the Pacific coast only, and Mr. McKenna admitted that the conditions of Canada were such, that our coast was so extensive, that it was not possible to provide a fleet unit for both the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts. Does not the leader of the opposition think that the coast of the maritime provinces needs protection, inasmuch as it is through the ports of that coast, St. John and Halifax, that the bread stuffs for the English people must pass on their way across the ocean? I believe that our representatives not only acted wisely, but I give them credit for having been able to bring about harmony in that conference in the interest both of Canada, and of the empire. I am sure there is scarcely a Canadian who will say, after looking at the question in all its phases, that this

government has not adopted the wisest policy, not only for Canada, but for the empire, by providing for the protection of trade on the Atlantic coast and on the Pacific coast. Canada being a maritime country cannot avoid the necessity of protecting her coasts. Whether we form part of the British empire or join the United States, Canada will always have to protect her coasts, both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. Those great harbours of St. John and Halifax, as Joseph Howe said, have not been placed there merely for the use of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; they have been placed there by Providence for the use of the northern half of this continent, as gateways through which the foodstuffs of Canada may pass on their way to Great Britain. They have been placed there by Providence for the advantage of the British empire, and as we are a part of the British empire for all time to come, it is our duty to refuse no sacrifice, to shirk no effort, in order to protect those coasts. Even if we were not a part of the empire, we would have to protect them for our own exclusive advantage. Hitherto we have not expended anything for their protection, because, forming a part of the empire, the empire has protected them for us. Therefore, our gratitude to the empire, as well as our own national pride, should now lead us to begin the work of self-protection. No nation can aspire to greatness that has not maritime interests.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to be proud of our position, proud and thankful to Providence for giving us such advantages as we have. It is our earnest prayer that we may be able to use them in the interest of Canada and of that great empire which maintains supremacy amongst the nations of the world, to the benefit of civilization, and whose flag protects us as no other flag could protect us. I say that the sooner this parliament passes this Bill, and the sooner we put Canada in a position to commence the building of her docks, her shipyards and her navy, the greater will be the service we will render to this country and the empire. For my part, I express again with all my heart my greatest admiration for the Bill which has been provided by the Prime Minister. It is not in my power to pass upon our esteemed leader the splendid eulogy that has been pronounced by other hon. members who have preceded me, from the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland), who spoke yesterday. Upon them has been bestowed the Providential gift of language adequate to their feelings, their sentiments and their love for their leader, as well as for the British flag. Upon me, however, has been bestowed the privilege and the right to nurture in all modesty the same feelings for my leader and for the British empire.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.). Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to find myself upon common ground with the last speaker (Mr. Turgeon) in this debate, but contrary to my expectations, I find that there is one point on which we can agree. He told us that he was unable to make any answer to the speech of the hon. member from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) who preceded him, and I confess that I am unable to follow the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Turgeon) in the ramifications in which he has indulged. I may say, in passing, in reference to the speech of the hon. member for St. Anne, that I very much doubt whether any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will undertake to analyse that speech and fairly and squarely meet the contentions which were made by the hon. member for St. Anne, for the simple reason that I believe that his arguments were so closely reasoned out and were so convincing that no hon. member on the other side of the House will accept the challenge thrown down by that hon. gentleman to endeavour to give a fair and square answer to them. In regard to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, there is one thing that he referred to which gives me some consolation to-night in case I should be tempted in any way to transgress the rules of the House to the extent of possibly going a little bit outside of the question before the House. When I observed that you allowed the hon. gentleman to discuss, without any rebuke on your part, the question of Commander Peary devoting the $10,000 that some society gave to him for discovering the North Pole, I came to the conclusion that pretty nearly anything that one might venture to say between the poles would be relevant to this discussion. I do not intend to take up the time of the House at any great length to-night, and I will promise you this consideration for your own feelings and for the feelings of everybody else that I will not quote the language of Dr. MacNamara where he promises that England shall have ten Dreadnoughts at the same time that Germany has five, and so forth and so on. I will try and keep a little more from repetition than that. I am sorry to see that the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) is not in his seat to-night, because, unfortunately, I feel that, owing to the line he took in addressing this House on this question the other day, I really must call attention to some matters which were contained in his speech and which should be answered. The hon. gentleman was very free in his accusations against members on this side of the House of inconsistency. He waxed eloquent upon the subject of the

instability of the line of action of members on this side of the House. Why, he grew so indignant at times that I almost felt that his vocabulary was hardly sufficient to find words in which he could express his disdain of anybody who had changed his opinion upon this subject. After rating hon. members on this side of the House for some time, the hon. gentleman stood forth as an apostle of consistency, and, clothed in the robes of his own righteousness, he proceeded to denounce hon. members on this side of the House for the stand they had taken on this subject. Well, let us examine records and see whether he practises what he preaches. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) put a very simple and a very courteous question to him, a question which has been put to many hon. members on the other side of the House during this debate. He was asked by that hon. gentleman if he considered that there was an emergency or a crisis at the present time, and whether he thought the policy of the government was one which would answer to that crisis. He said, somewhat grandiloquently, with a wave of his hand, that he did not like to have the logical sequence of his speech disturbed, and he went on to make a remark about the speech which my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo delivered, which, I think, was absolutely undeserved, for, I venture to say that any impartial listener would concede that my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo is quite as able to make a speech in this House as the hon. member for Nanaimo, or, for that matter, as any other hon. gentleman in this House. He was asked if he thought there was a crisis. What did he say? Crisis? Why, perish the thought. Here are the remarks he made:

> Now I submit that the question as to whether a crisis exists is to be determined by some reasonable process.

I would like, in passing, to say that I have noticed since I have been in this House that the hon. member for Nanaimo is very fond of using the words 'reasonable process,' 'logical sequence,' and words of that kind. He proceeded:

> The leader of the opposition said we must determine whether there is a crisis in Britain by the statements of responsible men in England. In that I agree with my hon. friend. But can my hon. friend, or any other man of this House, conclude that there is a crisis or a serious danger, from the statements of responsible men in England? I may be told, how is it that the Liberal government in England, for the last two years, and especially the last year, have been increasing the power of the British navy; and according to the despatches received in this country yesterday, the speech from the Throne, at the meeting of the British parliament, asks for a further increase in the provision for strengthening the navy. Well, Sir, I look upon all that as an evidence, not of a crisis, not of danger, but of a determination to secure absolute security.

Not satisfied with establishing, quite to his own satisfaction, like every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side of the House, that there is no crisis, he proceeds to tell why there is no crisis. To do that, he quotes certain language published in a certain English newspaper, the name of which he does not give, but which makes certain reference to Lord Northcliffe, and he says:

> What is the 'emergency'? It is nothnig more than the superheated sixpence a word rant of a Socialist agitator, backed by the prestige of the greatest living journalistic acrobatic and mountebank—chief press agent of the Unionist party—Lord Northcliffe.
>
> These two dangerous demagogues have played the strings of the war harp so clamorously and persistently, they have for political purposes so basely misrepresented the naval strength of England and exaggerated that of Germany, that half the nation believes Britain is in danger, and excitable Canadians have already begun to shout for a life line. This is to take the form of an 'emergency contribution.'

Well, Sir, judging from the language of the hon. gentleman and from the fact that he quoted that clipping from an English newspaper with reference to Lord Northcliffe, any reasonable person would come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman had a very poor opinion of Lord Northcliffe, who is evidently not the kind of man upon whose view he would base a conclusion as to whether there was or was not a crisis. At the opening of this debate the Prime Minister remarked that a number of tongues had wagged during the recess. Possibly they did, but although the right hon. gentleman may not have known it, some Liberal tongues also wagged, and amongst those wagging tongues was the tongue of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith). In the city of Victoria, which I may say is very much interested both for patriotic and commercial reasons in this Bill, a telegram was received during the recess from London which gave rise to the apprehension that possibly the naval station and dry dock might be removed from Esquimalt to some other point in British Columbia. A meeting of the Board of Trade was held to consider the matter, and there were present at that meeting my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) who was brought from Nanaimo especially for the purpose, and my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, and being present myself I happened to hear what the member for Nanaimo said, and I have before me quotations from the local papers giving his remarks. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) said at that meeting:

Last session at Ottawa he had occasion to refer to military expenditures. He did not complain of their size, but he did complain that the people were not getting all they should from the expenditure. There was not a fair distribution. British Columbia was not getting as fair a distribution as many provinces. He had never been carried away with jingoism.

There again I think the members of this House will recognize the member from Nanaimo.

He had often wondered whether all the fuss that had been made had any foundation. He had met military men, statesmen and others, many experts, and had discussed the situation with them. As a 'democrat' in the old country he had always been against jingoism. His father had told him the Tory party was ever ready with a war scare while the Liberal party was working for the peaceful development of the country. He stated this in explanation. He had, however, listened to the speeches.

And to whose speeches do you think the hon. gentleman had listened?

He had, however, listened to the speeches of Lord Northcliffe, he had read the speeches of Sir Edward Grey, and others, moderate in tone the most of them, but convincing.

A Crisis at Hand.

After serious consideration he had arrived at the conclusion that there is a crisis in England, and it is necessary for the colonies to interest themeslves in the defence of the empire. It is necessary for them to make their position and interest in the empire felt. He believed that not only was there a crisis but that there was danger, and the time had undoubtedly come when the colonies of the empire should arise and make known their real position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have read that quotation from the 'Colonist,' which is a Conservative paper in Victoria, but I am glad to be able to say that a representative of the Liberal paper in that city was also present at that meeting. The Minister of Inland Revenue spoke at that meeting also, and as the Minister of Inland Revenue controls the destinies of the Liberal newspaper, the 'Victoria Times,' the hon. member for Nanaimo naturally could not expect to have the same amount of space devoted to his speech as the Minister of Inland Revenue had to his, and consequently the report of the member for Nanaimo's speech in the 'Times' is not given so fully. However, it was fairly well reported, and from the Victoria 'Times' of September 25, I quote:

Ralph Smith being called upon, said that he had been commanded by the president of the board of trade to appear. He felt that all the people of British Columbia were in favour of Esquimalt as a naval base. The imperial authorities had chosen it, and arguments in its favour were superfluous. Every condition of nature had seemed to have selected it as a suitable place, therefore there is nothing to discuss. The object in asking them to attend the meeting was doubtless that they might give an expression of opinion. Being the member for Esquimalt, from which district he drew so much of his support, it was natural that he would do so. Taking the natural advantages of the place into consideration, and as the member for the district, he would be glad to lend it any support. It was satisfactory to think that Canada had by unanimous resolution of the House of Commons committed themselves to the policy of aiding the defence of the empire. He was glad that they had taken the stand that it was not wise to make a direct contribution, but to build ships of their own.

At the last session of the House he had made a few adverse remarks on the administration of that department, but in discussing the question with men of all lines of thought from the old country he had come to the conclusion that there had arisen a crisis in England, and that it was necessary for the colonial interests to make themselves felt.

Here again you recognize the same old story:

His natural tendency was opposed to militarism, but now he believes there was a crisis. Men like Sir Edward Grey and others of the Liberal party who could not be easily led astray by a scare had expressed themselves on this subject, and he was now ready to support any plan for naval defence.

Now, the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) is the gentleman who came into this House two days ago and accused the members on this side of the House with having changed their views on this question of naval protection. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) is not present as I would like to have asked him what is responsible for the change in his views. No change in the meantime has taken place in the conditions to account for his sudden reversion of opinion. We know that, on the authority of the hon. gentleman himself because speaking of the leader of the opposition he said:

There can be no change in any conditions or any circumstances which would correspond to the enormous change in his opinions.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there was nothing to change the opinion of the leader of the opposition which was expressed twelve months ago, what has happened in the last four months to so diametrically change the opinions of the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith). Can it be possible that the hon. gentleman has one opinion on this question for the benefit of his constituents and the people on the Pacific coast, and that he holds another view for the benefit of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Liberal party? I hesitate to think that can be the reason. Is it that he did not fully consider the matter? It cannot be that, because he

told us at the meeting to which I refer that he had come to the conclusion he did come to after serious consideration; and I give the hon. gentleman the credit of giving at least as serious consideration to his remarks in the House as he gave to his remarks made before the public outside of the House. Well, Mr. Speaker, is it the party lash, is it the thumb-screw, to which he has referred? The hon. gentleman, in spite of the fact of his English birth—I think he has enlarged on that once or twice in this House, and I am sure that he has done so once at least during this debate—in spite of the fact of his devotion for what he is pleased to call the motherland, and in spite of the pious affirmation,' an expression which I think has been used before in this debate, he stands in this position, that four months ago he was convinced after serious consideration that there was a crisis in the affairs of the empire, and he is now willing, in obedience to the party lash and the crack of the party whip, to vote for a policy which provides for no immediate aid in that crisis, which in fact negatives immediate aid and provides that there shall be no aid for something like six years. The hon. gentleman said that the party thumb-screw had been applied to me and that I had been compelled to change some of my opinions. Well, I am thankful to say that if I have experienced the party thumb-screw, although I do not know of it as yet, I certainly have never been placed in as pitiful and humiliating a position as the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) is in to-day.

I would like to refer to one or two little samples of the consistency and logic of the hon. member, as evidenced by this one speech. I do not propose to go outside of that, because I think it is enough. He scores the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for what he said concerning British diplomacy. Why, Mr. Speaker, the feelings of the hon. member for Nanaimo were absolutely hurt. What does he say? He says: 'I myself am a little jealous of Britain and British diplomacy'; and on the strength of that he proceeds to read a lecture to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. He reads that lecture because that hon. gentleman made some reflections on British diplomacy; but the same hon. member for Nanaimo is prepared to fall in adoration at the feet of the Prime Minister, who said in this House that he hailed with delight the day when Canada would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy. He was quite right to say that he was only a 'little jealous' because under the circumstances he can't really be very jealous. Again the hon. gentleman has been one of the strongest advocates of the present policy of the government. In fact, he advocated it so strongly that he became almost belligerent. He looked and talked like a regular old warhorse. One would imagine he was almost dying to get this navy so that he could go to war with somebody. What a change has come over the hon. gentleman, if you compare his remarks the other day with those he made when speaking on the budget last session. These will be found at column 4732 of 'Hansard' of 1909. Speaking of the expenditures on the militia he said:

> I say there is no justification for spending $7,000,000 on the frills and fripperies of militarism. I am speaking frankly to the House. I will tell you what I would do with the $7,000,000 that is now expended on the militia. I do not know what it is for. I can quite understand the necessity of defence if you know that there is an existing enemy, but I am not aware of any. Where is the possible approaching enemy of Canada? Where does he live? Do you say in the United States? There never was a time in the history of this country when the feeling between this country and the United States was as friendly as it is at the present time. Where is the enemy to come from? What are you spending the money for? Is it fashionable to have a militia?

Compare that language with the language of the hon. gentleman in the House the other day, when he was advocating a naval militia. Is that the language of a man whose heart is sincere for the defence of the country? He went on further to say:

> I know it is proper to have a reasonable measure of protection and have it better distributed in Esquimalt as well as Halifax and other points.

What he meant by this is shown by the following remark which he made a little later:

> I believe that our coasts should be protected by fishery cruisers and that there should be efficient police supervision and protection along the boundary line. But what I did say and what I repeat is, that a time when you have to restrict the ordinary expenditures of this country in its present state of progress and development, is not the time to expend $7,000,000 of the people's money for military purposes, and that whatever is spent ought to be better distributed to the advantage of the Pacific coast.

This is the last example of the consistency of the hon. gentleman which I propose to quote. In dealing with his consistency, of which he is so proud, we have found, first, that his opinion of Lord Northcliffe has, for the purposes of this debate, undergone a most radical change; we have found that his careful and seriously considered opinion as to there being a crisis last September has changed. He was satisfied then that there was a crisis; he is satisfied to-day that there is no crisis. His condemnation of the hon. member for

Jacques Cartier does not, as we say in the west, 'gee' very well with his adoration of the right hon. the Prime Minister. His attitude of militarism last session is very different from is attitude this session. Truly, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman spoke with very special knowledge and with great authority when he told this House 'that it was easy to turn around, that it was easy to say one thing to-day and the opposite thing to-morrow.' He made that remark, I think, in a burst of candour, and possibly may be sorry that he said it. He also proceeded to say that it was easy for him to understand the Prime Minister when he said that 'when Britain was at war Canada was at war, and if Britain were at war Canada need not be at war. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. gentleman would have the slightest difficulty in understanding that statement. No gentleman who could so radically change his opinions in so short a time would have the slightest difficulty in understanding anything his leader might say. If the right hon. gentleman should casually say to him that the moon was made of green cheese, we would have the hon. gentleman standing up in this House prepared to defend the statement at all costs. Now I want to say a word or two in reference to his remarks on a quotation from the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He proceeded, by one of his peculiar processes of logic to try and prove out of the mouth of the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that it was quite wrong for Canada to make a contribution of Dreadnoughts at this time. He said:

If I want to find an argument against making a contribution to Great Britain for Dreadnoughts or anything else, I must go to the arguments of these gentlemen a year ago. I take first the argument of the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as hon. members listened to his words, I ask them to keep in mind the policy of the leader of the opposition, and keep in mind also —

This coming from the hon. member for Nanaimo is rather good.

—and keep in mind also the somersault of the hon. member for North Toronto a few days ago in the debate of this Bill—a political somersault that I sumbit, was cleverly executed; no member of the party could execute such an 'about face' as did my hon. friend.

Well, Sir, I venture to say there is a gentleman who comes not very far from Nanaimo who can beat the hon. member for North Toronto as a political acrobat every day in the week. Then he proceeded to say, speaking of the hon. member for North Toronto:

Speaking of the thing to be considered, he said:

The first is the policy of a fixed annual contribution in money to the British government or the British admiralty. Now, that divides itself, apparently, into two branches, but it is really the same thing. One man says: Send one million dollars or two million dollars a year; another man says: Send a Dreadnought or two Dreadnoughts, and so far as Canada is concerned, these two are absolutely one.

Then he continued:

The present policy of the leader of the opposition is to send Dreadnoughts, but the members for North Toronto demonstrated that, so far as the principle of the thing is concerned, there is absolutely no difference to Canada.

Quoting again from Mr. Foster:

When we translate one contribution into Dreadnoughts it comes down in the end to money which would be sufficient to build and equip a Dreadnought. And, therefore, I say, they are both parts of the one proposition——

The comment of the hon. member for Naniamo on this was:

Now, I would like the hon. member, and especially the hon. gentleman who is to follow me in this debate to remember this.

Again citing from the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto:

—An annual fixed contribution of money to the British government for the purpose of national and imperial defence.

As to this my hon. friend (Mr. Ralph Smith) said:

If that statement be correct, then this House has to consider not only the proposition of the leader of the opposition for two Dreadnoughts at the present time, but the more serious contingency of a repeated contribution to the British empire which is involved in the principle necessarily and according to the hon. member for North Toronto himself.

Now, I wish merely to say this. I am not foolish enough to endeavour to make any defence of the hon. member for North Toronto, for he is quite able to take care of himself; but I do not think it right that he should be misquoted or that his language should go to the public in such a way as to have it misinterpreted. The remarks which my hon. friend from Nanaimo quoted were made, it is true, by the hon. member for North Toronto, but they were preceded and followed by other statements which gave them a wholly different construction. Before making these remarks quoted by the hon. member for Nanaimo, the hon. member for North Toronto said:

Recollect that my motion deals simply with a stated, regular uniform, normal lines of proceeding and policy. Let us argue that out first. It seems to me that when you boil down all the propositions that are made you get down to two propositions, one or the

other of which must in the end be adopted, and I desire for a very few moments to canvass these two propositions, not as an advocate who has dogmatically made up his mind and who admits of no reason on the part of one who takes the opposition thought and might wish the opposition course. But let us, as far as we can, think around them and see what the two mean.

Then came the remarks quoted by my hon. friend. But at the end of his speech the hon. member for North Toronto went on to say:

Outside of any settled action, outside of the normal condition of things in society, in the world, in nationhood, occurences arise, special emergencies, that are unexpected, suddenly loom in view, a great crisis, a great danger. That is absolutely outside of the normal policy to be carried on year after year with settled purposes and upon a settled plan. Every one of the emergencies must be met as it comes and met according to the gravity and importance of the occurence.

Then, winding up his speech he said:

Let me say to my right hon. friend, that if, after careful consideration, he proposes to this parliament a means for meeting that emergency adequately by the gift of Dreadnoughts or the gift of money, this side of the House will stand beside him in thus vindicating Canada's honour and strengthening the empire's defence.

I do not think that the treatment by my hon. friend from Nanaimo of the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was fair, nor do I think it was worthy the parliamentary record of my hon. friend. He proceeded after that to run through the statements of a number of the other members of this House, and finally he got down to my humble self and seemed to come to the conclusion that I had said some things on the debate last session which I would now find it necessary to take back. Well, I have gone over my few remarks on that occasion, and I am happy to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that there is nothing I said on that occasion which I have the slightest desire to withdraw. I began by saying that this government had put the country in a humiliating position. That is a statement which I certainly have no desire to take back. To my mind the result, and the only result of the conference of 1909 was to put Canada still further in a position of humiliation. The only thing shown by that conference was the determination of the government to do just as little as they possibly could. The ministers who went over to that conference, showed their determination to shave the proposals of the imperial government just as closely as they could, and at the same time try and preserve some semblance of their own self respect. What has been the course of the government in this whole matter? At the

1907 conference, we had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) taking the glorious position that Canada did not need to do anything for the defence of the empire, because she was protecting her fisheries and had taken over some dockyards. Was not that a glorious position? I am sure that Canada must be proud in having a Minister of Marine and Fisheries who found it necessary to proclaim that we had received from the British admiralty a couple of places in which to store his goods and that he was giving up, one or two cruisers which, so far as our Pacific coast is concerned, were absolutely incapable of doing their work and that he was going to keep up a couple of steamers which were barely sufficient to keep off a few marauding fish thieves. Then we had the Prime Minister's curt refusal to consider, much less discuss, the resolution of Dr. Smartt, of Cape Colony. When we come to the conference of 1909, what do we find? We find that the imperial authorities ask the Canadian representatives for a fleet unit. What was their reply? Well, I fancy that before they gave a reply they put a question, and that question no doubt was, how much will it cost, and I think the answer was not satisfactory. Then the conversation probably went on these lines. They said: 'Oh, that is going to cost too much; you have got us over here and now you must help us out; tell us what is the most we can do for the least amount of money, for we have got to go back and bluff these good people of Canada into thinking we are doing something.'

During the recent local by-election in the city of Ottawa, the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) made use of an expression which is possibly more forcible than elegant but which correctly, to my mind very correctly, expresses the situation. He said:

If we act as belly crawlers in the empire we will be treated as belly crawlers and rightly so. If we maintain our own defences we will be respected by England for it.

It has occurred to me that possibly the Minister of Labour might be in want of an illustration of this particular phrase which he used on that occasion. If he does, I can only point him to the conduct of the representatives of Canada at the imperial defence conference of 1909.

Now, the proposition of the admiralty was a fleet unit—which meant, of course, as has been pointed out so many times during this debate, a Dreadnought—which should be stationed on the Pacific coast. Well, of course, that would not suit the government. The Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) at this same meeting at which the Minister of Labour distinguished himself, also made a few remarks.

All this talk about not following the admiralty advice is rubbish. When they talk about the admiralty suggesting a fleet unit they leave out 'on the Pacific.' When the fact that we have two sea-boards to protect—Atlantic as well as Pacific to protect, was pointed out, the suggestion of our ministers was concurred in.

Well, I am satisfied that the admiralty, in making that proposal, were quite well aware that Canada had an Atlantic sea-board as well as a Pacific sea-board. And I think that, in all probability, they were under the impression that the fleet they had on the other side of the Atlantic was quite sufficient for the protection of the Atlantic coast of Canada. At any rate, I am quite sure that they probably remembered—possibly more vividly than did the Secretary of State—that they had withdrawn forces both from the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts. I think that when it was pointed out to them that Canada's navy must be smaller than originally asked for and then be divided and part placed on the Atlantic and part on the Pacific, it is more likely that they assented to the division in disgust or in contemptuous indifference. I believe they would have assented equally readily if the representatives of Canada had proposed to put part of the fleet on the coast of Patagonia and part on the Newmarket canal. It certainly is a peculiar argument that because we have a double sea-board, we should reduce the force. We are told that when it was pointed out to the admiralty that we had two coasts to protect, then it was decided that we would not put the fleet unit on the Pacific coast. So by way of assisting the empire, our Canadian representatives decided that we would reduce the force and put a little on one coast and a little on the other. Those of us who feel at all keenly on this subject may congratulate ourselves that our representatives forgot that Canada also borders on the Arctic ocean, because, if they had called that to mind, the fleet would have been still further reduced. And if, by any chance, you could twist Hudson bay into a fourth coast, in all probability the Canadian navy would reach the vanishing point altogether. Taking all these matters into consideration. I do not think I want to take back the statement I made last year, that the government had placed Canada in a most humiliating position on this question.

Now it is easy to criticise, but what should these representatives have done? Well, I think that the proper course for them to have adopted was to have placed that fleet unit upon the Pacific coast. That was what the admiralty, who were the best judges of the situation, asked for. Then, if the government had come to the conclusion that it was necessary to defend the Atlantic coast with another fleet unit, I would have been very glad to support them. If, either because they had plenty of money to spend, or even if they had come to the conclusion that because there happened to be more votes along the Atlantic than along the Pacific coast, they thought the Atlantic coast was the one to be defended, and, if, in taking care of these votes and these voters, they had decided to put a fleet there, as long as they had first put a fleet upon the Pacific coast, I do not think I would have found fault with them, provided always they had made provision for present aid to the empire and for a navy of some efficiency. The Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) in speaking on this question took some pains—speaking mainly, I think, to his friends in the province of Quebec—to let them know about the different countries smaller in population than Canada that have navies (he called them 'colonies'; whether that was a slip or not I do not know). But, in making that reference, he mentioned such countries as Argentine, Brazil and Chili, countries which we have not been accustomed to think very much superior to our own, and he told his friends how these different countries had navies, but neglected to tell them that any one of these navies built or projected could knock his navy into a cocked hat in five minutes. He was, as I understood him, talking to his friends in the province of Quebec, to make them think that it was their duty, as loyal British subjects, to go in for this little tin-pot navy of his. I do not pretend to know the feeling of the people of the province of Quebec on this subject, but from what I do know of that people, I am satisfied that, if they are prepared to go in for a navy at all, they have enough national pride not to want to build a navy that will be afraid to show itself on a rainy day. The Postmaster General also made a few references to Esquimalt. Without taking up the time of the House too long, I would like to say a word or two on that subject. The hon. gentleman referred to the taking over of the dockyards at Esquimalt as one more reason why we should have a navy. I do not see the force of what he said about Esquimalt. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) also told us, in the course of his illuminating address, that the reason the cost of the militia had jumped from one and a half millions to seven millions per annum was that he had taken over Esquimalt and Halifax.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the imperial troops left Esquimalt three years ago they were some 500 strong; to-day the Minister of Militia has the magnificent force at Esquimalt of 80 men. The imperial people when in charge of Esquimalt were erecting a new fort; they had spent on what was to be known as the Signal Hill battery, a

very large sum of money. The value of that work, at ordinary rates of labour, would have been some $250,000. They had brought out from England two guns to manage this battery, which guns cost $40,000 apiece; I am told those guns are worth something like £20,000 where they lie in the city of Victoria. Directly the Canadian authorities took over Esquimalt, the Signal Hill work stopped. The carriages for those guns were actually in position, and the guns were at the foot of the hill in the dock yard. They are there to-day, and so far as one can see, they are going to stay there until the crack of doom. Well, it might not have been so bad if they had only left things alone, but they would not even do that. The Fifth Regiment of garrison artillery is a militia regiment in the city of Victoria, and it had great difficulty in getting any guns upon which to train. They were asked to go into competition with other garrison artillery regiments in the eastern provinces, and they were asked to do it without having afforded to them proper facilities for training. They protested, and protested for some years, to the Minister of Militia, without result. Finally, all the officers of the regiment, with one exception, handed in their resignation in a body. This, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Milita has stated once or twice in the House, he knew nothing about. I may say that I have these facts on credible authority from three officers of the regiment who were there at the time this was done. As soon as that was done what did the Militia Department do? They actually dismantled one of the permanent batteries put in by the imperial authorities, and carried their gun over to the city of Victoria and put it in a drill shed. Not only that, but they dismantled another battery for the same purpose. So when the Minister of Militia, or the Postmaster General, tells this House that because they have taken over Esquimalt, therefore they need something in the shape of a navy. I say they are using a very poor argument. Why, the people on the coast who know anything about the Esquimalt fortifications and the administration by the present minister, look upon the whole thing as a huge joke; and if the Minister of Militia thinks he is going to get any support for his navy on the strength of his administration of the militia, I can assure him he is very much mistaken. Now, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that men like Sir Wm. White should make the remarks he did? He stated, writing to the 'London Times':

> During the past summer he had visited the naval yards at Esquimalt and obtained first knowledge of its condition. Considerable extensions had been made in comparatively recent times to its workshops, store houses and plants, fortification designed to protect the harbour had been modernized but the work was incomplete. He found the fort unarmed, the guns lying on the ground at the foot of the hill in the open. The navy yard was without a staff capable of maintaining in good condition the expensive machinery left in the work shops and in the buildings. The stores had been disposed of locally at ridiculously low prices and the naval base had been virtually abandoned and was rapidly deteriorating.

Yet these gentlemen tell us that because they have taken over the naval yards at Esquimalt and Halifax, therefore, they ought to build this little navy, because they are both on the same basis.

Now, with regard to the motion before the House, I wish briefly to explain my position. I am, I need hardly say, entirely in accord with the suggestion of an immediate contribution in the shape of Dreadnoughts, or the value thereof. I would be generous, and I would be inclined to strain somewhat the resources of the country in giving that contribution. We must remember that for years to come the British navy is going to be the only protection for Canada. As to a Canadian navy, personally I have not the slightest objection, always provided three things: First, that there is immediate aid given to the empire; secondly, that that navy must be adequate, must be capable at least of being a fighting unit; thirdly, that it is to be at the service of His Majesty whenever hostilities break out, without waiting for anybody to decide the question. We have had a lot of talk, pro and con, upon this subject. Well, my own opinion is that there should be absolutely no room for debate on that question. If there is room for debate, there is room for doubt at the time hostilities break out, and the time to settle that thing is now. If this navy is going to be a navy that is to be at the service of His Majesty at the very moment hostilities break out, now is the time to say so, and now is the time for us to know, and until we know that, I for one do not propose to vote for the government's Bill. When we see the press of a certain province in this country stating that in time of war the Governor in Council may place the force at the disposal of His Majesty, and printing the word 'may' in large black type, and when it goes on to say that the government may grant or refuse to allow this fleet to go into action, reserving the constitutional right and reaffirming its guarantee of autonomy; when we take that statement, coupled with the statements and quotations that have been made from various utterances of the Prime Minister in this House and in other places, and remembering, as we do, that when he was confronted by the hon. member for North Toronto the other night, and asked if he had changed his idea of the goal toward which he wished this country to tend, he refused to answer—when we

take this combination of circumtsances together, I say that any man who is in favour of British connection, and the maintenance of British connection, is guilty of a breach of duty to himself and to the country if he votes for the second reading of this Bill. I am willing to vote for a Canadian navy that is started on right lines, that is to say, on lines that will tend towards the consolidation of the empire. But for a Canadian navy which is to be started on lines such as these, which I believe are lines designed, or at any rate tend, to the dismemberment of the empire, the severance of Canada from its allegiance to the British Crown, I for one will never vote.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member (Mr. Barnard) who has just taken his seat will pardon me if I do not follow him in the exact line which he has taken this evening, because his speech seems to be made up more of an attack upon the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) than a discussion of the Bill which is now engaging the attention of this House. As I have no quarrel with the hon. member who has taken his seat, I do not require to take up the cudgels with him. I wish to approach the discussion of the subject before the House with one view and only one view, that which always has been taken by the Liberal party throughout the history of this country—the welfare of our own country and the cultivation of a truly national spirit. I hope, Sir, that no words of mine shall offend even the most sensitive, because I respect the opinions of every hon. member of this House no matter what his politics are, and upon the matter of the merit of the naval Bill I readily understand how different our views may be. It is deplorable to see how members of this House, in the discussion of an important measure such as the one we are now dealing with, should go out of their way to make attacks upon a class of members who may not share their views. I congratulate the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) upon his manly action in repudiating the words which were uttered in this House yesterday. I feel that I must join with him in repudiating the speech, or part of the speech, which was delivered yesterday by one of the hon. members. I have absolutely no mandate to speak for the French Canadians of the province of Quebec, I have not, Sir, a drop of French blood in my veins, but I have no hesitation in saying that if I had I would feel very proud of it, because I know of no class of men in this country who should command the respect of this House more than our French Canadian friends. They have been classed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards)—and I want to be perfectly fair with him—as a disloyal body.

Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he will quote any words which I have uttered from which he could draw that conclusion.

Mr. DEVLIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well do so.

Mr. DEVLIN. I did not mean to quote the hon. gentleman's speech, but since he has invited me to do so I feel that I will be forced, in answer to his question, to go into th emerits as well as the speech which he has made. When I was a student at college, and it is now a good many years ago——

Mr. EDWARDS. I think I have the hon. gentleman's permission to ask him——

Mr. DEVLIN. Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS. —if he can state any words I used charging the people of Quebec with being disloyal. I said that I did not use any such words nor any language which could be so construed. My reference was to the leaders of the Liberal party and not to the mass of the people of the province of Quebec, whom I never charged with being disloyal.

Mr. DEVLIN. I was proceeding, in answer to the question of the hon. gentleman, to say, that when, many years ago, I was a boy at college, I heard an expression used which runs like this: 'Timeo hominem unius libri' and I felt, as I listened to the hon. member representing the county of Frontenac, that he was one to whom that expression might be very aptly applied. It was not my intention to go into the merits of his speech, but he invites discussion of it, and I am quite prepared to take up his challenge and discuss it. Let me tell him that he has taken quotations from newspapers in this country that may be adverse to the French Canadian race, he has taken translations which it was proved by the hon. member for St. Anne were not exact, were distorted, he has taken words uttered by one of the greatest French Canadians who ever lived in the province of Quebec, by one whose memory is sacred to the people of that province, a man to whom the province is going to erect a monument, the late Hon. Honoré Mercier, he has taken page after page of the same book, and he has argued from these—what? Let me ask him, was he arguing that the French Canadians of the province of Quebec were a loyal people?

Mr. EDWARDS. I will answer the hon. gentleman since he asks me the question. I was arguing to prove the existence in Quebec, the extent of which I do not know, of an anti-imperial sentiment, due to the teachings of the leaders of the hon. gentleman's own party. As regards the

quotations in the book I am willing to submit that book to which I referred to any gentleman he may name, and I will verify what I said.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman should have invited discussion because I think for his own sake he would have done far better had he allowed his remarks of yesterday to go without having had them put anew upon 'Hansard'. But I will try—and I do it directly against my will in a way—to make it clear to the House that the whole tenor of his speech, or the greater portion of his speech, was designed to show that not only were the French Canadians disloyal, but that hon. members representing constituencies in the province of Quebec were teaching disloyalty to the people of that province. Will the hon. gentleman contradict that?

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman is charging me with saying that the people of the province of Quebec are disloyal. I ask him to either quote those words which he says I used or to withdraw that statement. I did not use any such words, and I ask him either to make good his statement or withdraw his accusation.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have asked the hon. gentleman a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will read the rule which is as follows:

Whatever a member says in explanation—whether relating to the words or the meaning of his speech—is to be taken as true and not afterwards called into question. The words, which he states himeslf to have used, are to be considered as the words actually spoken; and the sense in which he says they were uttered, as the sense in which they are to be taken in the debate. If the member disavows the use of words attributed to him, and objected to, the matter must end.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the Chair and I am most ready to obey your ruling. I am also willing to accept the construction which the hon. member has put upon his words, but which I am inclined to think the actual words do not bear out. Now, Sir, I shall proceed to quote from the speech of the hon. member and I only do so in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) has invited me.

Mr. PAQUET. Will you allow me a question? Do you think that all French Canadians to-day are not loyal to the British Crown.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I stated some time ago very clearly and distinctly—

Mr. PAQUET. Please answer.

Mr. EDWARDS. Just sit down.

Mr. EDWARDS. Continue to read.

Mr. EDWARDS. I shall do so. You shall get just as much of your speech to-night as you want if you continue interrupting me.

Mr. EDWARDS. All right.

Mr. DEVLIN. I continue to quote.

Mr. EDWARDS. Just sit down. I stated very clearly and distinctly that I accepted the position taken last night by the member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) when he said that the people of the province of Quebec were not disloyal.

The hon. gentleman did not know it until Mr. Rivet told him so:

I have not said one word to charge the mass of the people of the province of Quebec with disloyalty.

Mr. EDWARDS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. Oh, that speech is not finished yet.

I have not said anything that could be construed into such a charge. On the contrary, I have said that the people of the province of Quebec have shown a more than ordinary intelligence in resisting the political leaders who for political purposes essayed to lead them from their allegiance, and I do not propose to allow any hon. gentleman from the province of Quebec or from any other province sitting on that side of the House or this to prevert my language.

Mr. EDWARDS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. What did the hon. gentleman mean? He meant that the leaders of political thought in the province of Quebec, irrespective of party, taught disloyalty to the people of the province of Quebec, and these are the words which I object to.

Mr. EDWARDS. I named the men.

Mr. DEVLIN. They are not all named.

Mr. EDWARDS. I may have left some of them out. I thought I named enough to satisfy you when I named your leader for one.

Mr. DEVLIN. Who?

Mr. EDWARDS. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. FIELDING. You did not name the Conservative premier of 1896 who circulated the book.

Mr. EDWARDS. I don't think the past record of the Finance Minister will bear close examination in that respect.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is going to get into deep water if he begins to name the men whom he charges with disloyalty in the province of Quebec. To-night he mentioned one; he mentioned the name of a statesman who commands the respect of all races and of all creeds throughout this continent when he mentioned the name of

the Prime Minister. Sir, what is the attitude taken by the Conservatives in my native province? Some of the political friends of the hon. member for Frontenac charge the Prime Minister with disloyalty to his race because forsooth according to their statement he is too loyal, and to-night we have the Conservative member for Frontenac charging the venerable leader of this House with disloyalty to the British Crown. Has the hon. gentleman any other leader of the French Canadians to mention? The hon. gentleman does not reply. I am glad he is not willing to continue the discussion, because the less he says about the disloyalty of the people of the province of Quebec the better for himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall refer to an incident or two in the history of our country, and before doing so, I may state that while I have no mandate to speak for the people of Quebec, I have the honour to represent 30,000 of that race, and I want to protest in the name of my constituents, as well as in the name of French Canadians of Quebec generally, against any charge of disloyalty whether against their leaders—as the hon. member for Frontenac says, irrespective of party—or against the people themselves. I have not allowed political bias to carry me away to such a degree that I would charge any hon. member who does not share my views with disloyalty, but I will say to the hon. member for Frontenac here and now, that the leaders of political thought in the province of Quebec, from Sir Geogre Etienne Cartier down to Sir Wilfrid Laurier have been amongst the most loyal men that Canada has ever known. I remind the hon. member for Frontenac that in 1862, Sir John Macdonald having failed to get a Militia Bill through the legislature, it was the French Canadian leader, Sir George Etienne Cartier, who succeeded in that task, thanks to the support he received from his native province, in passing that Militia Bill. This incident is known to every student of history, but I cite it for the instruction of the hon. member (Mr. Edwards), who for the first time learned last night from the hon. member from Hochelaga that the people of the province of Quebec are a loyal people. Let me say that when Sir George E. Cartier succeeded in carrying that measure, the 'Journal de Quebec,' which was never well disposed towards Cartier praised him for his success in these words:

> The Minister of Militia has succeeded where many expected to see him fall. He has nobly retrieved his fortune and has his revenge for his defeat of 1862.

Another French Canadian paper 'La Minerve,' added:

> All those present at the sittings of the House during which Mr. Cartier expounded his militia scheme are unanimous in saying that no other speech of his ever carried more weight or authority, but nothing else could have been expected from the minister who is considered as master of the situation. This is due to the influence derived from his popularity in Lower Canada and to the confidence which his integrity and honesty as a statesman give him in the other provinces.

Let me say further to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) that if the French Canadian people or at least a large portion of them, are ready to support the government of to-day on a naval policy, it is due to the teaching of the erstwhile leader of the Conservative party, Sir George E. Cartier, and to the teaching of the present leader of the government, another distinguished French Canadian. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the French Canadian people do not claim anything out of the ordinary. They have secured certain rights by the treaty of 1763, they have secured certain rights by the Quebec Act of 1774, and they have certain rights which were granted to them by the British North America Act of 1867, upon which our constitution is based. I have yet to hear in the province of Quebec that the French Canadian race are claiming any further rights than those that were given to them by the authority of the British Crown, and those that are given to them by the constitution of their country. Has the hon. member for Frontenac ever inquired whether there might not have been disloyal people from other sources? Does the hon. gentleman remember a speech that was delivered by Sir John Young on his arrival in Canada? Let me quote a passage of it to him. On July 15, 1869, Sir John Young said:

> At the present moment Canada is in reality independent. It has its own destinies in its own hands, and its statesmen and people are recognized as competent to judge of their interests as to what course to pursue to conciliate those interests. England looks to them for her guidance, and whatever their decision may be, either to continue the present connection or in due time and the maturity of their growth to exchange it for some other form of alliance.

This would be fearfully disloyal language if it were used now by me; but I hope no hon. member of this House will charge me with disloyalty because I repeat the words of Sir John Young. As my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton is giving considerable attention to this question of loyalty, I would like for his benefit to read a passage from the 'Times' of London, which is not a French Canadian paper, but the great organ of public opinion in England.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it an editorial or a report?

Mr. DEVLIN. It is an editorial. The 'Times' about the same time said:

Now, what is meant by speaking of England as the mother country? What is to be understood by the description of Australia, Canada and the rest of her colonies? If all that is intended to remind us of the historical fact that the citizens of Canada, New South Wales and Victoria are mainly of English origin and descent, we shall not quarrel with the accuracy of the statement, although we may doubt the pertinence of the phrases.

The article goes on:

Let us then in the interest of truth and right conclusions, discard altogether the phrase 'another country' in the discussions which are before us; let us even use with deliberation, words apparently so innocent as 'England' and 'Colony' and remember that what we are called upon to weigh and determine is the proper relations of Englishmen, Australians and Canadians.

I can hardly understand that such language, coming from such an eminent person as Sir John Young and from the London 'Times', would shock the sensitive ears of certain hon. gentlemen opposite, and I regret for their sake that such language should ever have been used. But I wish to show, from the words of His Excellency the present Governor General of Canada, Earl Grey, that the attitude of the Liberal party upon this subject is the attitude which His Excellency has been proclaiming in this country from coast to coast, and I hope that when I quote his words, as one coming from the province of Quebec, I shall not be charged with disloyalty. After the very elaborate speeches which have been delivered by the right hon. the Prime Minister, the hon. the Postmaster General and other gentlemen who have followed them upon this side, it would seem as if we might have been able to give a vote upon this subject without giving expression to our opinions. But in view of the awful indictment preferred by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) charging injustice, ingratitude and treason to our province, not in the same sense as the charge by the hon. member for Frontenac, but in an opposite sense, it becomes imperative to speak our minds. What led up to this Bill? We have heard of this imperial union which has been spoken of tonight, for many years past in this country. There have been conferences between the home government and the governments of the dominions beyond the seas for a great number of years. England has been telling Canada time and again that we have been knocking at her door for assistance long enough, and she has been asking Canada to assist herself. The right hon. Joseph Chamberlain at one of the conferences asked what contribution Canada would be ready to make to the imperial navy. Canada answered, as Canada has always answered, that she would be prepared to defend the shores of this country. That seems to me to have been a reasonable sequence of the discussions which have taken place in this House from time to time on this question. What did the hon. member for North Toronto propose in this House? The wording of his resolution is this:

That in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

That was apparently the accepted policy of the Conservative party, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier did not propose any amendment or offer any objection to such an attitude being taken by this House. Now, Sir, what interpretation could be given to these words which I have just read? Simply the same theory as has been proclaimed from ocean to ocean by His Excellency Earl Grey, the Governor General of Canada. At the risk of being charged with disloyalty, as a member coming from the province of Quebec, I would like to call the attention of the House to some remarks which were made upon this very subject by His Excellency in the city of Quebec on August 22, 1906.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that to quote or to refer to the Sovereign or his representative with the view of influencing the minds of members is not in order. I will read to the hon. gentlemen the passage:

The use of the name of the Sovereign, or his representative, in debate, so as to interfere with the freedom of discussion or for the purpose of influencing the determination of the House or the votes of members in respect to any matter pending in parliament, is out of order.

It may be that the hon. gentleman would not seriously think that, but I would prefer that he did not quote His Excellency in this debate.

Mr. DEVLIN. I was not quoting the Governor General, but Earl Grey in the speeches delivered throughout the length and breadth of this land on this subject. I could undertsand that the King must not be brought into the discussion of political issues, but if His Excellency, the Governor General, delivers throughout Canada a series of lectures upon imperial questions, I take it for granted that, in so doing, he is

not speaking as the Governor General of Canada, but simply as Earl Grey, and it was simply the words of Earl Grey, that I meant to quote. But of course, Sir, if you rule that I am not to quote any language uttered by Earl Grey——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be better that the hon. gentleman should not. I cannot discriminate between Earl Grey and the Governor General at the present time. The rule is explicit enough.

Mr. DEVLIN. I bow to your ruling, Sir. I had no desire to be discourteous to the Governor General, and shall, in obedience to your ruling, pass over what His Excellency has said.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman has been understood as being in any sense discourteous, but simply as not being in accord with the rule of the House, which forbids any expressions of opinion by the Governor General to be used in debate.

Mr. DEVLIN. I was going to quote from a pamphlet which was printed in Ottawa by the King's Printer and entitled 'Addresses to His Excellency Earl Grey, Governor General of Canada and His speeches in reply,' having relation to the resources and progress of the Dominion. These are, in a sense, speeches from the Throne, which we are allowed to discuss in this House. This pamphlet was sent me, I do not know by whom, but I always presumed it was sent by His Excellency for my benefit; and as I found in it certain passages bearing upon the subject before the House, I was simply going to give the House the benefit of them. I quite understand the rule of the House that no hon. member may use the name of His Majesty or His Majesty's representative or any member of the Royal Family in any way that would reflect upon them or in any discourteous way; but I never knew that expressions of opinion from His Excellency, which he had been giving on every platform in the Dominion, should not be referred to in this House, more especially when such expressions have been commented on by every newspaper and on every platform in the land. Is this House the only place in the whole Dominion in which may not be quoted the words of His Excellency used? It was not my intention to speak discourteously of His Excellency, but simply to quote his speeches. Is that against the rule?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not a question of discourtesy at all. The rule is that no reference may be made to the representative of the Sovereign for the purpose of influencing the votes or opinions of members in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I must say that even the statement made by the hon. gentleman implying that the Governor General sent him this pamphlet would in itself naturally provoke discussion if went on with, and would lead to irregularity in the debate which it is very desirable to avoid.

Mr. DEVLIN. I submit, Mr. Speaker, to your ruling.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Without questioning your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I may say that His Excellency drew a distinction in the speeches delivered in the Northwest, in which he said he spoke as Earl Grey, but not as the Governor General.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know what the article is, but I presume it is complimentary to His Excellency, but is it not better to keep all this thing out of debate and observe the rule?

Mr. DEVLIN. I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) says, it may be just as well to keep His Excellency out of the debate; but as most of the eminent men of the United Kingdom have been quoted, I thought it would not be derogatory to the dignity of His Excellency to give his opinion also.

After the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) offered his resolution, the government proposed another resolution which was in the nature of the policy this government intended to adopt. That resolution read as follows:

> The House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.
>
> The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury.

I would like to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to those words:

> For naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.
>
> The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.
>
> The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) did not at that moment offer any objection or give notice of any amendment, and the resolution was adopted unanimously and declared to be the policy of this country, and that resolution is in conformity with the Bill we are now considering. I submit that, no matter what may have been the differences of opinion as to the advisability of the introduction of such a resolution, once it had been passed, and passed unanimously, there was no alternative for the government, but to bring down the Bill they did. Let me say that the building of a navy for Canada, as one of the great nations within the British empire, imposes itself as a necessity upon the Canadian people. Our population is increasing, our resources are being developed, Canada is gradually growing into nationhood, our exports are increasing beyond the dreams of the Canada of a few years ago. We have been invited, time and again, to do our share towards upholding the strength of the British empire. We have been invited to contribute towards the British navy. We have been invited to build our own ships. And, in the consideration of the different proposals which were before this country, Canada adopted the course which, to my mind, was the wisest, that of building a navy of her own.

Let me say a word about the criticism that is offered to that navy as a navy. The hon. member for St. Anne, Montreal (Mr. Doherty)—and I will not criticise his speech at all—spoke of a navy as a means of attack, and not as a means of defence. Well, Sir, that is a pretty fine distinction to draw. A navy may be a means of attack if attack is necessary, but always a means of defence. Now, not only that but he and other hon. gentlemen opposite have criticised the advisability of building what they have termed 'this small flotilla'. I am unfortunately, not a naval expert, and I have been forced to go to authorities for information upon navy matters. In the course of reading the expressions at the several conferences, I came upon this word, uttered by Lord Tweedmouth, the First Lord of the Admiralty:

> There is, I think, a further advantage in these small flotillas, that they will be an admirable means of coast defence.

Sir, I take the opinion of the First Lord of the Admiralty as against the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite. And if the First Lord of the Admiralty tells the representatives of our country in London, and tells this parliament, through the conference, that what this government proposes to build in the way of a navy, this 'flotilla' that the government proposes to build, would be a sure means of defence of our shores, then, Sir, I think we have lived up to that portion of the resolution which was introduced in this House by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster):

> To the suitable protection of our exposed coast line and our great sea ports.

—and to the resolution of the government when we say that—

> —we are prepared to defend our coast and our shores.

If the opinion of the First Lord of the Admiralty is not proper information in matters naval, I must candidly confess, Sir, that I do not know where to seek for better. During the course of the debate, when hon. gentlemen opposite were forced to change front upon this subject, I was reminded very much of the words uttered by an eminent author: 'The human race is divided into classes, those who go ahead and do something, and those who sit back and ask why it is not done the other way.' It seems to me that is about the position: They sit back and say of every proposition in the matter of the construction of a navy, 'Why wasn't it done the other way?' Let me quote to the House the words of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. Speaker, I find that it may be some considerable time before I get through the remarks which I propose to make, as I have not entered upon the merits of the Bill, and I propose to discuss the merits. If the House would prefer it, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The House will go into Committee of Supply, and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will take up his estimates again.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 25, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE ALBERT MEDAL—HEROISM OF CONDUCTOR REYNOLDS.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to refer to a matter which was brought to the attention of the House

the 8th of this month by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden). My hon. friend drew the attention of the House to the herosim displayed by Conductor Thomas Reynolds in rescuing a number of people in the wreck of the 21st of January last, at the Spanish river crossing of the Canadian Pacific railway, and suggested that application be made to the imperial authorities for a suitable recognition of the heroic conduct of Conductor Reynolds. Had I been in my seat at the time, I would have been glad to inform my hon. friend and the House that, prior to his inquiry, application had been made for an award of the Albert Medal, the highest honour conferred in such cases by His Majesty the King. Just before coming to the House to-day, I had the pleasure of receiving the following cablegram:

Greatly pleased to advise you that the King has awarded the Albert medal of first-class to Thomas Reynolds. When received it will be transmitted to you.

STRATHCONA.

SUPPLY—EXPORT OF HORSES FROM ONTARIO.

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

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL. Before we go into Supply, there is a matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the House, and more particularly of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). It has reference to the exportation of horses from Ontario to our western provinces. Horses brought from Saskatchewan into Manitoba are met at the border by a veterinary surgeon who examines them for any contagious disease, and in the case of the importation into my province from any other province to the south, the horses are examined at the borders of my province. But horses from Ontario are not so treated. I understand that the custom is to examine them at the point of shipment in Ontario, but that does not seem satisfactory. A case that has occurred within the last few weeks was brought to my attention the other day. A horse shipped from Toronto in a carload developed glanders inside a few days and was shot for that disease. With the method employed in shipping horses a horse thus affected might infect all the animals in the car and all the stock yards at the feeding points; the water troughs, the hay racks and the thousands of horses shipped over the same route are subjected to that infection. Glanders is the worst disease to which horses are subject. It is incurable and very contagious not only to horses, but to men, and men so infected die a horrible death. The horses exposed to contagion in such a case go to a hundred different points and may carry the contagion all through the western provinces. I think it is up to the government and the Minister of Agriculture to take such steps as will prevent the possibility of such occurrences and protect the farmers of my county. I would also point out to him that the sales stables in different large centres are sometimes in the most disreputable condition as respects the health of horses.

Mr. FISHER. Was that horse shot by order of one of my officers?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. FISHER. Then I can assure the hon. gentleman that any animal that has been in contact with that horse in cars, stables or yards through which it has passed will be carefully watched, and the cars, etc., carefully investigated and disinfected immediately. That is part of the orders and practice of our department. Whenever any animals have been in contact with an animal infected with glanders, they are all watched, and we see that all places where the infected animal has been are disinfected. No doubt a report of this case has been sent to the department. I have not heard of it myself, but I have no doubt my officers have heard and I shall make inquiries.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I received my information from a shipper. The horse passed through and was fed in the various yards all the way from Toronto to Yorkton. It passed through some four or five weeks ago, and up until four days ago there had been no disinfecting of the yards. That is the point that I want the minister to notice.

Mr. FISHER. I shall look into it.

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

Public works—harbours and rivers, Quebec —Pointe aux Trembles (en bas), wharf improvements, $2,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This $2,000 is to make provision towards constructing a building for use as a waiting room and constructing guards at the side of the wharf. It is expected the work will cost $2,500 altogether.

Rimouski wharf—repairs and improvements, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to put on a new planking.

Rivière aux Vases—wharf near its mouth on northeast side of River Saguenay, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the sheathing on the part of the wharf already built, and to construct 100 feet more, consisting of one pier and head block. It is believed this will complete the work.

River Ottawa—beach protection work on Vaudreuil Cove, $3,100.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. What is the nature of this beach protection work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been made to appear to my satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the resident engineer, that this work is necessitated by reason of other works which have been constructed on the river, and which have raised the water so that erosion has thereby been caused by the increased floods. That is the ground upon which it is put. I hesitated until I got all the information and was satisfied there was good ground for that contention.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this complete the improvements?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will require $1,900 more.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On whose property are these improvements located?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not on anybody's property. I think there is a roadway passing near the water, the road allowance goes to the bank.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is there any wharf there or landing at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is not in connection with any navigation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is what the engineer says:

The rapid and dangerous erosion of the bank here is due to the construction of locks and dams at St. Anne de Bellevue, and by the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific railway of numerous large stone piers, thus producing increased high water in the lake. The damages complained of are due to this increased flow.

So the injury we are seeking to guard against was caused first by the construction of the locks and dam at St. Anne, which is a government work, and to a certain extent also by the bridges of the two railway companies, which of course were constructed with the consent and approval of the government. But as I understand, the greatest cause of the erosion has been the construction of the lock and dam.

Rivière Ouelle wharf—repairs and improvements, $4,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for repairs to the Rivière Ouelle wharf urged by the resident engineer. This will complete the work, the total cost of which will be about $8,000.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Did the government originally construct this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a wharf built there away back in 1856, and the government in 1906 made an extension or built a spur to the wharf. It is owned by the government. This is the place where the government steamer lands which runs in connection with the Intercolonial across to Murray Bay.

Mr. WRIGHT. When did the government purchase this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it has always been a government wharf since the time of confederation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was built before confederation. Some years ago the Intercolonial built a spur line from the village of Ouelle to the St. Denis wharf. It gives a winter service to the village of Ouelle.

River Richelieu—improvements, $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue the very important work of improvement upon the Richelieu river. The matter was fully discussed at the last session, when the vote for this purpose was granted. The improvements consist of a lock and dam at or near the city of St. John upon the Richelieu river, and also of the dredging and removing of large boulders which are in the channel. The object is to improve navigation, and at the same time to prevent the flooding of a vast section of country which has been flooded almost every year by the waters of the Richelieu.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. While I do not object to this appropriation in itself, I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that this improvement is designed to perform a service on the Richelieu river which he denied to us on the Fraser river, on the ground that it was impossible for the government to make such expenditure unless it was to be made for the improvement of navigation. Now the minister has just stated that this item was for the improvement of navigation, and also that it was in connection with the works being carried on on the Richelieu river. I have referred to his report, and I see that the primary object of this work is, not for the improvement of navigation, but to save this land from inundation. Now I wish to make myself quite plain, I am not opposing any vote for that purpose; I think it is a matter to which this government should give attention. But, the point I wish to make is that when the Dominion government makes a large expenditure of this kind to save lands from inundation in one province, the government is in duty bound to make a like expenditure in other provinces. I find in the annual report of the Minister of Public Works this paragraph with respect to Richelieu improvements:

Along the upper part of the river from the boundary to St. Johns, a distance of 22 miles, the shores are all low lands, except the first two miles.

These low lands are covered at high water for sometimes over two months, long enough to prevent the culture of large areas. This high water also extends over the shores of the tributaries of the Richelieu such as Rivière du Sud and Rivière au Brochet. Some 40,000 acres of land are thus rendered entirely useless.

Then it gives the parishes. The report proceeds:

In order to lower the water and prevent the annual floods, it was decided to dredge a channel, 1,750 feet wide (the whole width of the river at its narrowest place), and 5,200 feet long.

I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that in this official report of the operations on the Richelieu river there is not one word about these improvements being necessary in the interests of navigation. We must take it that the engineer who makes this report, the chief engineer of the department, is speaking by the book, and that he is making a faithful and trustworthy report to this parliament with respect to the real object of these improvements. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that we on the Fraser river are entitled in equity to similar improvements which will protect our lands from flooding at Chiliwack, Matsqui, Langely, Nicomen Island and Ladner, where the conditions are precisely the same as we find here. We claim the protection on the Fraser river that is given on the Richelieu river, and we claim it not only as a matter of equity, but as a matter of compact with this government that has undertaken to give to us in the province of British Columbia expenditures of the same nature as are made in any other province of the Dominion. I wish the minister would take this seriously into his consideration, because, although this is a matter which has been mentioned frequently here, and has been met very casually by the minister, I wish to say that the conditions are getting so serious that the people of British Columbia will not permit their representatives in parliament to go without blame if they continue to vote money for expenditures in other provinces which are denied to the province of British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) says that no stress has heretofore been laid on the fact that these improvements are for the purpose of aiding the navigation of the Richelieu river. I am quite sure my hon. friend is entirely in error as to that.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. If the minister will permit me, I was quoting from his own annual report here, and I said that in this report there is no reference of that nature.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find in the note which I have, and which is taken from the reports, that it is claimed that this movable dam will afford considerable advantage to the navigation of the river and permit dispensing with the dredging which has now to be done at regular intervals between St. John and Lake Champlain. It will also provide an increased depth in the Chambly canal of at least one foot, and with the additional improvements, 9 feet of water can be obtained in the canal prism instead of 7. I repeat that the object of this improvement is two-fold. One effect will be to improve the navigation of the Richelieu river, which is a very important stretch of navigable water connecting the St. Lawrence River system with Lake Champlain and the Hudson river in the state of New York.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is the Richelieu river more important than the Fraser river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not compelled to answer that question at the moment. I will come to the Fraser river in a few minutes, and I think my hon. friend will say that this government has done full justice to the claims of those who are interested in the improvement of the Fraser river. I also repeat that the effect of this improvement will be to prevent an enormous amount of otherwise good land from being periodically flooded by the waters of the Richelieu river. I think my hon. friend will agree that the work is an important one. In regard to the Fraser river, my hon. friend says that his constituents will complain if he does not, while considering items for other provinces, insist upon similar work being done on the Fraser. No one appreciates to a greater extent than I do the importance of the Fraser river, and as an evidence of the importance which I attach to that great river, I may say that last year the government, upon my recommendation, purchased a suction dredge called the 'Fruhling' at a large cost, a dredge which is one of the very best operating upon either the Atlantic or the Pacific coast, and the primary object of the purchasing of that dredge was the improvement of the Fraser river. We have, through the engineering department, laid out a system of improvements on the Fraser river, by means of dredging and by means of jetties, which we expect will give a ship channel 30 feet in depth from the city of Westminster to the Gulf of Georgia. We anticipate that these improvements are going to cost this country at least $1,000,000, and yet, when we have engaged in this great work and have asked parliament to vote money for the purpose of carrying it on, it seems that the hon. gentleman feels

it to be his duty, when we are asking for a small amount for the River Richelieu, to rise and protest against this item being passed unless a similar item is put in the estimates for a certain improvement on the Fraser river.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I do not think the minister is quite fair in his remarks. I do not think he has interpreted fairly what I said. He seems to have entirely misunderstood my remarks. I did not protest against this work on the Richelieu river, but I did object to the policy laid down by the minister the other evening in answer to a question addressed to him by myself, wherein he said that work of this kind would not be carried on any longer, that this government would not any longer make outlays in any of the provinces except for the improvement of navigation. If that is strictly adhered to, no doubt we in British Columbia can stand it as well as the people of any other province, but I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that we in British Columbia are very large contributors to the general revenue of the Dominion, that we pay to Canada every year many hundreds of thousands of dollars, or, many millions of dollars, in excess of all the expenditures upon the province of British Columbia. Therefore, it is our good British Columbia money that is being spent to a considerable extent on these Richelieu river improvements, and it seems to us an intolerable position that, while our money is being spent upon the protection of property throughout Canada, the minister should lay down the principle that we must not ask for any of that protection in British Columbia. What I am asking for is equal rights. I am not jealous of any other constituency getting improvements, but I do object to one yard stick being applied to eastern districts which are near, which are under the eye of the minister, and in which the department seems to take more particular interest, and another yard stick being applied to British Columbia. I think the minister lays too much stress upon the cost of this magnificent dredge, the 'Fruhling,' and tells us too little of what the 'Fruhling' has accomplished. The question is not as to whether the minister has spent $300,000 on that dredge. What we would like to hear from the minister is what the dredge is doing, what progress it is making, not giving its capacity per hour or its capacity per lift, but how many lifts will be necessary to carry through the work, and what return we get for this $300,000. Moreover, to say that the dredge 'Fruhling' is working at the mouth of the Fraser river comes very far short of being an answer to our request for improvements on the Fraser river. I would like to point out that the work of the 'Fruhling' at the mouth of the river does not meet the requirements of the people along the Fraser, because, as I told the minister just now, the lands that are flooded are not immediately at the mouth of the river. We are applying for protection at distances long removed from the mouth of the river, at Chiliwack, at Matsqui, at Nicomen island, at Langley, and throughout the Delta, and to answer me that the department has bought a $300,000 dredge and put it to work at the mouth of the river is not an answer to our request for protection to works from Chiliwack down, to which we think we are entitled.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that my hon. friend on reflection will see that the question as to the money the government is expending on the Fraser river in British Columbia is an important question to consider in connection with other improvements in the same locality. We cannot spend all the moneys of Canada in the one place, and when we have made out a plan for a million dollars for improvements on the Fraser river I think it will be said that we are dealing—I will not say generously, but dealing justly with the important interests on the Fraser river. The hon. gentleman speaks of the large revenues derived from the people of British Columbia. I am very glad British Columbia is so prosperous. The population of the province is not large but the province has been blessed by Providence with resources of enormous value. We are all glad to see British Columbia improving so rapidly. I notice by the newspapers that the provincial government proposes to expend during the coming year some $7,000,000 which shows that their revenues are buoyant and that they are in a position to make improvements which other provinces are perhaps not able to make. My hon. friend will of course have an opportunity of discussing the Fraser river improvements later on, but when he complains that outside of this dredging work we are doing nothing for the Fraser river, I would call his attention to page 71 of the items for British Columbia in which he will see that under the head 'Fraser river (lower) wing dam, bank protection works inclusive of repairs', we are spending $35,000, in addition to the $25,000 which we expended last year.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. It was not my intention to say that the government were doing nothing for British Columbia, and I do not think I said it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is certainly giving that impression because he is seeking to convey the idea to the people of British Columbia that British Columbia is being discriminated against with regard to these improvements.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the inference that the hon gentleman (Mr. Taylor) seeks to have drawn by the people whom he represents.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. With regard to this particular kind of work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the item I have read we are providing for work of a similar character to that which the hon. gentleman has already brought to the attention of the committee. But, so far as I recollect the hon. gentleman has not spoken of works to prevent the surrounding country from being flooded. I understood the hon. gentleman to speak of work to prevent the erosion of the banks of the Fraser river. And when the hon. gentleman the other day mentioned that class of work I spoke of the fact that while we have done work of that character in different provinces we were not prepared to recognize that it was the duty of the federal government to engage extensively in such work. I think on reflection the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Taylor) will see that we are endeavouring to treat the province of British Columbia as fairly as any other province in Canada, and I do feel quite sure that if instead of complaining, when some item for another province is under consideration, he would prefer his particular request to my department it would be better, because then the request could be carefully considered on its merits irrespective entirely of what is being done for other provinces. I am sure the hon. gentleman will feel that he should not interpose any obstacle in the way of this vote passing, and when we come to British Columbia I shall be glad to hear any representations as to the particular needs of that province.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I have again to call the attention of the minister to the fact that he is persistently misquoting my remarks. I do not know how parliamentary it is to say that, but I have stated three times, if not oftener, that I have not opposed this item, and I object to the minister persisting in stating as he did state several times—and he was corrected by me each time—that I was opposing this vote. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that as a representative from British Columbia I am not to be gagged in this committee by any misinterpretation put upon my remarks by the minister, and every time such misinterpretation is given I shall feel it my duty to stand up and correct him and to tell him that he is misquoting the observations I have made to the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surley when the hon. gentleman, without waiting for the British Columbia items to come under consideration, rises in his place and complains that this item is being put in for improvements in one province and there is no similar item for improvements for the province from which he comes, that is throwing an obstruction upon the item and seeking to raise an objection in the minds of the members of this committee against the vote being granted. In effect, the hon. gentleman says: It is not right or proper to make that appropriation for Quebec unless you make a similar appropriation for British Columbia. Although the work may be similar in principle we are not making an appropriation for any work of a like character. It does seem to me that a fair inference from the hon. gentleman's remarks is that he wants the people of British Columbia and of his constituency to believe that by voting this item for the Richelieu river and not voting a similar item for the Fraser river we are doing an injustice to the province of British Columbia, that we are discriminating against that province and treating the province of Quebec with a favour which we deny to the province from which he comes. If that is not a fair inference to draw from his remarks I fail to understand the meaning of language.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I wish to say that the minister during the course of the last part of the remarks which he has just now made correctly interpreted me. That is precisely what I wish this House and the province of British Columbia to understand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought so.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. But, in the first portion of his last address to the committee the minister reiterated that I opposed this vote, and I wish to state again for the fifth time that he is wrong in saying that I oppose this vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the purpose of the hon. gentleman's observations?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. If the minister had been listening to me when I first spoke, instead of carrying on a side conversation, he would have understood precisely what was the purpose of my remarks. The purpose of what I said was that whereas the minister stated to this committee the other evening, in answer to me, that works of this kind could not be expected in future, that this government had carefully considered the matter and had come to the conclusion that they would not grant them in the future; that whereas he gave that to me as a complete answer and an intimation that we need not ask for them, we are now called upon to vote this money for similar works. I say we are willing to vote for these works and that it is our

duty to vote for them, and that it is the duty of the government to make appropriations like this. But I say, further, that when they are made they should not be confined to one district or to four or five districts and denied to another district. That is the sole purpose of my rising to speak in connection with this vote for the Richelieu river. My purpose was to attract the attention of the minister to the fact that he is giving here a vote which he has represented to us we need not ask for British Columbia because we will not get it.

Mr. COWAN. The minister has made one statement that I cannot allow to go unchallenged. He says that this government is not discriminating against British Columbia. I would like him to understand that this government has so manipulated the power of indirect taxation that it is taking out of British Columbia $3 per head of the population for $1 per head of the population of the rest of Canada. Since this government came into power in 1896, it has actually taken out of the pockets of the people of British Columbia over $11,000,000 that it has not returned to the people of British Columbia, but has expended in the other provinces. Not only so, but this government has borrowed, until the borrowing power of the Dominion is pretty well exhausted, and spent every dollar of the money so borrowed, not in British Columbia, but in other provinces of Canada. Now, I think the object of confederation was that there should be equitable treatment of the various provinces and that the expenditures should not be made necessarily where the big vote is, but where they are needed in the development of the country. What has been the fact? In British Columbia, as every one knows, public works necessarily cost a great deal more than they do in the level provinces of Canada. No account is taken of that fact. The minister has said that the British Columbia government is going to spend a large amount of money on public works this year. It is obliged to spend that money because of the neglect of the duty cast on the Dominion government to look after the public works of British Columbia. The minister says our revenues are buoyant. In British Columbia we have a direct tax on land of 1 per cent of its value in the hands of a solvent debtor, a tax on personal property of 1 per cent, a tax on wild land of 5 per cent, an income tax of from 1½ to 4 per cent, a tax on minerals of $2 per ton. There is not another province in the whole Dominion of Canada that has any one of these taxes; and they are not municipal taxes, but provincial taxes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not the provincial tax in lieu of all municipal taxes?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR.

Mr. COWAN. No, it is not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the provincial government look after all the roads and all the court houses?

Mr. COWAN. No. A very large portion of British Columbia is not under municipal government. In the very nature of things it could not be. Remember that our arable lands are in most cases in narrow valleys and gulches surrounded by snow-capped mountains, and are not sufficiently settled for municipalities to be organized; they are unorganized districts. Outside of the large cities and the more thickly settled suburban districts, this is practically the condition of things in British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend pardon me a moment? I think he will agree with me that it was quite right that I should answer the hon. member for Westminster, but it does not seem to me that it is in order for another hon. gentleman to rise in his place and start in with a general discussion of the circumstances and the local conditions in the province of British Columbia. Of course, my hon. friend might and probably will refer pretty fully to British Columbia when we reach the British Columbia items; but on an item for the improvement of the Richelieu river, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman is hardly in order in giving us a long speech on the municipal and local conditions of British Columbia, its snow-capped mountains and beautiful valleys, with all of which we are very familiar. On another occasion I would be delighted to hear the hon. gentleman, but it seems to me that we should confine ourselves to the item under consideration.

Mr. COWAN. The minister remarked that there was no discrimination against British Columbia, and I wished to show him that his statement is entirely inaccurate. If he will withdraw that statement, there will be no occasion for any further remarks from me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman. I can say that I am not aware that there is any discrimination, and there is no desire to discriminate.

Mr. COWAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the minister's lack of knowledge on the subject calls for a little passing comment. Until he has knowledge that will make him aware of British Columbia conditions, it seems to me that it would be better for him not to give us even that negative statement. If he will say that even that negative statement should not have been made by him, I would be quite satisfied, and the only thing I could do would be to take my seat. Does he withdraw it? I understand the hon. minister withdraws even that negative statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad you have such a good understanding.

River Saguenay—dredging and other improvements, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the improvement of deep water navigation. It is to make a navigable channel by dredging and also improve the approaches to the wharf at Chicoutimi and form a turning basin.

River St. Lawrence—protection wall along south shore between Laprairie and Little St. James river, $11,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work will be 3,800 feet long and 25 feet on top with slopes. It is to be rip-rapped and covered with concrete. The estimated cost is $11,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is this to protect navigation or the banks of the river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to protect the town of Laprairie against the annual damage caused by ice shoves and floods, which prevent communication with Montreal by land at certain seasons. The necessity for this has been caused by the erection of the Montreal and Verdun dykes built by the Harbour Commission. That takes this work out of the category of general works for the protection of banks.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a bend in the River St. Lawrence below Lachine rapids and a large bay fronting Laprairie. For years the whole village of Laprairie, which is an important place, has been flooded and loss of life and property has been occasioned thereby. These works were laid down many years ago by the late Sir Hector Langevin, then Minister of Public Works, and it is absolutely necessary that this protection wall should be built, as the flooding is largely due to the piers of Victoria bridge and the guard pier.

Mr. M. CURRIE. What has the harbour work to do with this?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The land is very low and is submerged during April and the beginning of May. There is a large pier in the centre of the river at Isle aux Millions near Montreal, and this large pier and the piers of the Victoria bridge as well as the Lachine rapids, and the bend of the river, cause these floods.

Mr. WRIGHT. This land was always flooded before the Victoria bridge was built and there are many other places in Canada in the same position. Do the government assume the responsibility of protecting the shores of all navigable waters, which might be affected by erosions? If they do, we ought to know it. I am not finding fault with the work, but we should know if similar work is to be carried on in other sections.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This protection has been rendered necessary by other works which the government, through the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, has carried on in the vicinity. We have had a petition from the mayors of the municipalities affected asking protection against the annual damage caused by the ice shoves and floods, which entirely prevent communication by land with Montreal at certain times. This protection has been rendered necessary by the Montreal and Verdun dykes built by the Harbour Commissioners. The government did not at once undertake this work, but had the matter investigated by their resident engineer who made the report upon it.

Mr. M. CURRIE. What is the date of the petition and of the report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the date of the petition, but the report of the chief engineer was made in 1909, so that the petition must have been a little before then. Our resident engineer, Mr. Michaud, a very competent man, reported that the construction of these dykes had diminished the flow of the St. Lawrence at that point, and that the proposed work would not only be valuable to the citizens of the town of Laprairie but also to the farmers of Laprairie and Napierville and other parishes, by permitting them to take teams to Montreal at all seasons of the year whereas now, communication by land is stopped during high water.

Mr. WRIGHT. How far are the works below Montreal?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are nine miles above Montreal.

Mr. WRIGHT. That would apply anywhere up the river; it might be assumed that the water would be affected in some way by the works constructed there. I want a pronouncement from the minister on the subject as there are hundreds of places in Canada under similar circumstances, and if works of that kind are being taken in hand by the Dominion government I would be pleased to know of it. I am not finding fault at all but I wish for the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In any case where complaint is made that as a result of the construction of a government work, whether it is a dam or dredging, or any work of a similar character, injury is done to one or more people, I would feel it my duty to investigate the matter, and if I found that by a reasonable expenditure we could relieve the people from the injury caused by such a Dominion work I would do so. That is the only thing involved in the passing of this item. I am not prepared to-day to admit and I think it would require a good deal of argument to in-

duce me to admit that it is the duty of the federal government in all cases to take the necessary steps for the protection of the banks of rivers or the shores of lakes from erosion. I think that this is work of a local character and ought to be attended to by the municipal or provincial authorities. In cases such as I have mentioned, where perhaps there is a vast damage caused and large sections of the country affected, so that it is work of a federal character, we might adopt a different rule. But, speaking generally, I think that work of the character to which my hon. friend has referred is rather for the municipal or provincial authorities to attend to.

Mr. MACDONELL. Did I understand the minister to say that this work was made necessary by works performed by or under the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is the government taking the position that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, who are a duly incorporated body and are largely subsidized by this country, can perform works of a local character, and that if these works cause damage to localities, this government assumes the responsibility of making compensation for these damages? Surely the works of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal can be taken care of by that commission; they have been liberally subsidized by this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do not get a dollar of subsidy.

Mr. MACDONELL. They have had Dominion loans. Is the government taking the position that it is to indemnify either private or public interests for damages caused by the operations or works of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal? There are harbour commissions in other parts of the country that are doing their work in their own way under proper authority. As far as I know where they create damages they pay for them themselves, some proper provision is made for the indemnifying of public or private interests damaged by the works of these harbour commissioners. Is the government creating this precedent that it will make good damages of this nature which have been caused by the Montreal Harbour Commission? If so, it seems that the government is leading itself into a position that is never-ending in so far as making good damages of this kind throughout the country is concerned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not intend to lay down any general rule because I suppose the cases would very seldom arise. I regard the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal as really public officials. They are called on to perform a great national duty in connection with perfecting, improving, enlarging and developing the port of Montreal, the greatest in Canada. They receive no bonus, they cannot engage in harbour work without coming to the government for its approval. They pay interest on the money the government loans to them and they are simply a branch of the public service. I think that where in the performance of their duties in improving the harbour of Montreal they cause flooding several miles away, in sections of the country not within their jurisdiction, it is not unreasonable that the government should perform the work of relieving the people from any damages they may have sustained. The harbour commissioners have no funds which would enable them to carry on work of this character. The money which they raise is all used for the improvement of the harbour. This is outside of their jurisdiction, their district is limited, and I do not see how they could do this work. There would have to be special parliamentary authority to enable them to do it. Without laying down any general rule, I would think that if the harbour commissioners of any part of the country in the performance of work which they undertake with the approval of the government for the improvement of harbours cause damage to individuals outside of their jurisdiction, it would not be unreasonable for the government to take steps to relieve the people of the consequences of that injury. However, I do not want to make any statement to extend beyond the particular work in hand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What difference does it make if the damage is outside or inside their jurisdiction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The harbour commissioners could not build any works outside of their jurisdiction. They would have to come to parliament to get authority to carry on a work of this character outside of their jurisdiction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not suppose they would have any power to build a work of this kind in their jurisdiction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They might if it was for the improvement of the harbour.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have seen some of the works carried on by the Board of Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, and it is not conceivable to me, as a layman, that it interferes with the flow of the St. Lawrence to any appreciable extent, whatever might be said of the Victoria bridge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The dock does interfere.

Mr. WRIGHT. Have not the lands now supposed to be flooded by the improvement of the harbour of Montreal not been flooded before the work was undertaken, in fact every year since settlement first took place on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The representation which was made by the mayors of these various parishes and towns was that the floods had been increased as the result of the building of these dykes at what is known as the Isle au Millions, and the report of the engineer was that while it was not possible to say how much the dykes had impeded the flow of the river, if the waters were held back, the low lands would be flooded, whereas they would not be to the same extent if the waters were allowed to flow freely. The road has been flooded to such a degree that the people could not travel on the highway at high water. We have been satisfied that to a considerable extent this flooding of the highways has been caused by the building of these dykes

Mr. MACDONELL. The representation of the minister makes the case rather worse than I supposed. I am not opposing the expenditure of this money for this particular purpose. I admit this is a necessary public work, from what the minister has said, and from the explanations that have been made. But what I object to is this: Here is a body duly organized under the authority of the government, known as the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. They have large revenues and large resources, they act entirely independently of this government. They cut their coat according to their cloth; they make expenditures, they undertake public works on their own initiative, and carry them out. Now in carrying out these works this board of commissioners causes damage and loss to communities or to indivduals, and this government, without any knowledge of what the board is doing, without having anything to say about these undertakings, without knowing what damages are being done, this government comes along and makes good the damages they have caused. Is that a businesslike proposition? I have some knowledge of the operations of the Board of Harbour Commissioners of the city of Toronto. Whatever work they do, they have to pay for, and if any damages are caused by their works they settle the Bill themselves. Here the country is paying consequential damages resulting from the operations of this board, indiscriminately, without apparently having any control over them, and without knowing the extent to which they are being let in for damages. I object to that principle as unbusinesslike and improper, and I do not think the government ought to ask us to pass this vote.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am sure I am convinced by the statement of the Postmaster General, and of the Minister of Public Works that this is a very praiseworthy appropriation. I would like to point out to the minister that the operations of this department are more extensive and comprehensive that he has any idea of. If I may be permitted to mention an item which is not in the present estimates, but is taken from the report of the minister, I find that he goes beyond repairing damage done by the Harbour Commissioners, or by works carried on under his government, and he goes beyond works necessary to promote the navigation of rivers. I have under my hand this item in his report respecting the River St. Louis, page 120:

During the spring high water the River St. Louis spreads over the farming lands from the canal feeder to the village of St. Louis de Gonzague, a distance of about seven miles and thus causes considerable damage. During the summer, the river often overflows equally after a heavy rain storm, and extensive fields of promising crops have been entirely lost. . . . By proper deepening of the river bed and straightening of certain curves, the waters should be lowered some four feet, which would be amply sufficient to protect the farmers along the banks.

Now, I say by all means protect these farmers along the banks, but do not limit the protection to those particular farmers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does my hon. friend object to the proposed work in the River St. Louis?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Certainly not.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may inform my hon. friend that the flood in that section of the county of Beauharnois is caused every year by the entrance to the Beauharnois canal constructed by the government. The level of the water of the St. Louis has been raised, and for years and years there has been some work carried on there in order to minimize as much as possible the damage caused by that flood. Now, this is a great public work which was started long before confederation, and which has been going on ever since. The new work on the Beauharnois canal made some fifteen or sixteen years ago, has even affected the level of the water to such an extent in the bay somewhere in the county of Huntingdon, that Ste. Barbe, I think, or some other village, was flooded. I remember when Mr. McLaren, the former member for Huntingdon, was in this House, he explained the whole thing. It is caused by the Public Works Department at the entrance of the Beauharnois canal.

Rivière du Loup (Fraserville)—repairs and renewals to wharf, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Rivière du Loup is a very important place upon the St. Lawrence, one of the important towns on the Intercolonial, and this work is very necessary to repair the wharf. It is expected this sum will make all the necessary repairs required at present.

Shigawake—extension of breakwater—revote of $880 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This wharf is in the county of Bonaventure, and this work is urged by the resident engineer, Mr. Amyot. It is to build an extension of 300 feet to the present wharf, so as to give it a depth of seven feet at low water. The government owns the wharf.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there any revenue from any of these wharfs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no revenue from this one, because it has not yet been transferred to the Marine Department.

St. Alexis, Ha! Ha! bay—extension of wharf —revote of $2,500 lapsed, $10,000.

St. Alphonse de Bagotville—To complete new addition on south side of wharf and repair old work, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a head block, 160 feet long by 56 feet wide. It is to be an addition to the present government wharf at St. Alphonse. We require this amount in order to make repairs to the existing wharf, also to build an extension. I understand this wharf will give accommodation to ocean steamers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What ocean steamers go there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Saguenay (Mr. Girard) informs me that the railway is being extended down to St. Alphonse for the purpose of getting to deep water, and ocean steamers will come there. This is the Lake St. John railway, which ships large quantities of manufactured stuff and farm produce over its road.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was $38,350, and this will complete the work.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. What is the population of this place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for the district (Mr. Girard) tells me that this is a part of the parish, that it is not a separate town, but there are about 3,000 people in the parish. The important thing is that it will afford a deep water terminus for the railway. Until the Saguenay is dredged out ocean steamers cannot go any farther than St. Alphonse.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many ocean steamers go up there each year?

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from the district says that about thirty ocean steamers will go up during the course of the season. Those are tramp steamers going for freight.

St. Andrè de Kamouraska wharf—extension —revote of $3,200 lapsed, $10,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost is $10,500, so that we expect this will complete the work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the annual revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think this has been transferred; if not there will be no revenue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we ought to have information about such matters in connection with the very large sums proposed to be expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that last session, or the session before, a statement was brought down showing all the wharfs that had been transferred.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would make it very easy to give the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would make it very easy for my hon. friend to get it too.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not passing the estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend had intimated he wanted that information I would have been glad to have obtained it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We should have it always. When we are asked to vote sums of money ranging from $10,000 to $25,000 for these wharfs it seems to me eminently proper that the minister should come fortified with the information in all such cases. This is information that ought to be given to the committee without any request having to be made. It would be very much easier to get the estimates through the committee, if the minister would always be prepared with a certain amount of information in every instance which should be available without any question whatever. When we do ask what seem to be absolutely relevant questions we are told that there is some other minister who might give it if he were here, or that there is some return which has been brought down and from which, if it were available, we could get the information instead of having it ready for us. I do not think the minister is really prepared with his estimates until he has all the information of this kind available.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that all the items for Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island went through and it is only now that my hon. friend says that he wants a statement as to the revenue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. Whenever I have been here I have asked about that particularly. I did so a week ago to-day, when the estimates were under discussion. I said then that the information ought to be forthcoming in regard to the revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason I did not think it important was this: Where wharfs have not been transferred to my department the revenue is nothing, as my department does not collect any revenue. In building wharfs we are not influenced by the revenue which we will get, in fact, hardly at all influenced by the revenue; it is rather by the accommodation which will be given to the public and by the opportunities for the development of trade and travel. But, if my hon. friend would like it, I will be very glad to find out as to the St. André de Kamouraska wharf and also as to the remainder of these wharfs, but I cannot give it to my hon. friend now. I will undertake to furnish it if he wishes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When we were considering the estimates a week ago I mentioned the information that I would like to have in this connection. There does not seem to be any principle whatever governing the transfer, or non-transfer, of these wharfs from the Department of Public Works to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. In one case no tolls are exacted; in the other case tolls are exacted. In one part of the country farmers are not obliged to pay any wharfage charges upon their goods; in other parts of the country, farmers, equally entitled to consideration, are obliged to pay such charges. There seems to be no system at all except perhaps a system of political expediency, and I do not think it is a good way to carry on public business. The minister does not think it is a good way to carry on public business, and from his statement there is some proposal now under consideration by the government for the purpose of adopting a general system in that regard. A general system ought to be undertaken. There is a further consideration. In the case of some of these items there may be a very good justification for building a wharf, but I do not apprehend that the government is very much concerned with any general principle in building these wharfs. Not long ago, this afternoon, the minister was speaking of works of a local and private nature. He said that the government could not undertake to engage in the expenditure of public money upon such works. Yet, a great many of these wharfs seem to me to be works of precisely that character. I dare say I might find more than one illustration, but in one case in particular we were asked to spend a considerable sum of money in the construction of a wharf in my own county, where there was a very good private wharf in existence at that time. It is impossible for the minister to suggest that the expenditure of that money was governed by any consideration of public interest. It could not have been governed by any such consideration. The fault I have to find with these estimates that come before us year after year is that they do not seem to be based upon or inspired by any actual consideration of the public interest, but by some considerations that are absolutely foreign to the public interest in a great many cases at least. Where there is a locality, even if it has not a large population, which is to be the terminus of a large railway, and where the produce of a large portion of the country will be brought to the wharf and will be shipped on steamers for export abroad, I can see some reason for the expenditure of public money, because the enterprise is too great for the local community to undertake. But, to spend $700 or $800 upon wharfs, here, there and elsewhere, all along the sea coast and even in competition with private wharfs does not seem to me to be very good policy, and does not seem to be founded on any system that ought to commend itself to the members of this committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know about this wharf, and it was I who asked the hon. member (Mr. Lapointe) to urge for its improvement. The wharf was built long before confederation to serve local traffic, but recently the Trade and Commerce Department has granted a subsidy for winter navigation between River Ouelle and St. André de Kamouraska, and north shore points. Recently a company has been formed at Fraserville to afford both summer and winter navigation between these points and across the St. Lawrence. The enterprise has met with a good deal of success this winter, but of course the winter has been mild. The intention is to have winter navigation between Fraserville and St. André, on the south shore, and St. Catharines, Tadousac and Seven Islands, on the north shore. At the latter place, Clarke City is a large manufacturing centre. The Desjardins firm at St. André are largely engaged in the furniture trade, and they ship their furniture to all the north shore points. I may tell the leader of the opposition that Mr. Desjardins is one of his strongest supporters in that district, and he is a very able man.

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

Mr. LEMIEUX. Formerly the Desjardins firm were obliged to send their furniture to Quebec and there have it transferred to the Lake St. John railway for distribution to north shore points, whereas now, from this wharf, they can ship direct

across the St. Lawrence. I really believe that this wharf will be a great public utility.

Mr. WRIGHT. Some few days ago I asked the minister as to the method of collecting dues at these wharfs, and I would point out that the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken in seeming to think that I was then making any criticism. I understand that no dues are collected on these wharfs while they are under the control of the Public Works Department, but that when they are handed over to the Marine and Fisheries Department dues are supposed to be levied upon those who use the wharfs. In some cases when these wharfs have passed from the Public Works Department they are simply monopolized by some large interest which takes control of them to the exclusion of everybody else. In instances which have come under my observations these companies have refused to repair the wharfs, and as it seemed to be nobody's business to do so, they fell into disrepair. From what I can learn, it would appear that where a charge is made, the fees are simply handed over to the man who was appointed as wharfinger or harbour master, as the case may be. I inquired as to this a few sessions ago, and I was told by the Minister of Public Works that negotiations were pending between his department and the Marine Department with a view towards bringing all these wharfs under some business management. No progress appears to have been made in that direction. It was then intimated by the minister that the government was considering the question of handing these small wharfs over to the local municipalities, and I think this could be done with benefit to the government and to the trade of the different districts. Where large expenditures have been made on wharfs, it seems to me that they should return some revenue to the government. If the smaller wharfs were handed over to the municipalities the government would be relieved from the charges of repairing them. I would like to see this question finally settled.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I expressed my opinion on a former occasion, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) very correctly says, that the smaller wharfs, and indeed the larger wharfs in the country districts, might be handed over to the municipalities if they would undertake to make the lesser repairs. Of course, the larger repairs would have to be done by the department. I also expressed the opinion that in the case of wharfs used by regular steamship lines, they might be leased to the companies upon the understanding that farmers and others who only bring a small quantity of freight to the wharfs should not be obliged to pay any top wharfage. At the last session of parliament a Bill, having that object in view, was introduced by the Minister of Marine, and passed, but the minister shortly afterwards left for England, and since his return he has not been able to give attention to the matter, which probably explains why it has not been settled. I am very anxious that some satisfactory arrangement should be made as early as possible in this regard. The present condition is unsatisfactory, but the government is not responsible. The same trouble has been existing for the last forty years, and I know of wharfs constructed by the late government which never were transferred to the Marine Department. They came in this shape as a legacy to us. In the case of one wharf which was built twenty years ago, when it was known that I intended to transfer it to the Marine Department and that tolls would be collected, the people entered a very vigorous protest. I hope the question will soon be taken up and dealt with satisfactorily.

Ste. Anne des Monts—harbour improvements at mouth of Grande Rivière Ste. Anne, $4,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision to carry out certain works in connection with improvements now going on at the mouth of this river. This is in the county of Gaspé. This vote will complete the work. The object is to make a suitable and safe harbour at the mouth of the river for fishing boats.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At the entrance of the river there are large boulders, and the tide is very strong.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Is the river navigable?

Mr. LEMIEUX. For about a mile and a half. During the past three or four years there have been wrecks there owing to the unsafe condition of the river. This work will, so to speak, bridge the entrance of the river. The piers on each side will keep the mouth in fairly good order so as to give ships fairly good facilities for entrance.

Mr. WRIGHT. What will be the total cost of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cos is $28,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would seem to be a pretty large expenditure for the removal of boulders from the mouth of a river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is more than that. There is to be a combined dam and landing pier of brush and stone work on either side of the river and ballasted crib work on the outer end. The pier on the western bank will extend for a distance of 400 feet,

and on the eastern bank for a distance of about 300 feet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the depth of water at the mouth of the river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We shall have 5½ feet at low water and 15 or 16 feet at high water.

Mr. PERLEY. Is this for the benefit of the village and the public or for the purpose of helping some of the sawmills there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the benefit of the public, to make a safe harbour.

Mr. PERLEY. Is this not one of the wharfs built for the purpose of helping the sawmill owners?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no sawmill there.

Mr. PERLEY. The report of the minister at page 123 says that several sawmills are in operation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Rathbun Company of Deseronto were there some years ago, but they have left. It is the largest place in the county of Gaspé. It has a population of something like 1,500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The report of the minister is hardly up to date.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work was begun in 1904. There was a sawmill there at that time, and the notes would be carried forward. I did not know that the sawmill had disappeared.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister an idea of how many fishing boats go out from that place?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is quite a trade.

Mr. WRIGHT. Do the ocean steamers call there?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry that I cannot tell my hon. friend the number of fishing boats.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought this was principally for the benefit of the fishermen.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Some twenty years ago there was a fish industry there; but, as my hon. friend knows, the codfish have left that side of the St. Lawrence. A herring industry has been started, however, and there is quite a trade between St. Anne and Quebec. There are no railway facilities on that shore, as it is too hilly, and the people have to go to Rimouski or to Quebec to get their supplies; and, as there is quite a large district served from Ste. Anne des Monts, there are quite a number of schooners there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Great Lakes Transportation Company, whose boats will call there have also urged this improvement.

St. Charles de Caplan—extension of wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This extension will be 350 feet long and 20 feet wide, and will give 9 feet 5 inches of water at low water spring tide and 17 feet 5 inches at high water. There is an old wharf there, and this is to make an extension to it. The total estimated cost is $20,000. We spent in 1908-09, $5,008.72, we are now asking $5,000, and it will require a further amount of $10,000 to complete the work.

Mr. PERLEY. Will the minister explain the necessity for such a large expenditure? Has not this wharf been there for a long time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not a very full detail, but the work has been urged by the hon. member for the county. The wharf already built does not give a sufficient depth of water to accommodate the steamers, so it does not fulfil the purpose for which the money was originally expended to an extent that is reasonably necessary.

Mr. PERLEY. Has the minister any facts regarding this work, or is he simply doing it because the member for the county has asked for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do it at the request of the member for the county.

Mr. PERLEY. Has the minister no report on the subject from any of his engineers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there must be a report, but I have no memorandum of it.

Mr. PERLEY. Were there any petitions for this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no record of any.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is in my constituency. The wharf was built in 1904-5, reaching into 5 or 6 feet at low water, and the intention is to complete it. St. Charles de Caplan is a parish on the Baie des Chaleurs, and there is another parish in the rear. There is a settlement extending into the interior a distance of some twelve miles from the coast. The population today exceeds 2,000, and the postal revenue of the district is close on to $1,000. It is one of the important localities along the bay. This wharf has been called for during years past. Steamers plying along the coast have to stop in the open and land their passengers and freight in scows, and when the weather is unfavourable people cannot get either on or off the boat, but must proceed to New Carlisle, about twenty miles distant in order to get a landing.

Mr. PERLEY. The explanation seems fairly good, but I would like to ask about the work done on this wharf in the fall of 1908. I see by the report of the Public Works Department that the wharf was suddenly found to be in a dangerous and dilapidated condition in the fall of the year, and it was necessary to repair it by day labour at a cost of nearly $800. How comes it that this work was all done between October 14 and November 7, 1908?

Mr. SPEAKER. In that year there were some very heavy storms in that part of the country, and it is difficult to have this work done in the seasons when the farmers and fishermen are busy. The timber of course can only be got out in winter.

Mr. PERLEY. Was not that the time when the general elections were held?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A heavy storm came on late in the month.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What depth of water for the extension?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a tide of from 6 to 8 feet, and at the lowest tide the depth is at least 6 feet. The tide rises to 12 or 14 feet. I omitted to state that Mr. Fair has taken over the bait freezer from the fishermen's association there, and has entered into a rather extensive fish industry, the selling of fresh fish. He is doing a pretty extensive business. I have had several reports from him showing that quite a profitable business is being done as the result of the construction of that wharf, and the government have been urgently requested to have it brought into sufficiently deep water to enable steamers to effect a landing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it a fishing place?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, according to the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1909, 200 men are there engaged in the fishing industry, and they own 100 boats. Their fishing tackle is valued at $7,750. The fish district, of which St. Charles de Caplan is the most important centre, brought in last year $111,000.

St. Denis—wharf on River Richelieu—revote lapsed, amount, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete a small wharf. The estimated cost is $5,500. We have spent $3,000 and are asking $2,500 to complete.

Ste. Croix wharf—revote of $2,000 lapsed, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount voted being so small, I did not think we should enter into a contract without coming back to parliament. We are now asking $20,000. The locality is a very important one, and this work has been urged very strongly on our favourable consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have a very full report. Total estimated cost, $46,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How large is the town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not a town, but it is in the centre of a very populous farming district. There are over 6,000 people to be served by this wharf. For a number of years there has been a regular boat service between Ste. Croix and Quebec, largely used for the transport of agricultural products and other merchandise. The wharf is now badly wrecked, and it is in the public interest that one should be built. We sent an engineer to report and he became satisfied that the demand was reasonable.

Mr. BARNARD. What is the size of the town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a village, but the centre of a populous agricultural district. The abutments will be of wood and stone, and the trestle 75 feet wide and 775 feet long, besides a roadway of gravel and sand. There will be 683 lineal feet of open-faced crib work and a head block consisting of 172,175 cubic feet of crib work. We shall have to remove reefs and boulders and level the approaches at both sides to accommodate steamers at low water. We propose to build a waiting room and freight shed and a barn for sheltering stock. Total estimated cost, $46,000.

Mr. BARNARD. When did the minister get the reports?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time in 1908, I have not the exact date. This $2,000 was expended for improving the approach, I think.

Mr. BARNARD. It seems strange that last year you spent $2,000 and this year you are spending $20,000 and you tell us it will cost $46,000. The ideas of the members for the county seem to have considerably magnified in the last twelve months.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What county is it in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Lotbinière.

Mr. WRIGHT. $46,000 seems a large sum to spend for a wharf in what must be a small place, as according to the census it was not even incorporated at that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At page 125 of the report a description of the work already done will be found, but that is but a small part of the work we will have to do. The amount required did seem large and I hesitated for quite a while. That is why we

did not go on actively with the larger work the year before last, but after having the matter fully looked into we find that we cannot build a wharf giving the accommodation required for less than the sum mentioned. It is a difficult and expensive place in which to construct a wharf. I have had many conversations with the member, who knows how I hesitated in the matter, but he showed the benefit which it would be to the people. The large number of people in the locality, 5,000 or 6,000, have no other means of sending their produce to market. There is no railway and this wharf is absolutely essential to give to the people the accommodation required.

Mr. PERLEY. The report says it is on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. FORTIER. The Intercolonial railway is too far from these localities to transport the produce of the farmers to the market.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood it was not feasible for the farmers to transport their produce to market by the Intercolonial railway, and that they required to use water transportation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is only a small community which will be served by the wharf, some 5,000 or 6,000 people, and it is impossible to conceive that all of those people would be nearer the wharf than the railway.

Mr. FORTIER. It is to serve different parishes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I cannot understand how the wharf is to be nearer the scattered community of 5,000 people than the railway.

Mr. E. ROY. The only market for these people is Quebec which is on the north side of the river, while Lotbinière is on the south side. As the Intercolonial railway stops at Levis, people who want to take supplies to market have to go to Levis and take the ferry and carry their produce to the Quebec market. The only practicable mode of taking produce to Quebec is to go by steamer right through to Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there winter navigation?

Mr. FORTIER. No.

Mr. BARNARD. If the old wharf was in such a dilapidated condition, why was it deemed desirable to spend $3,000 in repairs, especially when there was a vote of $5,000 for a new wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What we have done is all good work that will form the approach to the new wharf.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the old wharf a government wharf or a private wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A private wharf.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then if private enterprise could build and maintain a private wharf for many years, how is it that the government has now to build a public wharf there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That often happens. You will find sometimes that thirty or forty years ago some enterprising man has been in a certain line of business, perhaps shipping lumber, who would build a wharf. He may have failed in business and not have kept the wharf up. In this case the wharf was allowed to go into decay and it has become necessary, if we are to give the people any reasonable accommodation at all, to build a new wharf.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the government own the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memorandum with regard to the title, but I feel sure the title to the approach and to the portion which we have built, the crib-work is in the Crown. If my hon. friend wishes the information, I will have it looked up. I am quite sure that is the case, because I remember the question coming up.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How far is the wharf from the railway?

Mr. FORTIER. Ten and a half miles.

Mr. E. ROY. The best part of the municipality consists of farms along the river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Without speaking particularly of this wharf, the policy upon which the government are embarking will result in the necessity of building wharfs all over this country. Where private wharfs have existed in the past, we are to have government wharfs in the future. That will be a large undertaking. Take the rivers of this country, both sides of the rivers, wherever a wharf is required, and all indentations of the coast line on both oceans, you will have perhaps 12,000 or 15,000 miles of country upon which the government will have to build wharfs. If you carry that out to the extent of building a $50,000 wharf to accommodate 5,000 or 6,000 people, some of whom must be fairly well accommodated by a railway, it is going to involve a large policy. Yet I do not see that there will be any escape from it. I know that in the province of Nova Scotia, up to within recent years, the principle was that these wharfs were matters of private enterprise, they were built by private individuals who charged wharfage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to what time was that?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Up to a recent year, I think. As I have told the minister, I know of one instance in my own county

where there was a very good private wharf, and a government wharf was built within a quarter of a mile of it; if I remember rightly it was at Port Dufferin. The subject was discussed in this House six or seven years ago. I think it is the very wharf about which some inquiry was made in the House the other day, but I am not absolutely sure of the locality. I had letters from the place at the time, on behalf of the persons who were interested in the private wharf, and who bitterly complained because the wharf they had built, and from which they derived a certain revenue, would be practically put out of business by the government wharf. Well, that does not seem to be a very provident system, to say the least of it. I think the government are embarking upon a pretty large undertaking.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not this government which is embarking upon this policy. The old government built wharfs along the St. Lawrence many years ago, and I remember it was a great complaint we used to make in New Brunswick that the federal government were building wharfs on the St. Lawrence and the provincial government had to build them in New Brunswick. My hon. friend now speaks of Nova Scotia; but perhaps a little later on this evening, or at some other time, we will hear members of this House upon the opposite side complaining of how many wharfs are being built in Nova Scotia as compared with other sections of Canada. This is not a new policy at all. All governments since confederation have engaged in building wharfs, more or less, regarding it as a policy in the interest of the transportation system of the country. I am prepared to justify the building of wharfs wherever they are necessary for the accommodation of the people. Wharfs are so intimately associated with transportation, and with navigation, they are so much a necessity in aid of navigation, that if there is any work that is properly federal work, it is the construction of wharfs. Of course, we must draw a line as to the extent of expenditure to which we shall go. For instance, if a large expenditure is necessary in order to give accommodation to a limited number of people, we might hesitate in doing that work. But my hon. friend is entirely wrong when he says that he can fairly take the cost of this wharf as a measure of the cost of all other wharfs which are to be constructed. If my hon. friend looks at the expenditure made upon other wharfs he will see they do not at all come up, upon the average, to the cost of this one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why should this one come up so high?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because the local conditions are such as to make it necessary to expend more than is usually expended upon wharfs of this character. The physical features of the site often make a great difference in the cost. We can build in one place a wharf for $5,000, whereas in another place we might have to spend, owing to the physical conditions, $10,000 to build a wharf not any better, and perhaps not as good. A great deal depends upon the length of the approach, or how far you have to build your crib-work out in order to get a depth of water sufficient to accommodate steamers. In many cases you will get that depth at fifty feet, and in other places you might have to go out 100 feet or 300 feet to get the same depth of water, and to get the same accommodation for steamers. All these things affect the cost of the wharf. I think in this case we are justified in expending this amount of money in order to give this accommodation to the people. Here are some 5,000 or 6,000 people whose natural market is the city of Quebec. There is no railway, as has been pointed out, from that portion of the province to the city of Quebec. To take the produce down that railway to Levis and cart it across to the city of Quebec, adds so much to the cost of transportation as to give no profit to the farmers. I think the expenditure, while it is large, can well be justified by reason of the advantage which we give to the people.

Mr. PERLEY. I do not think the minister has made out a good case for this particular wharf. No one objects to the government building wharfs where they are needed. The minister is continually harping upon what the Conservative party did in the old days; if he followed them a little more closely perhaps he would get on better. He talks about their spending money on wharfs; certainly they did. As a matter of fact, last year this government expended on public works nearly $15,000,000, and in the days of the Conservative party the expenditure was from ten to twenty per cent of that amount. I have no objection to this particular wharf, except that I think the cost is extravagant.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The country has trebled in business since that time.

Mr. PERLEY. But the government is spending eight or ten times as much money on wharfs, and if they were spending it well, I would not mind. But the minister has not yet read us any report from an engineer of his department saying that this wharf was needed at this particular place, a wharf that he estimates will cost $46,000. According to past experience with this government, it is likely to cost $70,000 or $80,000 before they get through with it. The wharf is at a place where there is no incorporated village. We cannot see the

place, and we cannot see these wharfs to judge for ourselves. But here is one across the river at Hull which we can see, and it is an expensive wharf, practically no value to any body. Even there it is built in a city of 10,000 people, but it is hardly used at all. Many of these wharfs built by the government are in places where they are not required, and the government often build wharfs costing four or five times as much as it is necessary to spend, because a wharf costing a quarter of the amount would answer the purpose just as well.

Mr. FORTIER. The village of Ste. Croix is not a large town, but it is the chief place in the county. There are six or seven important merchants doing business there, and a bank and the registry office is located at that point. Unless this accommodation is provided, all the products of farmers will have to go by the Intercolonial railway to Lévis, at which point they will have to be transferred to the boat and then taken across the river to Quebec. Instead of doing that, when this wharf is constructed, the produce will be placed on the boat at Ste. Croix and go straight to Quebec, which is the market of the farmers of Lotbinière. This service is now performed by two boats which call at St. Jean des Chaillons and carry the produce to Quebec. One of these boats goes every fifteen days to Montreal with cheese, butter, potatoes and other products intended for shipment to Europe. With regard to the old wharf, I would like to remind my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that it was built only for the accommodation of sail boats. There is not a sufficient depth of water, and these sail boats could only go to this wharf at high tide.

Mr. S. SHARPE. It seems that we are spending $46,000 of public money to take traffic away from the Intercolonial railway when we have been complaining that there is not enough traffic.

Mr. FORTIER. The Intercolonial never had that traffic It was carried by these boats, but they were not able to come to the wharf at low tide.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I understand that the Intercolonial runs through this parish?

Mr. LEMIEUX. For about 12 miles.

Mr. S. SHARPE. There are a great many farmers throughout the country who have to team their produce 12 miles to the market or station, and I cannot see that it will be any great hardship to the farmers of this parish to team their produce to the station 12 miles away and ship it to Lévis, where it could be sold. It seems to me that we are spending $46,000 to take traffic away from the Intercolonial railway. This seems a most indefensible expenditure. The hon. gentleman who represents the constituency says there are only five merchants at Ste. Croix.

Mr. FORTIER. Yes, at Ste. Croix, but this wharf is to serve five or six parishes.

Mr. S. SHARPE. That will minimize the traffic that will go over the Intercolonial.

Mr. FORTIER. No, the Intercolonial never had that traffic before.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Where is the traffic going to-day if it is not going over the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. FORTIER. It is going by boats of all kinds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) asked me if we had a report from the engineer. There was a petition presented urging very strongly the necessity for the building of this wharf. The engineer concurred in the views of the petitioners and declared that there was a pressing need for wharf accommodation at Ste. Croix. He says in his report that the parishes supply an immense traffic which must find its way to the market by water. I think that is as strong and distinct as anything could be as to the necessity of this wharf.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. I would like to know if the old wharf has served the purpose of the parish up to the present time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It did before the days of steamboats. As my hon. friend from Lotbiniere says, this wharf was originally built to accommodate sailing boats.

Mr. FORTIER. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did a very large traffic, but now their places have been taken by steamers.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. What is the depth of water that these steam boats would draw?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Ten or twelve feet. I am told that a river steamer draws about 10 feet of water. A sailing boat could go up and lie aground at low tide by steamers will not do that and unless they can get wharf accommodation the steamers pass by and these farmers would be put to the increased expenditure in bringing their products to market or would have to go out of the business of raising products except for their own immediate use.

Mr. BARNARD. I understand the minister to say that there were two steamers which called at this wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two steamers the member for that district (Mr. Fortier) says.

Mr. E. ROY. No, three trips each week.

Mr. BARNARD. That is rather inconsistent with the idea of the minister that only vessels can get near to this wharf.

Mr. E. ROY. This wharf is not built yet. No steamers can come to the wharf but they do call at the wharf in the adjoining parish of St. Jean des Chaillons and these two steamers make two trips a week. So, there is one steamer every day calling at that wharf. When this wharf at Ste. Croix is built there will be one steamer a day. I live in the city of Quebec and we want this accommodation because the market of Quebec is supplied by the farmers of Lotbiniére as well as the farmers of other localities. We will find it impossible to get the products of this county at reasonable rates unless this accommodation is provided. If the products have to be transported ten miles to the railway, transferred from the railway to the boat, taken across to Quebec and then taken from the boat to the market it will so increase the cost that it will be impossible to bring them to Quebec.

Mr. BARNARD. We are then asked to vote $46,000 for a wharf that is to accommodate one steamer a day. Does not the minister think that it would be better to build a $6,000 wharf and put the remaining $40,000 into a steamer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has already been explained that we cannot get a sufficient depth of water for the steamers without building out a considerable distance and to provide a wharf that will accommodate the steamers will cost this amount.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. How far does the old wharf extend out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The old wharf was a private wharf and I have no memo as to that.

Mr. FORTIER. It is crib work joined by bridges. It extends out about 700 or 800 feet.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Is this wharf to be longer than 700 feet?

Mr. FORTIER. I have not the details of the new wharf. The site will have to be changed as there is no water at the old site of the old wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry I cannot give the length of the wharf.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Surely the minister is not asking for a vote without knowing how far the wharf will extend?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can give specifications of the plan it is now proposed to adopt. First, we are to improve the road down to the foot of the hill at the shore line.

Mr. ROY.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. How far inland does that shore extend?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just down the bank to the wharf.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Is that a private municipal road?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be a public road. Then we will have a crib roadway of timber and stone to the foot of the hill, 85,000 cubic feet; new intermediate block 100 by 22 by 17 equals 37,400 cubic feet; head block average 212½ by 52½ by 19 equals 211,964 cubic feet; new trestle roadway 500 feet which will be capable of being removed in the fall. That gives a very good idea in a general way of the extent of the wharf.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. In whom is the fee of the roadway leading down to the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the government.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Are the approaches to the wharf and the title of the land on which the wharf will be built, in the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All in the government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this interfere with the private wharf at which the vessels call at present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that other wharf is twenty-five miles away. When this wharf is built the steamers which call at the other wharf will call at it.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I wish to know from the minister whether he will entertain with respect to other localities of the same size and importance as this, an application for a wharf that would involve a like expenditure? I have two localities in my riding which have been petitioning for satisfactory wharfs and which cannot get them because the minister seems to think that the expense involved would be too large in proportion to the importance of the district to be served. I have listened very attentively to all the descriptions given of the importance of this district, and as I have said with respect to the other items, if it is a proper item I am certainly not opposed to it. I have heard the minister state that on account of the peculiar situation of this place it unfortunately takes a large expenditure to provide the accommodation, which of course it should have. I quite admit that this locality should have an effective shipping wharf, but I would like the minister to say whether I understood his principle correctly to be, that a wharf should be provided at any cost if a locality needed it. If that is the principle I want to apply it in another direction. Is that the principle upon which the minister asks for this appropriation, and if so

is he willing to extend the principle to an application which I shall file when the proper time comes with respect to wharfs which he has withheld from us, because he thinks they will cost more than the trade of the place justified?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not said there was any such principle. The hon. gentleman seems to think that I said that where a wharf was to the public advantage it would be built no matter what it would cost. I said nothing of the kind, and I never intended to lay down any such principle. What I said was that in this particular case, in view of the large number of people to be accommodated, in view of the report of the engineer, in view of the fact that the only reasonable means the people have of getting to market is by water, I thought we were justified in going to this expense. As to any application which my hon. friend has to submit I can give no promise and assurance whatever beyond this: that whenever any application is made I shall feel it my duty to consider the matter very carefully, and I must deal with each individual application upon its merits.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Am I to understand that if any damage results to a private or municipal interest by reason of the construction of a public work the department will make good that damage? I may say that I believe that is a proper principle. When the government was constructing the Trent canal there was a road running parallel to the canal between the counties of Victoria and Ontario; and those engaged in the construction threw the excavated sand on to the public road of the municipality, rendering it almost impassable. I understand that petitions have come to the department asking for a grant in reference to the gravel road injured in this way on the Balsam division of the Trent canal. I hope the minister will take these petitions into his favourable consideration. The principle involved in this is the same as that which justifies the government in protecting Laprairie and other villages on the St. Lawrence which were injured by water backing up in consequence of certain work done by the harbour commissioners of Montreal. I would ask the minister to make a grant to the municipalities to regravel that road.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would have thought that my hon. friend had heard the Trent Valley canal discussed often enough in the House to know that it is in the Department of Railways and Canals, and not in my department.

Mr. MAGRATH. I would like to ask the minister if his department has ever prepared a statement showing the length of life of these wharfs, and the expenditure for renewals per thousand dollars of cost of construction. This would be interesting information to have, because this is a growing expenditure, and it would give us some idea of where we stand with reference to the cost of wharfs throughout the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has not been figured out.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company—Mr. Ethier.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company—Mr. R. Smith.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 146) respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company—Mr. Harty.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

St. Joseph de Sorel—wharf on west side of River Richelieu—revote of $3,000 lapsed, $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards the construction of a pile wharf on the west side of the River Richelieu. There has been a petition for it sent to the department. We expect this vote will finish the work. We had a vote for the year ending March 31, 1909, which we did not use. This is a new work.

Sorel—deepwater wharf, $42,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had a vote last year of $86,000, but we only expended $44,000 of it. We are simply asking now a revote of the appropriation of last year that was unexpended. This will complete the work.

Sorel—breakwater of pile work and stone filling opposite Elizabeth street—revote of $2,500 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the construction of a breakwater of pile and stone work. Nothing has yet been expended on this work. This is the total estimated cost. We took a partial vote for it and allowed it to lapse.

Tadousac harbour, north shore of St. Lawrence—wharf on southeast side of Tadousac island—revote of $4,600 lapsed, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a new undertaking. The old wharf at Tadousac has got into a pretty bad condition, and has become dangerous. A new wharf is urgently required, and is expected to cost about

$30,000. It will be crib-work filled with stone, and there will be a slip in it, and necessarily a shed upon it.

Three Rivers—deep water coal wharf at west end of harbour, opposite windmill—revote of $7,500 lapsed, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a wharf which is very much needed at Three Rivers. We took a vote for the year 1908-9 of $7,500, but we did not proceed to let the contract, because the amount was too small to warrant us in entering into the contract without coming back to parliament. The pier which has been built there is required for ordinary merchandise, but there is no accommodation for the very large coal business. The harbour commissioners have urged this upon us, and the member for the county has also strongly urged it. I think also there are petitions for it; at all events, we had an interview by representatives of Three Rivers, including the harbour commissioners. This will be a new work. We called for tenders for the work under the appropriation of 1908-9, but owing to the vote being so small, I declined to accept the tenders and returned the cheques. I cannot give the exact amount, but my impression is that the lowest tender was in the vicinity of $140,000. The matter is entirely open, the deposit cheques having been returned. There is at Three Rivers a pier which was built in 1903-4, but that is for general merchandise, and it is fully occupied, so the engineer reports. This is for the purpose of enabling coal to be handled at the harbour. Three Rivers is a place of a good deal of importance. It is the outlet for Shawinigan Falls, some 20 miles away. Unfortunately, there was a severe fire at Three Rivers a year or more ago, which did the place a great deal of injury, but I am told it is building up rapidly again.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for the purpose of bringing in coal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Coal, and also to afford protection to boats frequenting the harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it under a harbour master?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a board of harbour commissioners at Three Rivers.

Mr. MACDONELL. Would the minister inform us just what purpose this wharf is going to serve? Is it the practice of the government now to build wharfs for every municipality that desires that accommodation, or for any private individual who may say that he needs a wharf for his own purposes? Is the government going to lay down piers and build wharfs throughout the entire country wherever there is navigable water? Is the government assuming not only the control of all the harbours, but also embarking in the enterprise of building piers wherever a harbour is to be used? If so it would seem to me that the government is laying up trouble for itself in the future both in regard to putting docks where there are no docks now, and as to perpetually keeping in repair docks and wharfs that they are now building. It seems to be a new departure in the policy of the government. I would like to know from the minister if this dock is going to serve any general public purpose, or whether it is serving a local purpose, and what other docks there are? Are there public or private docks, if so are they under any commission, or is this government simply going to build wharfs and docks at that point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a pretty difficult thing to answer my hon. friend categorically. We cannot lay down any definite rule as to what wharfs shall or shall not be built. For instance, at Fort William, the government is building a quay or wharf a good many hundreds of feet in length. We are doing that to facilitate the handling of merchandise, grain and coal.

Mr. MACDONELL. That is a national lake port.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend says it is a national port. I suppose he would say that the harbour of Toronto is a national port. So it is. You cannot say with certainty what is a national port and what is not. In the city of St. John I can well remember that the old government would not do any dredging in the harbour near any wharf because it would be said that they were benefiting the property of the city. They refused absolutely, stating that it was not part of their duty to do it.

Mr. DANIEL. So did this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to a certain date, but we have broadened out since then.

Mr. DANIEL. Lately, yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have awakened to a clearer realization of the needs of this great country.

Mr. DANIEL. That is right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And I do not think anybody will condemn us for doing it. The government are building a wharf at St. John to facilitate the handling of the business of Canada. I think my hon. friend will say that St. John is entitled to take its place as one of the national ports of Canada.

Mr. DANIEL. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We believe it is, but at the same time there are numerous places throughout Ontario where we have built

and are building wharfs. If my hon. friend will go up to Lake Nipissing, to the Montreal river, to Sault Ste. Marie, and scores of other places in Ontario, he will find that we are building wharfs, not to accommodate any particular railway company or any particular coal or lumber company, but to facilitate the particular business which can be properly handled at that port. At Three Rivers what have we? We have a town of large importance. It is the port of Shawinigan, Grand Mere, and other thriving communities situated back from the St. Lawrence. At Three Rivers the coal business has reached enormous proportions. It amounts to 100,000 tons a year, and there is no place at that port where that coal business can be handled. We have a pier built by the government. We had hoped that would be sufficient for the different kinds of merchandise, including coal, but the Harbour Commissioners, the people and the engineers say, no, it is crowded with business, and we have felt that it would be proper to build this pier in order to give accommodation to the rapidly increasing business. I do not know just whom it will help most, but I should think that the community will be the most specially benefited because it will make Three Rivers a very important distributing point for the coal which will be brought there from Nova Scotia and other parts. We do know that a large business is done there in Nova Scotia coal. A 100,000 tons a year, at least, will be distributed from Three Rivers if we give this required accommodation. As to the other question that my hon. friend asked, I may say that the pier which has been already built is placed under the control of the Harbour Commissioners, and this pier, when built, will also be placed under the Harbour Commissioners. I believe the work is a very important one, and if we recognize that it is our duty to assist in facilitating business we can justify to the fullest extent the building of this wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that the amount voted last year was so small that although tenders were invited none was accepted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to advertise for tenders again or to act on any of the tenders received under the first call?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided the matter. There would be some reason why we should accept the lowest tender now provided the engineer is of opinion that, considering what difference there may be in the cost of material and wages to-day as compared with the time when the tenders were invited, the lowest tender is fair and reasonable. We might accept that even at this late date because you will see there is some unfairness in rejecting tenders and then inviting them over again, providing the tenders are reasonable in each case. Therefore, all other things being equal, I would rather be disposed to favour the lowest tender now that we have decided to go on with the work.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is done is it intended to add to the amount of the tender the additional cost of labour and material compared with what it was when the tender was submitted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, if we accept the tender at all we will accept it as it is put in.

Mr. SPROULE. How many tenders did you receive for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Six or seven.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose it is too early to give the committee what the tenders are?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There would be no objection if I had them here, but my impression is that the lowest tender is somewhere in the vicinity of $140,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. What was the engineer's estimate of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between $7,000 and $10,000 higher than the lowest tender.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is it fair to give that information?

Mr. SPROULE. He has not given us what the tenders are.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, but the deposits have been returned and the lowest tender need not take it. It does not seem to me to be right that such information should go broadcast, if the department have any idea of dealing with the tenders that have been received by them for the simple reason that this knowledge is given to everybody and to the lowest tenderer that the department deem his figures too low.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the deposits been returned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Because if the deposits have been returned there is no obligation resting upon any of the tenderers to enter into a contract. It is entirely the option of the tenderer to take it or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was stated some time ago.

Mr. MACDONELL. Would the minister please state what work will be covered by the vote for Toronto harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The principal work at Toronto is the building of the entrance to the western harbour which is a very important work. A contract was let for I think $490,000 odd and this vote is to pay the contractor. There is some additional work which we are doing on the pier near the eastern entrance and this vote will also provide for that. I believe the new western entrance is going to be of very great value to the harbour, and while it was costly, it will probably be worth more than its cost to the traffic coming to Toronto.

Mr. MACDONELL. I agree with the minister as to the importance of the work and the necessity for it, and the wisdom of putting this appropriation in the estimates. The work at the western entrance is now being carried out on the basis of an 18 foot channel, and I believe it is the expectation that the inland waterways of the great lakes are to be standardized to a depth of 22 feet, as far as possible. The main harbours on the great lakes are I understand being deepened to 22 feet, and I would now suggest to the minister that the channel at Toronto be dredged to 22 feet instead of 18 feet as at present contemplated. I am informed that if the present contract is completed on the basis of an 18 foot channel it will in all probability have to be deepened in the near future, and that the increased cost of adding this depth after the present work is completed would be far greater than if the channel were deepened to 22 feet now. Would the minister state what is the intention of the department in this regard, and whether the opinion of the resident engineer has been obtained, which I think is a matter of considerable importance, he being on the ground and knowing all the circumstances?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It strikes me that it would be of no advantage to dredge to a greater depth than we are now dredging until the Welland canal be deepened, and even if that work were undertaken at an early date it would be some time before it could be completed. It seems to me there would be no greater difficulty in dredging the channel to the western entrance to a depth of 22 feet later on, than if we did it at present. I think the revetment walls at each side of the channel are sunk to a depth of 22 feet, but of that I am not absolutely sure, and at any future time the channel can be excavated to a greater depth between these walls just as well as it can be at the present time. I thank my hon. friend for the suggestion and I will have it looked into. I quite realize that in the future we must look to greater depth in our harbours. I am providing to-day for a 25 foot channel in Fort William and Port Arthur, and I am looking forward to having a depth of 25 feet in the harbours on the eastern shores of the Georgian bay, particularly at Tiffin and Victoria which are national harbours and which are so closely allied with Fort William and Port Arthur. If we are going to hold our trade we must make our harbours deep enough to give accommodation to the largest lake vessels.

Mr. SPROULE. You would have to deepen the canal as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MACDONELL. The eastern entrance of the harbour requires immediate attention from the government. The eastern piers are rapidly decaying, and unless they are at once put in proper condition it will cost a very large sum to replace them later on. Will any part of this vote be devoted to that purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have done considerable work at the eastern entrance in the past season and the work has been very satisfactory. We intend to continue it during the coming season and we shall take what is required for the eastern channel out of this vote.

Mr. MACDONELL. Toronto island has been practically washed away on one or two occasions and the breakwater is in urgent need of repair. Very excellent work has been performed there which has had the effect of protecting the island from the full sweep of the sea, and if that work is continued the island can be preserved. If steps are not taken now, not only will the island be in danger, but the work already done will be rendered entirely useless.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have received a certificate and report from the city engineer of Toronto testifying to the very satisfactory way in which the work of finishing the breakwater has been done. As now completed it is proving very effective, and we believe, from the reports of our own engineer as well as those of the city engineer of Toronto, that it will give great satisfaction.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is there any definite system of inspection or checking of the quantities of dredging done? I heard one of the engineers of the department admit on oath that in one case there were larger returns made by the inspector than the capacity of the scow, so that there must have been fraud or looseness or incompetence on the part of the inspector. Where millions of dollars are expended in these dredging contracts there should be competent and experienced inspectors, perhaps more than one on each boat continuously, to check the work properly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that we have a very thorough, and as we believe, a very

perfect system of inspection. We have recently made the rule more stringent than it was previously. We require the inspector to be constantly on the work, to personally inspect every scow load, to make his report and with it a solemn declaration that he has a personal knowledge of the quantity in every scow load. Having said that, let me appeal to my hon. friend not to believe one side of a story until he hears the other side, and not to be too ready to take insinuations which are made, but to look into the facts for himself. The hon. gentleman refers to some questions which were put by a certain member of this place. The gentleman who put these ques- House to the chief engineer in another tions assumed that the capacity of the scow was so many cubic yards.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The engineer said that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. I read the evidence, and he put the words into the engineer's mouth. As a matter of fact, upon that very work there were two additional scows which were hired by the contractors from the department, and which had a capacity of nearly 20 cubic yards greater than the quantity stated by the gentleman who examined the chief engineer. That fact explains the whole matter.

Mr. S. SHARPE. When was the new system of inspection inaugurated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1908, about a year after I became minister.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister did not commence a moment too soon, because I have a very distinct recollection of a good many irregularities in connection with the dredging system. For instance, in one case an inspector was inspecting two dredges which were operating a quarter of a mile apart.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was dismissed.

Mr. SPROULE. And he was at the time an employee of one of the dredging companies. It was admitted, I think, that it was utterly impossible for him to do his duty, but all the same payments were made on the returns he sent in.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I became minister in August, 1907, I took occasion to look into the matter carefully and to consider with my deputy what we could do to surround the dredging operations with the greatest possible safeguards; and in the following season we did adopt what we think are proper safeguards. We send out instructions in writing to the inspectors that if they do not give personal attention to the work they will be at once dismissed without notice, and we require them with each return to make a solemn declaration that they have been personally on the work and have a personal knowledge of all the scow loads which were removed. In the case to which my hon. friend refers, the moment it came to the knowledge of the department that the inspector was attending to those two dredges we dismissed him.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What is the wage of the inspectors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wages vary, but the usual wage is $3 a day.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The inspectors are continuously on the dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. What did the minister mean by saying that the member who questioned the chief engineer put the answer into his mouth? Did he suggest to the witness a certain capacity of the scow?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; what I said was this: The member took the capacity of a certain scow and assumed that that was the capacity of all the scows, and asked the engineer how he accounted for it that 200 cubic yards were returned when the capacity of the scow was only 190 yards. The engineer said he could not account for it. As a matter of fact, at that time there where two other scows with a capacity of 210 cubic yards each.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to draw the minister's attention to an application which I have made on two or three occasions to have a small wharf constructed at a place called Beaumarais, on the Muskoka lakes. I do not find any item for it in the estimates. I hope the minister will take a note of it and make provision for it. Beaumarais is a very important point. The wharf is getting into a very dilapidated condition, and is very dangerous to the travelling public. If I told the minister the amount of tonnage that calls at that wharf he would be very much surprised.

Mr. PUGSLEY. May I ask the hon. gentleman if that is a private or a public wharf?

Mr. WRIGHT. It was built originally by a private individual; but he has offered to hand it over to the government free of charge if they will take it. They can get it by building a new wharf.

Manitoba—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements—$8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the usual general vote taken every year to cover repairs to wharfs for which there is no special vote. It was $6,000 last year; we are asking for $8,000 this year.

Mr. STAPLES. I have watched the estimates come down from year to year since 1904, and I have failed to find any appro

priation for the completion of a wharf on Lake Manitoba, near St. Laurent. The government undertook to construct a wharf there in 1904, but they got it into their heads all at once that it was necessary to commence this piece of work without calling for tenders. They have expended almost $16,000; and so far as any value is concerned up to the present, that money might as well have been thrown into the fire. The work stands there a monument of the wonderful ability of this government to spend public money just before the elections. The people were promised that this would be carried to completion, but the day after the elections, the work ceased, the dredge was taken away and has not been sent back since; but I might tell the hon. minister that there was an election in 1908, which no doubt he remembers when the same parties, or some of them, went to these good people and said they regretted very much that this work had not been completed, but that it would certainly be gone on with provided the people voted for the government candidate. Well, the people did support the government candidate. In a particular poll where I got 28 of a majority in the election of 1904, my opponent got a majority of 65. Surely the people have done their duty. They took the government at their word on two occasions, and yet that piece of work stands there unfinished—not a dollar in the estimates or supplementaries to complete it, and it has so far cost the people uselessly $15,978. I would like to know if the minister still intends to leave that piece of work unfinished? I put a number of questions on the order paper this session regarding it which, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Railways and Canals answered. They will be found on page 1240 of 'Hansard.' The Minister of Railways told the House that this was a piece of work in first-class condition, that it offered facilities to meet the public requirements in that locality and so on. But the fact is, we cannot get to that wharf. His answers, however, would lead the House to believe that you could get there with almost an ocean going vessel. Why, we cannot get there with anything larger than a canoe.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work to which my hon. friend refers was evidently laid out upon a pretty large scale. It was begun in 1902 or 1903, and at that time it was expected that there would be considerable railway development in that locality, and also that a large freezer would be established there, and it was proposed to build two piers on Lake Manitoba and dredge the channel between that and a lake nearby, and then have a wharf on the other side of the lake, which would be reached by a railway and where a freezer would be located. There were strongly signed petitions for this work, including one from the Board of Trade of Winnipeg The expenditure incurred has been made upon the piers in Lake Manitoba and also in dredging out the channel between the two lakes. By the plan it was intended to dredge across the lagoon and then build a wharf at the opposite side. Just at present, I am not impressed with the immediate necessity of doing that work, particularly in view of the fact that the large freezer contemplated has not been erected and that the expected railway development has not taken place. During the past year we have expended on those piers $513.13, and they are serving quite a useful purpose.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not know where the hon. minister has got his information as to the usefulness of that work. I have letters from various constituents living up there, and I have been there myself and have seen the work, and it is of no practical value. The minister says he is not particularly concerned about it and has no intention of continuing it. It would have been better if this government had taken their present view before spending $16,000 of the people's money for no practical use. But the work, if completed, would be of great practical value to the people of that district. So far as the freezer is concerned, would any sane person undertake to build a freezer, which might cost thousands of dollars, before he could get goods to utilize the freezer for any purpose? And so far as railway development is concerned, the Canadian Northern railway say they are quite ready to build a spur into this wharf as soon as it is built. The minister now says he does not propose appropriating any money to complete this work. What right then had these very keen politicians, before the election of 1908, to advise the people that if they would support the government candidate, this work would be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend makes statements as to certain alleged facts, of which I was not aware. He says that the railway company has agreed to do its part of this development work by building a spur to the water. So far as my information goes, we have no record of any such offer.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not know that it would be necessary that the department should have any record of what the company intend doing. The people of the district have the promise of that company that when this work is completed, a spur will be built.

Mr. PUGSLEY. During the last year or two we have been obliged to go somewhat slowly in public works.

Mr. STAPLES. You should also go slowly in promises.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that the work done is very useful in connection with the shipping on Lake Manitoba. I have felt that it is not unreasonable that before going to the large expenditure necessary to dredge the lagoon and build a wharf on the other side we should have an assurance from the railway company that they would do their part towards the development of the locality. If the railway company would submit a memorandum of their willingness to make the extension as soon as we built the wharf, the matter would have my most careful consideration.

Mr. STAPLES. On whose advice is the minister acting as to the usefulness of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The advice I have is the information I received from the resident engineer, Mr. Dufresne, as to existing conditions.

Mr. STAPLES. Have you any letters containing that information? The people up there would be glad to know just what it is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend would convey to the people the answer at page 1240 of Hansard', he will see the statement made to the House and the representation of the resident engineer.

Mr. STAPLES. I have several letters from people in that district saying that the answer referred to is anything but accurate, and that if this wharf was completed there is no doubt the railway company would build the spur. I protest at the government expending $16,000 on a work that is of no practical use. It was spent when an election was pending to secure a few votes, the people supported the government candidate and it is up to the Minister of Public Works to carry out the promise that was then made by somebody.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nobody had my authority to make any statement in regard to this work. I was not aware that any such statements were being made and certainly never authorized any such statement. It would not be unreasonable that my hon. friend should ask the people to communicate with the railway company and ask whether they will engage to build this spur.

Mr. STAPLES. I desire to see this work completed, and I would think the government, to avoid the criticism they subject themselves to by spending that money on a useless work, would be desirous of making it of some practical use.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is curious that I have had no communication from any people in the locality on the subject. It was represented that the Manitoba Fish Company and a Gypsum Company would make large shipments from here, but that has not been the case.

Mr. STAPLES. How could they when the work was not completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The piers could be used for a landing and if the people wished the improvements it would be easy for them to have the Canadian Northern write me that they were prepared to build the spur and for these other companies to write that they would do their share.

Mr. STAPLES. I would expect the minister not to wait to ask the Canadian Northern railway or any other company what they propose to do but would send some one up to ascertain whether or not the work was of any value and then come here and tell us straight.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My engineer has been up there and has reported.

Mr. STAPLES. If the work was not worth completing it was not worth starting, and the government should have had the necessary information before beginning it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any connection between the building of the freezers and the fishing companies who received the very cheap licenses?

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Why did he spend $16,000 without an assurance from the company that they would build their share?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was all done before I became minister, therefore, I cannot tell what assurances there were. But I would suppose that at the inception of this work there were assurances. Probably the fishermen said: We are going right to work and build the freezers. I suppose the Canadian Northern railway said: We are going to work and build the spur; and the Gypsum Company said: We will ship all our gypsum in that way. Then my predecessor, did the government part of the work, that is the only part that has been done. This Freezing Company has not materialized, this Gypsum Company has not attempted to ship any of their products, and the Canadian Northern railway has not begun to build its spur. Although I have been minister for nearly three years, I have not received a single word from those people, I have not received a single assurance that if we did go on and finish up this additional work, any of these things will materialize.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Would not these assurances still be in the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know if they are in the department or not.

Mr. BRADBURY. I happen to know something about this district, although it is not in my constituency. I think if the minister understood the conditions there he would not hesitate for a moment in building that dock in such a way that it could be used. The dock is built in a position to-day that it is of very little use, no steamboat can get near it. I think it would not cost much to do sufficient dredging to let a steamboat in. I would like to say that the Gypsum Company has been in operation for years, they are shipping hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of gypsum down that lake, and they are compelled now, for the want of a wharf, to take it right down to the bottom of Lake Manitoba and up the Westbourne river, and it is very difficult to get up that river, and very expensive. I am satisfied if the minister understood the situation he would complete that dock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a curious thing that none of these interests have communicated with me on the subject at all.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. What would it cost to finish that in proper shape?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information, but I would be glad to get it.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the minister send his engineer up there and get estimates, provided he is not prepared to take the word of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) and myself with regard to the usefulness of it? Will the minister even go that far, and ascertain what is required to be done, and about what will be the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to look into the matter further, and to get a report from the engineer, Mr. Dufresne, who I presume is familiar with all the facts.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Would you not have information as to the cost in the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We no doubt have the original scheme as outlined, but I would not have a report as to the present condition.

Mr. STAPLES. There is a matter I wish to bring up though it does not come under this item, but under the next one. There is another piece of work the government have been doing in the constituency of Portage La Prairie, adjacent to the constituency of Macdonald; that is on the Assiniboine river. Could the minister give me any information as to the condition of that work? It is with reference to straightening out the river in order to let the water run a little more freely, and prevent the flooding of some land.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like very much if my hon. friend would intimate to me beforehand what information he wants on any particular item. I have not got the papers here to-night, or any notes in connection with any work except those that are actually in these estimates. I could not give my hon. friend the information which he asks for. All I know is that the work was reported as being very useful, but just in what stage it is I am not prepared to say.

Mr. STAPLES. I think it is pretty well completed. I have a return here that I moved for last session, in reference to this piece of work. This piece of work, like other work in that district, has occasioned a great deal of dissatisfaction. There is quite a large return here, and it is really laughable to read some of the communications. I find that some keen politicians were mixed up in it in the election of 1908. They even went so far as to dip down into their own pockets and pay the necessary money in order to keep the work going without creating dissatisfaction until the election was over. That is the position of affairs. They went on and completed this work on a piece of land before they even had a title to it. Now the Minister of Public Works cannot get away from this particular piece of work, he was minister, I believe, at the time. I think it is nearly completed now. But there are some letters here that would really make a person laugh to read them, from men who were concerned, Mr. Macpherson, a lawyer from Portage la Prairie, and even the outside leader of the opposition in Manitoba, Mr. Edward Brown, who was very active in it, and guaranteed the payment to a certain Mr. Armstrong for certain lands. But before he got through with the government, they wrote even to the Minister of Public Works very strong letters, that would indicate they were not very well satisfied with the way in which the government had treated them. I do not know what understanding there may have been between the government and these particular persons. But Mr. Macpherson had to write a good many letters, and write some rather plain letters, before he got his money back that he had put in it, and also certain other bills paid. The minister apparently does not know in what condition the work is in, and I would suggest that he let this item stand until he arms himself with the necessary information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Much as I would like to oblige my hon friend, he must see how unreasonable it would be to let these items for the coming year all stand over until I can get some information of a work that was done upwards of a year ago, and with regard to which he can get the fullest information before the Public Accounts Committee

Mr. STAPLES. I moved for this return on the 22nd of April last year, and only got it a few days ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend does not understand. He seems to think it has been done. As far as I know, he regards that as being satisfactory. But what my hon. friend wants to do is to indulge his curiosity in regard to what he says took place between some of the people engaged on the work. I must urge that this item of harbours, rivers and bridges should not be allowed to stand over. We will come later on to a dredging vote. Probably next week there will be some further items in public works, and I shall be glad to get the information for my hon. friend, but I trust he will not urge that these important items should stand over. We want to get along as rapidly as we can. I hope to get as far as the British Columbia items to-night, and I hope my hon. friend will not endeavour to delay these items.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not wish to retard the progress of this House a moment. I have sat in this committee night after night when the minister had his estimates before the committee, waiting for an opportunity to bring up one or two little things regarding Manitoba, and I do not think he can accuse me of entering into any discussion for the purpose of delaying the House. But I do not propose to allow the minister to sit down and say that I have brought these items up simply as a matter of curiosity. I think this committee is entitled to know the way in which this government have undertaken to do certain public works, and that they have undertaken to do this piece of work on land for which they had not the title. I do not think that is conducting public business on a very good principle. This work was done on property before they had the title. The minister cannot get away from that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The title is in the Crown.

Mr. STAPLES. It is now; it was not when this work was going on.

Mr. BRADBURY. Do I understand the minister to say that we can discuss any question relating to Manitoba?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At any time.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Can we get anything more definite than this statement of 'harbours, rivers and bridges'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps I can answer my hon. friend's question best by showing him what was expended last year. Last year, we only spent $2,654, but the resident engineer thinks that, taking all the different works together, we ought to take a vote of $8,000. We may not spend the whole of it; we may not spend more than two-thirds of it.

Mr. BRADBURY. Just for repairs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just for general repairs and work which may spring up during the fiscal year for which we have no other provision.

Lake Winnipeg—wharfs, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an amount which we are taking to provide for what we think possibly may be some wharf accommodation required on Lake Winnipeg in view of the improvements which have just been completed at St. Andrew's rapids, and which will enable steamers to leave the city of Winnipeg, pass down te Red River and to the foot of Lake Winnipeg. We believe that there will be considerable traffic developed, and we think that necessarily it will have to be provided for by the building of one or two wharfs which would probably serve as breakwaters as well. There should be at the northern part of the lake a breakwater, and we may utilize that as a wharf as well.

Mr. BRADBURY. Has the minister any idea where any of these wharfs should be built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided at what places, because it is a new business that is going to be opened up.

Mr. BRADBURY. I understand. I would like to say that at Gimli there is already a government wharf with an L built across. We hope that the government will extend that L for the purpose of making a harbour there. It is now the terminus of the Canadian Pacific railway on Lake Winnipeg and it is a very important place. I do not know whether the government have a petition or not, but I think that a petition from Gimli was prepared asking for the extension of this wharf, 120 or 150 feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are asking for 100 feet.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is a very important matter, and I would like to impress upon the minister the necessity of doing the work. All the boats that ply from Selkirk to the head of Lake Winnipeg pass this place. It is a very shallow lake, storms come up very rapidly, and the waves get very ugly there. There is no way of getting into Gimli when there is a heavy sea on at the present time, and if this 100 feet were built and a little dredging done it would make a first-class harbour for any boat on the lake, and it would be a great benefit to the people of Gimli, to the steamboat owners and to everybody who is doing business on that lake. I would, therefore, urge the minister to provide a sum to extend the wharf at this point this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have been already urged to make an extension of the wharf at Gimli, and the matter is under consideration. It will be quite possible to use part of this vote for this purpose. We intend to have a pretty careful survey of the harbours of Lake Winnipeg made with the view of expending any money on wharfs at points where it would be of the greatest advantage, always keeping in mind the importance of having some harbours of refuge which are essential to the preservation of life and the safety of shipping. As my hon. friend knows, storms arise very quickly on that lake, and it is essential to the safety of shipping that there should be some harbours of refuge at different points on the lake.

Mr. A. HAGGART. The building of these wharfs on Lake Winnipeg, the deepening of the river at the mouth and the construction of the St. Andrew's rapids all point to the fact that the destination of the trade which is expected to be developed will be the city of Winnipeg. If it is to be the destination of that trade we certain want wharfs. In the olden times when the river was navigated by the old Red River steamers with flat bottoms and stern wheels, any part of the bank was a wharf. They simply ran the prow of the boat upon the prairie and loaded or unloaded. But, if Lake Winnipeg is to be navigated, it will be by lake steamers which will come up through the lake and the Red river, and we will want a wharf at Winnipeg; otherwise there will be great inconvenience to transportation. There is expected to be a large trade in stone, timber and cordwood, and unless there are facilities for unloading there will be great inconvenience. Just in connection with this I would like to mention that now would be the time to procure a site, and now would be the time to lay out a plan for the wharf, because property along that river is being very rapidly acquired, a great deal of it by the railway companies. The minister ought not to lose sight of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the matter will have my careful consideration. I recognize that either the government or the city of Winnipeg must afford wharf accommodation. I do not think the government has been forgetful of its duties so far in assisting transportation. Just what we can do in the city of Winnipeg in the way of providing wharf accommodation is a matter for careful consideration, and certainly it will have my most careful consideration.

Mr. BRADBURY. With reference to the bridge over the St. Andrews dam——

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are going to build that bridge.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is just what I want to know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY. Then I will not discuss it. I am very glad that the minister has seen the necessity of doing that work.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the minister mean that he is going to build the approaches?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The approaches to the bridge.

Mr. STAPLES. The intention is to build the approaches?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The intention is to complete this work by building the approaches. The bridge is designed as a service bridge in connection with the dam, and also for a highway bridge. I just want to say, I have to say it now in the absence of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that I was greatly surprised at the statement he made here as to the uselessness of that work at St. Andrews rapids, and I was more surprised that hon. gentlemen from Manitoba who are familiar with the facts, and know the vast public importance of this work should allow these remarks to pass unnoticed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) stated it was a waste of public money, that he had been down to see it, that it was a splendid piece of work which was entirely unnecessary, and would not serve any good purpose. That is the effect of what the hon. member for North Toronto said.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister is doing the hon. member (Mr. Foster) an injustice. I understood him to say that owing to the elevation of that work, although it is a good piece of work, it would be of no value unless approaches were built.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was speaking of the whole work as being away beyond the necessity of the times, and as being an extravagance and a waste of public money. I desire to say that in my judgment there is no more useful work in Canada than that lock and dam in St. Andrews rapids. There is no work that is more likely to lead in the near future to a large traffic. We have designed the bridge as a highway bridge, and a service bridge. The extra expenditure to make it a highway bridge is not very great, and we purpose proceeding during the coming season with the building of the approaches. I visited this work, and I met there the representatives of the municipalities, and I told them I would take their request into my careful consideration. I have much pleasure in announcing for the information of our friends from that portion of Manitoba which is more particularly interested in this work, that during the coming season we will build the approaches to the bridge so that the people on both sides may have the accommodation.

Mr. BRADBURY. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) does not need any one to defend him in this House, but he is not here to defend himself, and while I think the minister does not want to be unfair to the hon. member (Mr. Foster), yet the minister made a mistake when he said that the hon. member for North Toronto had declared the work to be useless.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He made a big mistake.

Mr. BRADBURY. I was present with the hon. member (Mr. Foster) when he investigated this work, and what he did say was that he considered the expenditure altogether too large for the requirements of the place. As the representative of that constituency I am not prepared to say that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was not right. The government has spent a large sum of money there, and they have certainly done an excellent piece of work, and I must give the department credit for having erected one of the best steel structures of that kind on this continent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRADBURY. Whether that large expenditure is warranted at the present time I am not prepared to say, but at all events, what the hon. member for North Toronto argued was that the putting of the passenger bridge on top of the work required for the steel girders to allow the ice to pass had occasioned an increased expenditure of something like $200,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The increase would not be $20,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have to take the word of the minister, but against it I have the word of the engineer in charge of the bridge at the time whom I asked what the extra cost of providing for the passenger bridge was——

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will pardon me. The hon. member for North Toronto was simply speaking of the bridge that was there; he was not speaking of the approaches, and he said we had spent $200,000 beyond what it would have been necessary to spend if we had not provided that portion of it for a highway bridge, and he said that money was wasted. As to that he is all wrong; my engineer informs me that $20,000 will be the extra cost.

Mr. BRADBURY. Had the minister maintained his position of last session that he would not build the approaches——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say I would not.

Mr. BRADBURY. It was pretty near that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the minister had not built the approaches then the member for North Toronto would be right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have been up there since, you know, and I have seen the place.

Mr. BRADBURY. When the member for North Toronto criticised that work he stated that it was an excellent piece of work, but at the same time he did not feel that the large expenditure was justified at the present time. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) pointed out with reference to the lock, and I think he was right in that, that if the traffic from Lake Winnipeg and the north is going to be anything as great as that heavy expenditure would indicate, then the lock is surely too small, because at the present time it will not take an ordinary lake barge and a tug at the same time. It is only possible to take one barge through the lock by the old style of towing. Probably that is one of the things the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was drawn to when he was on the ground, and he realized that a larger lock should be provided in view of the great expenditure. I think the minister told me last year that the work would cost $1,500,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not so much, about $1,250,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. I will not criticise this work further. I congratulate the minister that at last he has seen eye to eye with myself as to the absolute necessity of completing that work. It would have been folly to allow that work to stand in the position it was in last year because it was useless for a passenger bridge as no one could get near it. I am glad the minister has made up his mind to complete it.

Red River projection—new entrance to channel at its mouth, $10,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. What does the minister intend to do at the mouth of the river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are to build protecting jetties to prevent the filling of the new channel at the mouth of the river. These jetties are to be respectively 400 feet and 300 feet long, pile work. A new channel 4,000 feet long and about a hundred feet wide, 4 feet 5 inches deep at low water and 9 feet 5 inches deep at high water, has been dredged at the bar, and we propose, by means of these protection jetties, to keep the current in that channel.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is a work which is very much needed, and I am glad the department is taking that way of making the channel. Thousands of dollars have

been wasted at the mouth of the river, and the method which the government is adopting will I hope make a permanent channel.

Winnipeg Beach harbour—protection pier on Lake Winnipeg, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a very necessary work, and we propose going on with it this year.

Mr. BRADBURY. I may say that this is a very necessary work. I urged this on the hon. minister last year as strongly as I could. He stated that the finances of the country did not then warrant him in going on with the work, but I am glad that he has provided for it this year. I have in my hand a petition from the residents of Winnipeg Beach, addressed to the minister, and signed by the mayor of the village, W. J. Woods, by counsellors A. C. Dukes, J. Stacey, Wm. J. Howes, and by the secretary, J. D. Forster, praying that this work be commenced immediately and be completed as soon as possible. They point out the absolute necessity of commencing the work before the ice goes away, if the minister has any intention of building it this spring, as I hope he has, because a great deal of the piling can be done on the ice, which could not be done afterwards, except at much greater expense.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that I have seen the locality and recognize the very great importance of this work, in the way of providing a suitable breakwater and harbour of refuge at this point on Lake Winnipeg. We are endeavouring to expedite the work as much as possible. We are taking all the preliminary steps in the hope that by next week we shall probably be able to call for tenders, so that the moment the Appropriation Act passes a contract can be entered into. In the meantime it will be intimated to the parties who are the lowest tenderers, so that they can get the timber out before the ice leaves. Now, let me call the attention of the committee to the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on the subject of the dam and lock at St. Andrews. It was a matter of surprise to me that my hon. friends from Manitoba should have let those remarks pass without correcting the hon. gentleman. I think common fair play to the Department of Public Works and to the government should have induced the hon. gentlemen who are so zealous for this work and know its importance to correct the hon. member for North Toronto. This is what the hon. gentleman is reported to have said, at page 1498 of 'Hansard.'

Mr. A. HAGGART. What was being debated at that time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was the Budget. Referring to St. Andrews lock, the hon. member for North Toronto said:

Mr. BRADBURY

Whilst in the west, I took an automobile trip down the Red river to see a very notable, noted, or notorious work, called the St. Andrew's lock. There you have a very fine work. The total cost of it, I believe, is to be over $600,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. A million and a half.

Mr. FOSTER. Six hundred thousand dollars has been spent now.

Mr. BRADBURY. Over a million.

Mr. FOSTER. It is worse than I thought it was. Supposing we put it at a million or a million and a quarter. Has the Prime Minister ever seen it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not had that privilege.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Prime Minister ever inquired into it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very weak reply. The Prime Minister is head trustee for the people of Canada. Will he now justify his conduct as head trustee for the people of Canada in sinking a million and a quarter of money in the St. Andrew's locks? Of that amount, $200,000 is for a highway bridge, for which no vote was ever taken, and that bridge lies there in its naked steel splendour, thirty-five or forty feet up in air from the road on either side.

Let me pause to remark that that bridge is essentially and primarily a service bridge for the purpose of operating these curtains in connection with the dam, and the amount spent to date on making that service bridge a highway bridge, which was also to be used as a highway bridge, was somewhere between $20,000 and $30,000 instead of $200,000 as stated by the hon. member for North Toronto. Then he proceeds:

I want to ask the Prime Minister, as head trustee for the people of Canada, to tell me to-night if he can get any three business men in the city of Winnipeg to put within his hand any justification, on the traffic that exists at present or on the business which may be expected in the near future, for the expenditure of a million and a quarter of money on that work? It is one of the finest pieces of concrete masonry and steel I ever saw; but where is the business to come from? It is an absolute waste of public money at the present time. Was that brilliant work, when the head trustee himself does not know a thing about it? Who does know? Somebody; and somebody ought to have told it.

If my hon. friend thought then, as he thinks to-night, that this was a most useful public work, and that it opened up possibilities for the development of traffic in stone, timber, cordwood and other resources, which will no doubt be developed in the future along the shores of that great lake, which is larger than Lake Ontario, surely it was his duty to have risen in the House and told the hon. member for North Toronto and the people of Canada that he was entirely mistaken in charging the government with building a public work for which there would be no business, and

which, therefore, was an absolute waste of public money. I desire to say that I have carefully inquired into the matter, and I do believe that the construction of that lock and dam at St. Andrews rapids is going to be the means of opening up between points on Lake Winnipeg and the city of Winnipeg a traffic which will grow to very large dimensions; and a man does not need to have a very prophetic vision to be able to look forward to the not distant future when, by the construction of a few locks near the mouth of the Saskatchewan, we can have steamboat accommodation all the way from Winnipeg to within a comparatively short distance of the foothills of the Rocky mountains, about 100 miles west of Edmonton, and this dam at St. Andrews rapids is the first link in this great chain of inland transportation.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am not going to dispute what the hon. gentleman says as regards the importance of this work. But I do not think it is altogether fair to the hon. member for North Toronto. He seeks to convey to this committee and to the country that the hon. member for North Toronto condemned the work in its entirety. This would not be fair or correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If language means anything, he did.

Mr. BRADBURY. I differ with the hon. gentleman. What the hon. member for North Toronto said was that a million and a quarter was a larger amount of money than was justified under the circumstances. This work has a history which the hon. minister does not perhaps know; but we who have lived in that country some twenty-five years know that government after government has been approached to build this great work. I remember that when the Hon. McKenzie Bowell, who was then premier of this Dominion, was in Winnipeg, he met the board of trade of that city at the city hall, and after listening to their representations, he told them that if they could show him anything to justify the expenditure, he would make it. At that time the engineers of the government estimated the cost at half a million dollars, but it has cost instead $1,500,000 or very close to that amount. I am not prepared to admit that such a large expenditure was absolutely necessary to create the dam and the dock at St. Andrews rapids but the work erected there is a magnificent piece of work and a credit to the government that did it. I believe, however, that we could have built a piece of work there, which would have answered the purpose just as well for perhaps one half the expenditure the government have made. That, I think, was the position which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) took.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You could hardly get that system of curtains for the amount you mention.

Mr. BRADBURY. The minister will admit that this is the only system of curtains on this continent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite so, and this is the only work of that character on this continent.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not think so. You will find other rivers that have a dam and a lock built along these lines.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Running from south to north?

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is just where the difference is.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am quite satisfied that a work could have been built there which would have suited the purpose just as well for much less money. Fifteen years ago we had as resident engineer in Winnipeg, one of the brightest engineers the department has ever had, and he never proposed any such work as this. There can be no question that we could have built a work which would have answered the purpose just as well, without these steel curtains. At the same time, now that the work is completed, I am not going to criticise it; but when the hon. member for North Toronto spoke, what he deprecated was the very large expenditure in excess of what he thought was justified under the circumstances. He was not condemning the work itself or a proper expenditure. Had he done so, I would have expressed my dissent.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. minister to say that work was contracted for, involving an expenditure of about $200,000, before there was any item in the estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. That is what the hon. member for North Toronto said. He said that $200,000 had been expended without any vote, but that statement lacked the essential element of truth.

Mr. A. HAGGART. I think we might now leave this. This bridge has been built, the money has been spent, the work is there, we have had the opinion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and we now have the opinion of the minister, and I certainly sympathize with the minister and hope that every prophecy he has made will be realized. In connection with the other item, the building of this pier at Winnipeg beach, that is a work in which the people of Winnipeg are deeply interested. That beach has been much improved by the Canadian Pacific railway. It is within about 40 miles of the

city, and is one of the outing places for its population of 170,000. By furnishing fast trains and giving good accommodation, the Canadian Pacific railway has given the people of Winnipeg the opportunity of enjoying an outing at that beach for the day or the week's end. A large amount of pleasure craft have their headquarters there, but these boats run the risk of being destroyed by every storm that blows. During Christmas time I was approached by many people who represented to me the crying need for the construction of a pier at that beach, and they want it begun now so that they may enjoy the benefit of it this summer. Now that the river has been dredged, there is water communication between Winnipeg and that beach, but no valuable boat can be left there over night for lack of this protection. Hundreds of people have cottages and live there during the summer months, as it is convenient for business men who can leave there in the morning and be in town in time for their work. It is really the only summer resort near Winnipeg where people can have their summer homes, and at the same time attend daily to their business. All classes of citizens have been urging me to use my best endeavours to have the minister go on with that work with all the expedition possible, but I doubt very much if the sum of $10,000 will be adequate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will take something more than that, but we intend to proceed as rapidly as possible with it. It will take about $16,000 to finish it.

Mr. BRADBURY. I want to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that at Hecla island, or Big island, on Lake Winnipeg, there are about 50 or 60 settlers. It is an old settled district. All the steamers coming to or going from the north pass by this island, and a great many stop there to take on wood. A wharf of some kind should be built at that place, and I would urge the hon. minister to investigate it this summer, and have his engineers select a site for a wharf there. I notice in the estimates quite a number of wharfs provided in the eastern provinces, and I do not think I am asking too much when I urge on the minister to provide a wharf at this island. It would not cost more than $5,000 or $6,000 and will be a great accommodation to steamboats and people who have no way of getting from the island except by boat. There is a large quantity of wood there, which has now to be shipped under great difficulties, besides agricultural products.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My object in providing this vote was to do these very things. It is to provide that, after careful examination, we may give wharf accommodation where needed. The representation of my hon. friend regarding Hecla island will have my most serious consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With regard to the appropriations for 1910-11, I would like to ask the minister what has happened the yearly appropriation I have seen in the estimates during the last five or six years for the lowering of Lake Dauphin and taking care of the silt at the mouth of the Mossy river? Is there any special reason why these works have been eliminated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work, if it be useful work, of course the government will look into carefully. It can be done out of the general dredging vote with our own dredging plant, and we do not require a special appropriation for it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The dredging at the mouth of the Mossy river was done in a very inadequate way, those operating the dredge knew nothing about their business, they took up the mud from one side of the boat and dumped it on the other, and the northeast wind sent the sand back into the old channel. If the dredging is not done this summer, it would be impossible for boats to get into the mouth of the river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am going to have it looked into. I have not been satisfied with the way that work has been proceeding, and I want to see if we cannot have it go along more satisfactorily.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Thank you.

Harbours and rivers, Saskatchewan and Alberta—Athabaska riier—removal of boulders and deepening channel through sand and gravel bars, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to do work urgently required to improve the navigation of the Athabaska river. There is a gerat deal of settlement going on north of Edmonton and we have as rapidly as possible to make provision for the people. The only way to get to remote districts is by the river. Some have motor boats, some small steamers, and some York boats and we are endeavouring to remove the boulders, etc., as fast as we can. The same remarks apply to the items for the Lesser Slave lake and the North Saskatchewan river.

Last Mountain lake—improvement of navigable route, $20,000.

Mr. LAKE. Would the minister give some information in regard to this work, the length of the navigable route, the amount of traffic, etc.?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a great deal of settlement upon both sides of Last Mountain lake. A steamboat has been put in operation on the lake and is doing a very considerable business. This work is to make the outlet and the mouth of the lake navigable. We have been dredging at the

entrance right into the lake so that a small steamer will be able to leave the railway at Craven and go up into the lake. The idea is that lumber and other supplies can be taken up to the settlers by water and grain can be brought down. Last Mountain lake is the one great sheet of water in the western country west of the Manitoba lakes. It is a beautiful sheet of water and there are a number of fine harbours on it. It is rapidly becoming a very favourite summer resort for the people of Regina. There is excellent fishing and, better than all, both sides of the lake for many miles back are settled by a very large number of industrious and thrifty settlers who have been very prosperous and who have improved the country in a few years.

Mr. LAKE. What is the actual distance of navigation being opened up, what has it cost and what is it likely to cost before it is completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Craven to the head of the lake, I would think would be about 60 miles of navigable water. I shall be able to give my hon. friend the details of the expenditure at a later date. I have not a memorandum of them here. We built a small dredge and a tug and have been dredging there. There will also be land damages on account of flooding.

Mr. MAGRATH. What is the area of land damaged?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By building a dam at Craven in order to preserve the water in Last Mountain lake at normal level a considerable area of land below the foot of the lake and in the valley of the outlet was flooded, and we expropriated quite a quantity of land, I think about 1,800 acres, thinking it better to expropriate the land than to pay damages. The Exchequer Court allowed $25 an acre. I believe that by utilizing the dredge to make a dyke along the foot of the lake and at the outlet we will be able to shut out the water and the land in a few years will be worth as much as we paid for it.

North Saskatchewan river—wing dams for improvement of navigable channel from Edmonton to Lake Winnipeg, $25,000.

Mr. HERRON. What does this improvement consist of?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Building wing dams for the purpose of confining the channel at certain points within narrow limits, in order to increase the depth of water. There are a number of places where navigation can be greatly improved in this way. I believe we can get, at a moderate expenditure, very good navigation from the head of Cedar lake, at all events, right through to a point west of Edmonton, without building any locks. Down the river below Cedar lake some locks will be necessary to make navigation reasonably good.

Mr. HERRON. Will the minister say what is the nature of navigation on the Saskatchewan, and what trade is being done there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At present there are quite a number of steamers operating at different points, but there is no through traffic from Edmonton to Winnipeg. There are steamers between different points. At Prince Albert there are a number of small vessels, and at Edmonton also. There is a good deal of settlement springing up along the banks of the Saskatchewan, and people living at Prince Albert and other points up and down the river, are of the opinion that it is desirable to preserve and improve gradually the navigation of the river. It is felt that it will be a most desirable means of bringing heavy freight from the prairie country, from the towns along the Saskatchewan, and from the farms in the vicinity, freight such as grain, coal and lumber down the Saskatchewan, to go either over the Hudson Bay railway to Hudson bay and thence to Europe, or to the city of Winnipeg. Coal would only be brought to Winnipeg, but lumber might be shipped over the Hudson Bay railway. If it were brought down by water, it could take the Hudson Bay railway at Le Pas and could thence be shipped to Europe. Of course it is impossible to tell the extent to which development will take place. But I do think that our western country is very fortunate in having such a vast system of inland navigation as we have on both branches of the Saskatchewan, and along the tributary streams such as the Carrot river. The main river has been more or less explored from time to time. During the past season, I directed an exploring party to go from the mouth of the river up as far as Le Pas where the Hudson Bay railway will start. A very valuable report has been made, and the engineers report that it will be practicable to give nine feet of navigation at low water to the head of Cedar lake, and in that way lake vessels navigating Lake Winnipeg could go up the Saskatchewan river to the head of Cedar lake, and from Cedar lake on to a point probably 100 miles west of Edmonton. Navigation would be suitable in the dry season only for light vessels drawing three or four feet of water; but that is the class of vessels which are largely used in navigating the waters of the western rivers in the United States, such as the Missouri, the Ohio, and ports of the Mississippi. My hon. friend probably knows about the South Saskatchewan. I know there are steamers, tug boats and other vessels plying upon that river. Of course the build-

ing of railways has done away to a large extent with the navigation that formerly was done on the Saskatchewan river. But as the country settles up, I think the time will soon come when people will look to water transportation as the chief means of getting heavy produce carried to market. Navigable rivers will prove valuable to regulate railway rates; and if there is one thing more than another I would like to say to the people of that western country, it is to preserve at all hazards the navigation of these rivers, not to allow any obstruction in them in the shape of building fixed bridges, or otherwise, but rather to induce the government to keep on improving and preserving navigation, because it will be found of incalculable value as the country develops in the future.

Mr. HERRON. I am aware that there has been some navigation on the Saskatchewan river for 30 years back. But the minister has not told us definitely to what extent navigation is carried on there at the present time. I would like to know, for instance, if there are any steamers running regular trips on schedule time from Edmonton east as far as Prince Albert, or for what distance, or are they only used as ferry boats? Is there any freight at the present time carried up and down the Saskatchewan river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not say that.

Mr. W. H. WHITE. I think I could give some information to my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Herron). There was considerable boat traffic on that river until the Canadian Northern was built two years ago. There is no boat running regularly between Prince Albert and Edmonton, but there is some boats running from Edmonton taking on freight to Battleford, and it is also used for the shipment of coal. The improvement of this river is much needed. Along the banks of the Saskatchewan river there are many outcroppings of coal, sometimes a hundred feet or 150 feet below the level, and it costs more to raise the coal up and draw it to the railway than it is worth. If the river was made navigable, it would afford a cheaper means of transporting coal than is now available, and would give an opportunity to ship coal to Battleford and Prince Albert. There is no railroad north of the Saskatchewan river, but there are large farming settlements, cattle and grain, and could be better shipped by boat than by rail. I think that if some of the boulders were removed from the river we would see regular boats running during the summer months between Edmonton and Prince Albert. They would carry a good deal of freight, and I think all the coal on the Saskatchewan might be carried that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. MAGRATH. I hope the minister will have his department prepare some comprehensive plan for the development of the water routes in that country. He has spoken about the North Saskatchewan. It is desirable, in making expenditures of this kind, that they shall all form a link in the final result that he expects to reach. Water transportation in America has not been satisfactory. The hon. gentleman was speaking, a few moments ago, about the Missouri. I remember when the upper reaches of the Missouri were crowded with steamers, and there are none there to-day. The railroads appear to have been shoving these waterways out of business. I do not hold that that is desirable. I think that expenditures of this character should be in line with a common policy and that a proper engineering force should be put to work along our western streams and a thorough investigation made so that every dollar we spend will be leading towards the perfected plan of final developments.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That comes under the next item for surveys of rapids, &c., on the North and South Saskatchewan river, and other navigable streams.

Northwest Territories—harbours, river and bridge work—general repairs and improvements, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for work in the Northwest territories outside of the provinces.

British Columbia — Athalmer — Columbia river—wharf, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the construction of a small wharf at Athalmer, asked for by a petition of the residents. This will complete the work.

Bamfield—west shore of Vancouver Island, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the renewal and enlargement of the existing wharf at Bamfield. It is asked for by the superintendent of the cable station and others.

Campbell river—improvements and wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is requested by the resident engineer, and it is for repairs to Campbell river wharf.

Mr. BARNARD. What is the work that is going to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wharf is to be renewed. It has been very severely damaged by the teredo. It is useless to renew it without protecting the piles. The engineer recommends that a Gold teredo proof pile should be used in the renewals as it will last ten or fifteen years and will cost $5,000.

Mr. BARNARD. I notice that some of the wharfs being built in the province of

Quebec, that we were discussing this afternoon, were apparently being built of concrete, and that the cost was more or less estimated by the cubic contents, showing that work of a practically permanent nature was being constructed. I think it is almost conceded that no piles in the waters of the Pacific coast will stand the attacks of the teredo for many more than a few years. Has the minister ever considered the idea of making these wharfs of a permanent nature by putting in concrete or something that will do away with the necessity of this constant renewal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To build piers of concrete in British Columbia at the present time would be pretty expensive. I do not know that there are any cement works out there.

Mr. BARNARD. I can give the minister some information as to that. There is no trouble about getting cement. You can get a very good quality of cement on Vancouver island.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it manufactured there?

Mr. BARNARD. Yes, at one of the best plants in the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is certainly worthy of considering as to whether or not it would be better, as far as possible to build of concrete in places where the teredo is very destructive.

Mr. BARNARD. That is everywhere.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems that it is almost everywhere on the coast except in the Fraser river where you have fresh water. The chief engineer of the department informs me that there is a timber called turpentine timber which is got in Australia—The Canadian Pacific railway are beginning to use it—which is said to resist the ravages of the teredo, and it may be that we will find it of advantage to use it and that it will be cheaper than concrete. It is supposed that it will last, as against the teredo, for forty or fifty years.

Columbia river—improvements, $14,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for general improvement upon the Columbia river.

Mr. BARNARD. Where?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Revelstoke, above Golden and at the Arrow lake wharf. These are three which we are urgently asked to attend to.

Mr. BARNARD. Are any of the works which are to be constructed at Revelstoke in the nature of protecting the bank against erosion?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BARNARD. I understand that representations have been made along this line by the provincial government on account of this being a navigable stream. I would like to know if the minister has taken into consideration the desirability of doing that work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Part of this money will be used for protecting the works there that we have already contributed to, but we have not in contemplation the undertaking of any new work of this nature upon the Columbia river at the present time. I have been communicated with by the British Columbia government asking me to pay half of a certain work that they are carrying on. I have not felt it advisable to accede to their request.

Mr. BARNARD. We have to-day voted numerous items for the protection of the banks of the St. Lawrence and other rivers in the east. I would like to know if there is any reason why this government should not undertake the protection of the banks of navigable rivers in the province of British Columbia in the same way as they do in the east?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are finishing up some works of this character in the east, which were undertaken some time ago, the same as we have done work in British Columbia and in other provinces, but, for reasons which I stated upon another occasion, I do not feel that we could, as a general rule, engage in work of this character. I do not feel that we could recognize that this is an obligation which rests upon the federal government. There may be circumstances under which we will continue to do it. There may be cases in which the work is of such great magnitude that it would not be reasonable to ask the province to do it entirely. In those cases we may perhaps fairly assume a part of the burden, but to say that we are bound, as a matter of duty and obligation simply because a river is navigable, as a federal government, to do the work of protecting the banks is to put forth a proposition which I deny in toto. I say that there is no obligation of that character resting upon the federal government. It will not do for the provincial authorities or the municipal authorities to attempt to throw that work on to the federal government, and to say this is work which it is your duty to attend to, simply because a river or a lake that is washing away the shores is navigable water. There are cases where we have done it. We have assisted the local government in British Columbia, but it does not follow that because we have given them some assistance we are going to assist them in every work of this character that they undertake. If we did that we would be called upon to do work of this character on the McLeod river, the Saskatchewan, the St. Lawrence, the Lievre

and hundreds of other lakes and rivers of Canada. There is another reason. We are already doing work on the Columbia river for which we are asking an appropriation of $14,500, and we are dealing as liberally as the funds at our disposal will enable us to do to improve the navigation of these rivers. We are going to clear out the debris in the steamboat channels for the purpose of assisting navigation. We are doing a great deal of work in various sections of British Columbia along these lines. I cannot undertake that as a matter of federal obligation we would protect the banks of all rivers simply because they happen to be navigable.

Mr. BARNARD. The minister has got heated over this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. BARNARD. I simply asked the minister whether he was going to do this work, and if not, whether he thought there was any distinction between the treatment accorded to British Columbia and the treatment accorded to the province of Quebec. I merely mentioned the province of Quebec in the comparison for the reason that we have had, to-day, several appropriations for work of a similar character in that province. I would like to know from the minister if we are to take it that it is not the policy of the government to do this kind of work in any of the provinces in the future unless special circumstances arise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is one thing the hon. gentleman seems to desire to forget, and that is that if he looks to the protection work that has been done in the different provinces in recent years, I venture to say that as much or more has been done in British Columbia as in any other province of Canada. But the hon. gentleman does not recognize that, and he seems to be wanting all the time to put forward the allegation that we are discriminating against British Columbia.

Mr. BARNARD. So you are.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a matter of fact, we have done more of this kind of work in British Columbia than in any other province in Canada.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like to ask the supporters of the government from British Columbia if they consider that the province of British Columbia has been as fairly treated as have the other provinces.

Mr. FIELDING. That is another question.

Mr. BARNARD. That is a question which neither the hon. member for Nanaimo nor the Minister of Inland Revenue will venture to answer to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not the question before the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a great pity to raise these sectional questions.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The question before the committee is not a sectional question; it is a question of honour between the Dominion of Canada and the province of British Columbia, which makes it far more than a sectional question. We have a solemn agreement with the Dominion of Canada and that agreement has been violated in several respects. We have a solemn agreement providing that the federal government shall carry on in British Columbia all classes of works which it carries on in the other provinces of Canada. That is the principle for which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard) has been contending to-night. It is not a matter of expediency, it is not a matter of policy on the part of the government, it is a matter of whether or not they intend to break faith with British Columbia. The minister and his colleagues recognize that it is a very difficult thing indeed for a province to compel the federal administration to keep faith in a matter of this kind, but there is such a thing as honour left in this country, and we have put it forward as a matter of honour time after time, that they have made a contract with us to do these works, and that they are doing them for other provinces as I showed this afternoon in regard to the province of Quebec when I read item after item—and I mentioned Quebec merely because the items for that province were before the House when the matter came up—item after item appearing in the estimates for all sorts of protection works in that province. I invited the intention of the Minister of Public Works to that fact in view of this discussion this afternoon. Now I would like to ask the minister whether he repudiates this contract with British Columbia or whether he thinks this government should carry it out in the spirit in which it was made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman asks me the question I would say that so far as this government is aware it is carrying out in the most absolute, good faith every obligation to British Columbia. It does not follow that because we build a wharf in one province we have got to build a wharf in British Columbia whether it is required or not.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That is not the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are carrying on all classes of work in British Columbia just the same as in the other sections of Canada. The Dominion is giving subsidies for railways in British Columbia just as

in other sections of the country; it is building wharfs in British Columbia, and it is doing dredging work in British Columbia just the same as in any other section of Canada.

Mr. BARNARD. Not the same.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The point before the committee is: Will the government continue to erect protectioin works in British Columbia or will it follow out the policy of refusing to do so, which has been indicated by the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Our policy in regard to protection works will be the same in British Columbia as in every other province of Canada.

Mr. BARNARD. The Minister of Public Works told us he was doing dredging work in British Columbia the same as in other provinces. I have not been in this House very long, but I have had two opportunities of showing the minister that the tonnage of the ports of British Columbia exceeds the tonnage of these pet ports of his in the maritime provinces very largely indeed. And I have also told him that the province of British Columbia in connection with these harbour works and harbour and dredging appropriations gets about 20 per cent in proportion of the appropriations that the other provinces get. I have pointed out that the province of British Columbia is to-day crying out for these public works and it is crying to deaf ears.

Mr. COWAN. The Minister of Public Works is seeking shelter in his own ignorance when he says he 'is not aware,' and perhaps it is my duty to put him wise to the facts. The fact is that this government is taking three times as much per head of the population from the people of British Columbia as it is taking out of the people of the other parts of the Dominion, and this government is spending in public works in British Columbia about one-fifth as much per head of the population as it is spending in the other parts of Canada. In other words, this government is discriminating against British Columbia about eight times. Where there should be an exact equality, where on every principle of honour there should be an exact equality, there is a difference of about eight to one against British Columbia. Now, the minister has sheltered himself twice under the statement that he is unaware of the facts, and I venture to say on the floor of this House that I am stating the facts when I give these figures.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. And I venture to state that my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) is not stating the facts with regard to the proportion of expenditure in British Columbia as compared with the other provinces in the Dominion. My hon. friend, I believe, claims to be the father of the famous better terms proposition of the British Columbia government, and the fallacy of the figures presented in the tabulated statement he has caused to be prepared was absolutely proven by the return brought down to this House a few years ago.

Mr. COWAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could show where that fallacy is?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is shown in the return brought down to which I have referred. The hon. member is making general statements to the House and is not producing any proof whatever to substantiate what he says. He simply says that the appropriations for expenditure in British Columbia are as one to eight in the rest of the Dominion, and he claims that the contribution to the revenue by the province of British Columbia is much larger than the contribution of other provinces Well, that is a very large question, and the hon. gentleman can argue almost anything he likes from that statement, because it is hard to prove a statement of that kind. I do not think it is so myself, and I say so frankly and fearlessly after a very long investigation into the question. I do think that the province of British Columbia is a very large contributor to the revenues of the Dominion, but that is aside from the issue altogether. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that public works are not being carried on in the province of British Columbia by this government, but I would like to know what demands made upon this government for public works have been refused. What demands have this year been made on the government for necessary public works in that province which have been refused? To my knowledge, I know of none.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I can tell you.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I might point out to the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) that the very large and necessary public work of deepening the Narrows is provided for to just as large an extent as it could be provided for. As much money is being provided for the coming year as can be well spent during the year. And so throughout the entire province, I know of no large public work which has been asked for that is not being done. The Fraser river, which is receiving a good deal of attention from my hon. friend from Westminster, is also being provided for, and the improvement of the channel up to Westminster is being carried out as rapidly as circumstances will permit.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The minister says that he knows of no public work that has

been requested that has not been provided. Without going into many others, that I could mention, I would like to ask him with respect to two, which I myself heard him promise at a public meeting at Chilliwack during the last campaign, namely, a new post office for Chilliwack, another public building for Chilliwack, and dredging for Chilliwack, a dredge being then supposed to be actually on its way up the river. I am bound under the rules of the House to take the hon. minister's denial if he says that he did not promise these, although I heard him promise them myself. I ask him whether he has ever asked for these or whether they have been granted.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is extraordinary, Mr. Chairman. In the first place, I think I am as non-committal in making promises of public works in a constituency or as to the performance of anything in the future over which I have not absolute control, as any other member of the government, and I deny absolutely that I made any such promises at a public meeting at Chilliwack. But it is a fact that a site for a post office was being considered at that time, if it had not been secured, and if there was not in the estimates a sum of money for a post office at Chilliwack, it was certainly intended that there should be, and if I am not mistaken, it is in the estimates to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is there.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Votes for public buildings at Chilliwack, Vernon and two or three other places in British Columbia were cut out of the estimates last year in consequence of the general reduction of the votes for public works. But I believe that these are in the estimates of this year. I may have said that I was personally desirous of seeing a public building, and would use my best efforts to have it built. If I made a casual promise of that kind, that promise is being fulfilled. As to the dredging in the Fraser river, that is a purely local question. I do remember something about the moving of a dredge from one point to another point to do a little local work. Whether that has been done or not I do not know. It certainly was intended to be done. But I know of no wharf, no dredging, no public building or other public work that should be carried out in the province of British Columbia that has not been carried out when proper representations have been made, and I challenge my hon. friends to say anything to the contrary. The province of British Columbia has not many towns or cities; but in almost every town of two or three thousand people and over we have now a nice public building, whereas when this government came into power there was only one public building if I am not mistaken, certainly not more than two, in the entire province.

Mr. COWAN. May I ask the minister a question? I presume that he knows that the tonnage of the port of Vancouver is second only to that of Montreal. Can he point to one dollar of Dominion money that has been spent in the improvement of that port?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The question is quite an unnecessary one. There is no better harbour in the Dominion than the harbour of Vancouver, and therefore it is unnecessary to spend much money to improve that harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have done dredging there. We have had the 'King Edward' at work there.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The great improvement which the port of Vancouver requires is to widen and deepen the narrows, and I believe it is the intention of the Minister of Public Works to buy a dredge for that work. In the last two or three years, one of the finest public buildings in Canada has been put up in Vancouver for a post office and custom house, and we have recently bought a tract of ground for an examining warehouse in connection with the custom house. We have provided all the accommodation in the way of public buildings that is necessary for the great city of Vancouver, and I am proud to say that it is a great city. It is all very well for my hon. friends to make statements in a general way, but they cannot substantiate them. I do not know what more we could get in the city of Vancouver. The deepening of the Fraser river from its mouth up to above Westminster is a very important work on which this government has already spent half a million dollars, and which it will take years to complete. In the city of Victoria we have been spending at least ten times as much money as did the former government, and in this year's estimates, there is twice the sum appropriated last year for the purpose of deepening some points in the harbour in order to accommodate the increase in shipping. It is all very well for my hon. friend to raise the miserable old issue, raised in the last general elections in British Columbia, of the alleged antagonism of this government to the best interests of British Columbia. That charge is a false one, and I challenge my hon. friend to make it good.

Mr. COWAN. I accept that challenge, and I say further: perish my right hand if I ever in this House utter one statement I am not absolutely sure is correct. If I am right in saying that there is discrimination against British Columbia, the government are absolutely unjust to that province. The minister says I am wrong, but

I base my statement on figures, not prepared by myself, but by the Dominion's statistician, and they are absolutely correct.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I dispute that absolutely.

Mr. COWAN. Very well, then grant an inquiry. Will the minister agree to that? I would like an answer. If the Dominion statistician will certify to the correctness of my figures, will the minister grant an inquiry?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which minister?

Mr. COWAN. Any minister—one or all. Will any minister say that if the Dominion statistician will certify to my figures, he will support my demand for an inquiry?

Mr. FIELDING. The proposition is too preposterous and ridiculous to entertain it for a moment. If British Columbia has any claim to any public works of the same class as is provided in any other part of Canada, that claim will receive consideration; but this pretense that one province pays more than another, is one of the ridiculous things we are apt to hear in this parliament. Why, my hon. friend from East Grey will remember when the province of Ontario was troubled with the conviction that it was the milch cow of the Dominion and had to pay for all the other provinces. We have heard Montreal plead the immense contribution it makes to the Dominion treasury because the imports for the west pass through it and the duties are there collected. But these duties are in reality paid by the people further west who consume the bulk of these imports. The same remark applies to Halifax and other ports of entry, so that no statement which could be prepared on the basis of the duties collected at the different ports could give a correct idea of the contribution to these duties by different sections of the country. The goods landed at one port may be consumed a thousand miles away, and it is the consumer a thousand miles distant who pays the tax, and not the importer at Halifax, St. John, Vancouver, Montreal or Quebec. No calculation that can be made on that subject can possibly be absolutely correct, but must be a matter of conjecture. It would be ridiculous to have an inquiry into a matter of that sort; but if British Columbia requires a public work of the same class as is provided by the Dominion in other provinces, and which is necessary and useful for the development of trade, then let that claim be brought forward, and if it be not considered then, and not until then, will British Columbia have a grievance.

Mr. COWAN. I am very much pleased, indeed, that one of the ministers has had the courage to speak out, but I regret the lack of that courage in the Minister of Inland Revenue. The Minister of Finance says that if there be discrimination——

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say any thing about discrimination.

Mr. COWAN. Against British Columbia——

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that.

Mr. COWAN. And the amount of that discrimination is certified to by the Dominion statistician——

Mr. FIELDING. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. COWAN. Still he says he will grant us no inquiry. Yet this is the minister who in 1886 carried Nova Scotia for the repeal of the union, because that province was not getting fair treatment at the hands of the Dominion. When, however the other man's ox is gored, he gets up, brave as a lion, and says, no, I will give you nothing. Fortunately we can retaliate, to the extent of seven representatives in this House, on any minister who will defy us in that way. Let me say to the Minister of Finance that I know whereof I speak. I say there is a black injustice being done British Columbia, and that it reflects nothing to the credit of the Minister of Finance, or his government, to refuse an inquiry. We are prepared to take the results of that inquiry, let it be absolutely fair and impartial. If we can establish no right, if we cannot make good our claim, we will take the result and take it like men, but I cannot understand how any minister of any government can close the door of justice to any province or any portion of the people. We do not ask anything more than that we should have a fair and impartial hearing on this claim. The minister says that that is ridiculous, and what reason does he give. He says that the goods may be entered at Vancouver, but they may be consumed down at Halifax.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear hear.

Mr. COWAN. And the minister's echo says 'Hear, hear.' But if the Minister of Customs were here, he could tell my hon. friend that the goods entered at the port of Vancouver—the through freight—do not pay duty at the port of entry, and if he would take the trouble of going to the office of the Dominion statistician he would learn that I am absolutely right and accurate in my statement that we can ascertain exactly how much that province is paying per head of its population into the Dominion treasury. I said exactly; I want to modify that to this extent, that

there are certain goods going north to the Yukon which leave a little shade of doubt as to the exact amount, but none of the goods going through east or anywhere else than north to the Yukon leave any shade of doubt. Thus his reason for saying, 'no' does not appeal to me as cogent. If that was the strength of the reasons he advanced in 1886 for the repeal of the Union and the secession of Nova Scotia, I do not wonder that the result was changed in 1887.

I wish to assure the minister that I am not raising this point for any purpose other than this, that British Columbia should get a fair, impartial, just hearing of a claim that she thinks is just. It may be that we are wrong, it may be that we have no claim. We are not saying that we have a claim, that we have proved it conclusively; I can say that I know it is proven conclusively, but I am not asking you to accept my word; I am asking you to give British Columbia an impartial tribunal before which that claim may be heard. No man will refuse that—I cannot understand why the exigencies of party—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member does not oppose this item at all?

Mr. COWAN. No: but I must surely have an opportunity to reply to the Finance Minister's emphatic 'no', and his unemphatic reason for saying 'no.' I would really like the Minister of Inland Revenue to offer his testimony as to whether he would be in favour of British Columbia having a fair and impartial hearing upon this claim or not.

Mr. FIELDING. I wish another word first. I think that if the hon. member felt that he had a good case in British Columbia he would hardly have travelled to the other end of the continent and introduced Nova Scotia. I have settled that question with my friends, with my Tory friends from Nova Scotia, over a long period of years, and there is nothing to be gained by reopening it. I have no reason to regret anything that happened. If I am to treat the hon. gentleman's remarks as serious, what is his proposal? That there shall be an inquiry as to whether or not British Columbia gets back all she pays. What reason is there that British Columbia shall have that inquiry? Why shall not the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) demand a similar inquiry for Ontario? Why shall not my hon. friends from Manitoba, from Prince Edward Island, from Quebec, why shall not the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Westmoreland demand a similar inquiry for their provinces?

Mr. COWAN. And if their claims are just why should they not be heard?

Mr. FIELDING. Then it means that we want to find out whether every province gets back 100 per cent on the dollar in actual direct payment—and that is provincialism run mad.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. What harm would it do to find that out?

Mr. FIELDING. I say that this country is not being run on provincial lines; there must be give and take between the provinces. If every province is to be measured, if you are to show that a given province has paid $100 revenue and must get back $100, it is a ridiculous thing, and you never could make a nation on any such ground.

Mr. COWAN. I never suggested that we should get 100 cents on the dollar back. There is not a ghost of a show of our getting that as long as there is in power a ministry that gives the money of this country to the big vote.

Mr. FIELDING. And as the hon. gentleman has no hope of seeing any other ministry I do not blame him for being anxious on the subject.

Mr. COWAN. Still I think they might at least correctly report my statement and not misreport it.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I misreported my hon. friend, but I would be glad if he would tell me any reason why an inquiry should be granted to British Columbia and refused to Prince Edward Island, why——

Mr. BARNARD. Possibly Prince Edward Island has not asked for it.

Mr. FIELDING. Prince Edward Island thinks it has a grievance. My hon. friend from Kings county tells us it has a grievance and I have heard Ontario members represent again and again that their province is the great taxpaying province of the Dominion.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Did not Nova Scotia set up the same claim?

Mr. FIELDING. Nova Scotia set up that claim at one time.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. And successfully?

Mr. FIELDING. That was a great many years ago, and the government of the day recognized Nova Scotia's claims many years ago by an additional amount.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. FIELDING. But does my hon. friend contend that the position of British Columbia is the same?

Mr. COWAN. Much stronger.

Mr. FIELDING. If we have to go to ancient history, the great difference is this:

Nova Scotia did not enter the union voluntarily and she had a right to complain if she wanted to. British Columbia and the other provinces came into the union voluntarily; they made their bargain and would have no right to play the baby act if that bargain was enforced. All they have a right to say is that they are citizens of this Dominion and should be treated like other citizens. But it will not make for good government, it will not make for nationality, if we are going to take a tape-measure to find whether one province pays a dollar and gets back only ninety-nine cents.

Mr. COWAN. The minister has asked why British Columbia should prefer a claim and the other provinces should not.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that, I said why should they have an inquiry more than any other province; they can make all the claims they like.

Mr. COWAN. Since the question is put to me I wish to answer it. British Columbia has a right to an inquiry, because every trust transferred from the colony of British Columbia to the Dominion is being abused, and I venture to say it is being abused in such a way that if we could get into a court of equity we could get justice.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a court of equity.

Mr. COWAN. But a court of equity that closes its doors; when we come rapping on the door, they say: No, no entrance here.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, no, you are here.

Mr. COWAN. The fountain of justice is closed. We are denied an impartial hearing.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is in the position that he cannot get a judgment in his favour and so he says the fountain of justice is closed.

Mr. COWAN. The minister says that because we came in voluntarily in 1870, therefore, we made a bargain. I do not know from what pettifogging lawyer he got the idea that a treaty is a contract. I did not know until I heard it from the Minister of Finance that a treaty such as the terms of union between British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada was a mere contract, and if we got the worst of the bargain we could squeal, but we must take our medicine. That is the position, the little position, the minister takes. Men who have studied these things know that it is not a statesmanlike position to take upon this question. The intention of the union was that there should be without undue taxation sufficient revenues left to the province to enable it to perform the duties assigned to it as a province under the terms of union and that the Dominion should only take such revenues away from the province—and that is the trust—as would enable the Dominion to perform the added duties imposed on the Dominion because of the province coming into confederation. So the Dominion is in the position of trustee of the powers of imposing indirect taxation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman would permit me to interrupt him, I would ask him whether it is really fair, on this item of $14,500 for improvements upon the Columbia river, to go into the question of the amendment of the British North America Act so as to give to British Columbia a larger subsidy than it now receives. What do you think, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not understand that the point of order has been raised.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is a point of order.

Mr. BARNARD. In speaking to the point of order, I think this discussion is logical.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order being raised, it is the right of the hon. member for Vancouver to explain what he desires to say.

Mr. COWAN. I was induced to rise to my feet by the statement of the Minister of Public Works that he was unaware that there was discrimination against British Columbia, and he seemed to think that that negative statement, that ignorance which he alleged in himself, was some reason for the argument he was advancing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend will realize that the question of an appropriation for a necessary public work in British Columbia is a very different question from that as to whether the British North America Act should be amended. They are two different questions. I am not aware that there is any discrimination against British Columbia.

Mr. COWAN. No one knows better than the Minister of Public Works, because he is a capable lawyer, that no amendment is needed to the British North America Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking on the point of order, I think any member of this House, in speaking of expenditures in his own province or elsewhere, if he thinks he is not getting a proportionate share of the finances that his province requires, can make a comparison between what is spent in his province and what is spent in any other province, on any item that is under consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would appeal to my hon. friends from British Columbia to allow these estimates to go ahead, because these are all necessary items.

Coquitlam river—removal of obstructions, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We wish to remove these obstructions so as to facilitate navigation.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. This is one of the public works we have been asking for. Is there anything special being done on that river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had an appropriation for the present year, and up to the 31st of November we have spent $691. We are now asking for $1,000 more, which we intend to use for removing obstructions which exist to free the floating down of logs and shingle bolts. We hope to be able to effect a substantial improvement with this money. There have been some complaints as to the results which have been obtained by past expenditures. We hope that this money will accomplish good work in removing those obstructions.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. When were the complaints made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I received a complaint not very long ago. I think I also have a letter from my hon. friend on the subject.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. For the information of the Minister of Inland Revenue, who does not know that there is anything required in British Columbia at present, I would like to state that this complaint was sent from Coquitlam about the 16th of December. I will read a copy thereof:

To the Hon. the Minister of Public Works, Ottawa.

We, the undersigned, mill-owners of New Westminster, interested in logging, and residents of the municipality of Coquitlam being land owners along the banks of the Coquitlam river, do respectfully ask you to make an inquiry regarding the work which has been done to improve the channel of this river, for the last five years, by the money you have from time to time voted for that purpose.

Both banks have been slashed, and all overhanging trees cut down and limbed and thrown into the river, with the result that the river channel was covered over with a net work of scrub mattresses on which sand bars have formed, thus forcing the river out of its natural channel, and is doing immense damage to property on both banks.

This makes it very expensive and difficult to drive logs even during a freshet, as they either lodge on the sand bars in the centre channel or get jammed in the irregular side channels.

We respectfully lay this matter before you, as the river has got out of all control, and unless these reinforced sand bars are removed by dredging or other means great damage will result from every freshet.

After inspection we humbly trust you will see your way to supplement your grant for this year, as it is altogether inadequate to meet the improvements required.

If the minister has acted upon this he will have to supplement the vote, I suppose, in the supplementary estimates. If he has done that, it is no use my taking up the time of the committee further. But if not, I think this is the proper time for discussion. Does the minister propose to make a supplementary grant for the Coquitlam river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite impossible for me to inform my hon. friend even as to whether there will be any supplementary estimates. When the estimates are brought down, assented to by His Excellency the Governor General and submitted to the House, my hon. friend will know what they contain, but until that time, very much to his regret, I am quite sure, I am unable to give my hon. friend that information.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That may be a satisfactory answer from the minister's standpoint, but from the standpoint of an independent member of this House endeavouring to do his duty to his constituents, it is not a satisfactory answer. I do not think it is the answer that a member of this House, acting on behalf of his constituents, ought to receive. I do not think we are sent here to trifle in this manner with the public business. When a member comes down from a riding, presents a numerously signed petition from his constituents and which has been in the hands of the minister for more than three months, asking for an appropriation for this work to avert threatening damage, the minister fails in his duty in standing up in this committee in this cavalier manner and making what is intended to be a smart observation that we shall learn what is in the supplementary estimates when they come down. I am quite as well aware of that as the minister is, and I do not thank him for the information at all. This only emphasizes the gross neglect of the interests of British Columbia by the Minister of Public Works, by the government and by the Minister of Inland Revenue, who is supposed particularly to represent British Columbia and who told us a few minutes ago that there were no unanswered requests for improvements in British Columbia. To my own knowledge thousands of dollars of damage is being done to private property along the Coquitlam river every year by the ravages of the stream because of the insufficient attention given by this department to the matter of controlling the Coquitlam river. As the people say in their petition this money is wasted because of its insufficiency. A thousand dol-

lars a year will do nothing substantial towards the improvement of the Coquitlam river, and if we are going to save these people from damage the government will have to take more vigorous steps than any appropriation of a thousand dollars will enable them to take. I call this matter again to the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Inland Revenue, the representative of British Columbia who speaks without knowledge when he says that no requests from that province remain unanswered.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know anything about the special merits of this work and I do not presume to speak of it, but I might inform the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken when he assumes that the answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works could have been given in any other way. The answer of the Minister of Public Works is the answer which he is obliged to give in and out of the House to innumerable requests. It is utterly impossible for the government to determine in advance what the supplementary estimates shall contain. Until these estimates are laid before parliament they are subject to revision and perhaps rejection. Not only did my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works intend no discourtesy to the hon. member, but he gave the proper answer when he said he was not able to tell him what might be in the supplementary estimates. That is the proper answer, and that is the answer that we have to give to people every day.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. There are ways and ways of giving an answer in parliament. It would have been a simple matter for the minister to say politely that he could not indicate what was going to be in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. Is not that what he did say?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. No sir.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did he say?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. His answer was a very supercilious answer intended to make a laughing stock of the member who asked the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member is too sensitive altogether; he is supersensitive.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The hon. member is not too sensitive, but I do not propose while I stand here on behalf of my constituents to accept an answer which is not a proper one. I guarded myself by stating in advance that if the minister could indicate that he was dealing with this matter in the supplementary estimates or otherwise I would not pursue the subject. Surely that was a proper request to make. I said if the minister was dealing with this I would say no more. But the minister stands up and gives a smart and flippant answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am exceedingly sorry that my hon. friend is so sensitive. I wonder if he wants to provoke a quarrel with myself as head of the Department of Public Works, I can assure him that if he does—

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is that a threat?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is not taking a course which would commend itself to reasonable men. What the hon. gentleman asked me was to tell him whether a further amount for the Coquitlam river would appear in the supplementary estimates. I do not know that I have shown any discourtesy towards the hon. gentleman by telling him that I could not state even if there would be any supplemetary estimates and that I would be unable to tell him what these supplementary estimates would contain until they had actually received the assent of the Governor General and were actually submitted to the House. If the hon. gentleman says however that this amount of $1,000 which is in the estimates will be utterly wasted, will be of no use whatever, on the Coquitlam river, it raises the very serious consideration for myself as to whether we should spend any part of this appropriation upon the Coquitlam river. My predecessor, in determining to make improvements on the Coquitlam river, stretched a point in his desire to assist the people. Coquitlam is not a navigable river. It is a river which may be called a floatable river, down which logs are floated, and it must have been for my predecessor a serious question as to whether an amount should be placed in the estimates. In view of the fact that the hon. gentleman says that this money will do no good, that it has been wasted in the past, that it has been productive of no results and that it will be productive of no results in the future it raises the important question as to whether any portion of this appropriation shall be used for this purpose.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I wish to state that, to use a sporting expression, that cock does not fight. I am not at all terrorized by the threat of the hon. gentleman to withdraw this appropriation from the Coquitlam river. I presume that it was placed in the estimates in pursuance of what he considered to be his public duty. I do not presume that, it having been so placed there, the Minister of Finance, or the Postmaster General, or the minister from British Columbia will permit him to withdraw it for the unworthy reason stated, because it is not a matter for the Minister of Public Works alone. It is a matter for the government. I do not presume that they will permit him to say that he will withdraw it as a threat against any mem-

ber of this House who is pursuing his duty. I wish to correct again the minister in the statement that I said this would be entirely useless. I told him that this was altogether insufficient to procure the effective results which should be procured on the Coquitlam river. Even $50 or $100 could be used to advantage there, and $900 can be used to advantage. But, the minister has not been using this appropriation in a way which would bring advantage from the expenditure; there are ways however in which it can be used.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not intend my remarks should be regarded as a threat, but I feel bound to take any hon. member of this House seriously, and when he alleges, as I understood my hon. friend to allege, that this amount would be practically useless unless we had a larger sum, I felt I was bound to take him seriously as a representative of that constituency, when the constituency, through him, spoke as it did speak to-night, and said it would be utterly useless to expend this money.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. I object to the minister misquoting my remarks, particularly as I have explained just now what I said.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was referring to what the hon. gentleman had said previously.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's declaration of what he said must be accepted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of what he said previously. Then, all I can say is that I did not feel that it was out of place for me to take the hon. gentleman seriously, and any remarks which I made were the result of my so regarding the observations of the hon. gentleman.

Fraser river—(lower) wing dam, bank protection works, inclusive of repairs, $35,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make further provision to maintain existing works from the city of Westminster to the Straits of Georgia, preventing the formation of detrimental side channels, protecting banks from erosion, also services in connection with the maintenance of navigation in this river.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Has the minister received a communication from the city of New Westminster lately in respect to this work, and what action, if any, has been taken upon the communication?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did receive a communication from the city of New Westminster as to going on with the very large works of importance which had been laid out, and which consist not only of the dredging, but also of the building of jetties for the purpose of giving direction to the channel and so improving the navigation.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Has the minister done anything in pursuance of the indication he gave to a public meeting at New Westminster last summer, that he might put two shifts a day on the dredge 'Fruhling' in order to obtain more effective work from it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure that I addressed a public meeting at New Westminster, I do not think I did.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. If the minister wishes to be very exact, it was a meeting of citizens and the board of trade.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it was not a large meeting; it was a meeting of the members of the board of trade. I did state that I intended to make provision for working the 'Fruhling' two shifts per day, and the estimates we have before the House provide this very service. We hope to have two crews working on the 'Fruhling' so as to do the work with the greatest rapidity possible.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. When does the minister expect to have the channel upon which he is now working available for traffic?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No one can tell in a work of that kind when there are shifting sands. It is a very large work, but we hope, in the comparatively near future, to have the channel in good order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I put a question on the order paper the other day, and I thought possibly that if the answer to it was given seriously by the minister he would remember it now. I am sorry he does not remember what time he told me then, because he placed the date so near in the future that I was more encouraged by it than by the reports I heard from New Westminster. The people of New Westminster are very anxious indeed about the progress of this work, and on the 7th of January of this year the board of trade at New Westminster addressed a petition to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier on this subject. I presume that petition found its way to the Minister of Public Works. It reads as follows:

To the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., P.C., Ottawa.

Sir,—The New Westminster Board of Trade deems it necessary to again bring to the attention of your government the matter of the Fraser river ship channel.

The board desires to express its appreciation of the work done so far by the new 'Fruhling' dredge, without which the channel at its entrance, would probably have become impassable for ocean vessels of any size. As it is, however, it is only when the high tides

occur in daylight that vessels drawing 22 or 23 feet can pass in or out, the latter draught being the limit that may safely attempt the channel at all at the present time.

The usual volume of ocean traffic on the river has been maintained during the past year, but various large industrial propositions have been and are deterred from locating on the river by the fact that much time may be lost by vessels having to await daylight tides to enter and clear. As cases bearing on this point it may be mentioned that the board recently received a communication from the agents of the Blue Funnel line of steamships, plying direct between Liverpool and Vancouver, intimating that upon assurance of the adequacy of the channel for their vessels, they are desirous of sending them to this port; also that a vessel chartered to deliver a cargo of iron pipe at this city due to arrive in March next, will not be able to come here, as there will not be sufficient water for her on the Sand Heads.

To accommodate the trade now offering, it is imperative that a channel be provided without delay, sufficiently deep for the passage of the largest vessels plying on the Pacific ocean, at any stage of the tide, and buoyed and lighted so as to be navigable by day or night.

The board is of the opinion that to attain this result within a reasonable time, it will be necessary to either augment the dredging power now available for use on the river, or to proceed at once with the construction of a jetty from Garry Point to the outer edge of the Sand Heads, as suggested and recommended in reports heretofore submitted, on behalf of the citizens of New Westminster for the consideration of your government.

The board earnestly hopes that this matter will receive the immediate and favourable consideration of your government, and that provision will be made at this session of parliament for the vigorous prosecution of the work necessary to this end.

The minister will see from that, that there is more than ordinary interest taken in the carrying on of this work rapidly, because there is a great deal of shipping that would be headed for the Fraser river if there was any reasonable assurance of its getting in there. There are some very large industries there, and particularly to the new industries established at New Westminster it is a very serious matter that those interested should have to bring in their freight by any other route than by the Fraser river.

Fraser river—to refund to the municipality of Delta one-half their expense of constructing emergency works to protect the south bank of the river near Ladner's Landing, on condition that the government of British Columbia will refund the other half, $1,850.

Mr. COWAN. Why the division?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it was Mr. John Oliver who saw me on behalf of the municipality, and he said they had an assurance from the provincial government that they would pay half the cost of this work, provided my department would pay the other half, and therefore I put the vote in in that way.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $10,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. In connection with this vote I have pleasure in further refreshing the memory of the Minister of Inland Revenue as to works applied for in the province of British Columbia and not granted. I see nothing in the estimates about a work to which I refer now, and so I must presume it has not received the attention of the government. I have here a letter which bears every evidence of authenticity, and which reads:

I wish to call your attention once more to the need of removing the obstructions to navigation in the Upper Lillooet river. All our farming implements and heavy goods that we cannot take in on horseback we have to bring by the Harrison and Lillooet lakes and the Upper Lillooet river, and it is almost impossible to get boats up the river. There are so many log jams in the river that men are in great danger of losing their lives in trying to get these goods up the river in boats. The government spent a few thousand dollars in removing log jams in the river in 1908 with very good results. We wrote to Mr. Templeman requesting him to try and get a grant for the above work. In his reply he said he would do all he could to comply with our request. We sincerely trust you will do all you can to get the government to remove log jams from the river, as it would be a great benefit to this settlement.

I would like to ask the minister whether he has given any attention to this case of the Upper Lillooet, which is before the government not only now, but was before it last year, on application from the same man who has written this letter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that I have given consideration to the matter.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The minister has given consideration to it, but will Mr. Punch get any result?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friend that. But this item will be available for that work, and I recognize the Lillooet river as a navigable river where improvement of the navigation might very well be done. My department has done work there already, and out of this very vote I trust that we shall be able to make further improvements during the coming season.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. There is another item which has been before the government for some time. I took the liberty of mentioning it to this House last year, and the minister promised me then that he would give it attention. That is the matter of improving the Fraser river be-

tween Chilliwack, the head of navigation, and Agassiz. I pointed out to the minister that on account of the river having been allowed to silt up between those two points, it is impossible to get navigation into Agassiz. This is a matter of recent date, because when this government took over the affairs of the Fraser river, navigation extended to Yale, which is far above Agassiz. I pointed out that the people of Agassiz were very much in the position of those of Ste. Croix, mentioned this afternoon, in that it was very advisable for them to make their shipments by water, but that it was impossible for vessels to get to the place. I suggested to the minister a very small appropriation for snagging between Chilliwack and Agassiz, and a provision for some sort of wharf at Agassiz, almost the cheapest kind that he could construct, so that these people might have relief from what they consider the excessive freight rates of the railway and send out their produce by steamer to New Westminster. I would like to ask the minister what has been done between last session and the present in the direction indicated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend must be wrong in his statement that I said I would give attention to this matter, if he takes that to mean that I would do it.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. No, the hon. minister did not promise it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing has been done between that time and the present that I am aware of; but perhaps we might be able to do it out of this vote. I will have the matter looked into, and see if we can use a part of the money for that purpose.

Mr. HERRON. When did the government adopt the policy of doing no further work in the way of protecting the banks of streams? Has it been adopted within the last year or two, or has it been in force a considerable length of time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that since I have been Minister of Pubic Works I have been thinking the matter over, having regard to the largely increasing demands being made on the government. My colleagues and I have discussed the matter somewhat. We all recognize that if it were our duty to do work of this character, it would involve the Dominion in very large expenditure. While we have not shut down on this work entirely, we are limiting it largely to matters in connection with works that have been already entered upon. In the very items under discussion some work of this character in British Columbia is being provided for, but I am endeavouring to curtail our expenditure for this class of work as much as possible.

Mr. HERRON. Perhaps the elections had something to do with that. The minister had an appropriation for protecting the banks of streams of my constituency—in fact, protecting government property—and he withdrew it after the elections of 1908 were over. Was it because the constituency did not deliver the goods to the government on that occasion?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to call the minister's attention to another matter which was before his department, a request for assistance which was not granted, and as to which the Minister of Inland Revenue has no knowledge. This comes from Mr. William Wilson, of Cottonwood island, near Chiliwack, who says he has been petitioning for two or three years in regard to the devastation of his farm by the current induced by the formation of a bar in the Fraser river opposite his place, a bar which would be removed if the suggestion which I make with regard to navigation to Agassiz were carried out. Mr. Wilson reports that the matter went so far that Mr. Kickbush, the gentleman in charge of the government work there, brought up the assistant district engineer, Mr. Gauvreau, who spoke of dredging through the bar. Mr. Wilson also reports that a petition to the government was being circulated at that time—the 22nd of November last. I wonder if the minister proposes to do anything in the matter of this protection work at Chiliwack?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not thought of that. When matters come up for consideration, we will have to see what are the most urgent demands that can be met out of this general vote of $10,000. I regret that I cannot say anything more to my hon. friend to-night as to the matter.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I have another matter that I must bring to the attention of the minister. It is from the same locality, and is in connection with a request, not only for dredging, which would enable the river steamers to come up to the proper wharf, but, if the dredging cannot be got, for road improvements which would enable the traffic to come down to the spot on the river where it has to meet the steamer. When I mentioned this the other night, the minister stated that he had no request from Chiliwack for that purpose, and the only meaning that we could take from that was that if he had such a request, he would pay attention to it and give it his kind consideration. I have here a memo from the Chiliwack Board of Trade which indicates the extent they are suffering for lack of just such an improvement as I have in mind. The letter covering it reads as follows:

I beg to inclose herewith copy of report concerning conditions re the Fraser river landing at Chilliwack, and statistics in support of claims of the residents of this valley for an improvement in the condition of the same.

The facilities afforded merchants and farmers, the latter class forming the majority of the population, for the shipping of goods at the Fraser river landing are entirely inadequate and cause a great deal of inconvenience, expense, and frequent loss to those engaged in business and the farmers.

The object of the inclosed report is to place in your hands some reliable information regarding the amount of business conducted in the Chilliwack valley, and setting forth the very inadequate assistance supplied for the facilitating of the same.

Trusting that this data will be of value to you in setting forth the claims of this district for an improvement of the existing conditions,

I beg to remain, yours truly,

H. P. WILSON.

Then, their memorandum, which will give the minister a fair idea of the importance of the trade generally in the Chilliwack valley, reads as follows:

CHILLIWACK, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Merchandise received and shipped at Fraser River Landings,

The amount of general merchandise received and shipped at the port of Chilliwack, on the Fraser river, for the year ending in July, 1909, comprises the large total of 26,474 tons.

The steamer 'Beaver,' operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, carried 16,474 tons, as per the returns given by the general freight agent, and the steamer 'Ramona' and other boats operated by the Western Steamboat Company of New Westminster, carried as near as can be ascertained by the records furnished, about 10,000 tons.

Wharfs.

There is a government wharf at this port, situated at such a point that it is only available for use by the steamers for a few months in the year, and from a statement made by the steamboat officials, fully three-quarters of the freight handled has to be shipped and landed at a point more than a mile below the government wharf, owing to the fact that the water is too low to allow the steamers to reach their proper landing place. For many years this fact has been a source of great worry and hardship to the merchants and shippers of this valley, and it must be pointed out that the period of low water comprises the rainy season in the fall and the winter and spring. The bulk of the shipping is done by the farmers in the fall and winter, their shipments comprising fruit and vegetables of all kinds, potatoes in large quantities, hay and live and dead stock; and at the same time the merchants are receiving their winter stocks of merchandise, &c. In the winter and spring, there is still considerable shipping of hay, potatoes and other farm produce held over, while the merchants and dealers are receiving their summer stocks of merchandise, machinery, flour and feed, &c., so that during the period in which the government wharf is in commission, from the months of May to September, there is comparatively little shipping to be done. The accommodation provided at the nearest point at which the boats can reach during the low-water period is only of a temporary nature and is situated on a gravel bar; the rush of high water each spring usually destroying it.

Shelter is provided by a shed built on a scow, and in many cases perishable freight has to be left out in the wet owing to lack of room. Goods having left the care of the transportation companies are frequently damaged by exposure, and the merchants have therefore no claim for damages, and after coming, perhaps, many thousand miles, are liable to the most damage within three miles of their destination.

Owing to the nature of the gravel bar at which, as stated above, the bulk of the freight is landed and shipped, it is impossible to maintain a road that will stand the heavy traffic during the seasons when the best of roads get out of repair through wet and frost, and the hardship inflicted in hauling heavy, costly and bulky freight over practically a beach and along shelving banks is nearly unbearable, to say nothing of the dangers incurred in conveying passengers to the boats.

Time and time again have the Dominion government been appealed to to have the channel dredged and maintained——

I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue to that:

—so that the wharf and sheds standing idle the greater part of the year can be used and this hardship now suffered by shippers and consignees alike be relieved, but nothing has been done except promises given to have matters remedied, and after great pressure being brought to bear, some temporary repairs to the inadequate shelter provided at the lower gravel bar.

Statistics.

That the district of Chilliwack, comprising the city and the fertile country surrounding it is an important one, and entitled to be relieved at the hands of the government from the condition of affairs with regard to better shipping and landing facilities on the Fraser river, is shown by some figures dealing with the post office, express shipments, &c., output of factories and population.

Population.

The population of the district, including the city of Chilliwack, which is incorporated, according to the last estimate made some time ago, is 5,500, but the next census will probably show larger figures, as new families are coming into the district every week.

Then follows a page of statistics which I shall not read. I would say, however, that I think the matter is sufficiently important to engage the attention of the committee even at this late hour of the night. An inspection of these statistics shows that the cost to the people of Chilliwack, because of the lack of facilities for making connections with steamboat traffic, is estimated on the rate per ton which they pay in addition

to the normal rate, and that amounts to $10,000 a year. That is the amount of tax levied on those people every year because of the neglect of this government to provide a work which probably all told would not cost what the people pay in one year. That is a matter which ought to have been within the knowledge of the Minister of Inland Revenue as representing British Columbia. It seems to me that it must have been within his knowledge. I have heard him address public meetings at Chilliwack. I know that he spent a whole day there, and I think he did make himself familiar with the surroundings. I am surprised, therefore, that he should tell the House that he knows of no application for assistance to this riding which has not been granted by this government. Why, the people are paying $10,000 a year as a special tax to make connections which the government should provide without this tax. This ought to be considered a matter of urgency, and the minister should make it a very special case, considering the number of years the people have been suffering.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. When I challenged the representatives from the province of British Columbia to show that any application which had been made for public works in that province had been refused, I was referring, of course, to works of large magnitude and not to works such as the one to which my hon. friend refers. No one knows better than my hon. friend the difficulties of the Fraser river, and I quite appreciate the difficulties under which the farmers of Chilliwack county suffer. It is true that certain wharf facilities are not available, but that is in consequence of the continual shifting of the river, the formation of sand bars, the washing away of banks and islands, the formation of new ones, and the continual changing of the channel. Right opposite the Chiliwack landing I will show broad areas of gravel bank, were some ten years ago a farm of 160 acres had existed that had been washed away. The Fraser river will always be a difficult problem for any government with respect to navigation and to construction of retaining works. I have discussed the matter frequently with Mr. Keefer, the resident engineer, and work has been done, but not probably of a nature sufficient to enable steamers to come to the present wharf. Mr. Keefer is most anxious to use the money voted for the Fraser river, so as to give the farmers all along the valley as far as Chilliwack all the facilities possible; and I am quite sure it is the intention of the department to carry out just that class of work to which my hon. friend refers. I repeat that when I made the statement that the representatives of British Columbia could not make good their challenge, I desired that they should point to some considerable public work which has been refused. There are here and there throughout the province, I know myself, places where wharfs ought to be built that are not in the estimates yet; we will have them there before very long. There are places on the Fraser river that should be dredged, and probably some places where wharfs should be built, but they are not very numerous and no doubt in a very short time all these wants will be attended to.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I must congratulate the Minister of Inland Revenue on the condition of affluence which he enjoys which makes him think that a public work —the absence of which costs the people of Chilliwack $10,000 a year—is not worth his lordly consideration.

I want to bring another need before his attention. I refer to the matter of aids to navigation on the Serpentine river, which serves the municipality of Delta, near the mouth of that river. This was undertaken many years ago, the minister of that day recognizing the importance of providing water transportation by the Serpentine river. In the course of years the work then done has become decayed. On September 24 last, this letter was addressed to the secretary of the board of trade of New Westminster who had interested himself on behalf of the petitioners:

Ottawa, September 24, 1909.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst., in reference to aids to navigation in the Serpentine river, and would advise you that Captain Gaudin referred your previous correspondence to this department promptly, with a recommendation that the piles formerly marking the channel of the Serpentine river should be replaced. The lowest offer Captain Gaudin could get for doing the work was $1,062, and besides which, the department would have to provide several buoys, and as the life of the piles from previous experience, appears to have been only two or three years, we question whether the traffic in the district would warrant so large an expenditure, and propose deferring action until a technical officer of the department can visit the locality and determine conditions on the spot. We have only a limited vote available for aids to navigation, and must spend the money where it will be an advantage to the greatest tonnage of shipping.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) C. STANTON,
Assistant Deputy Minister
of Marine and Fisheries.

CHAS. H. STUART-WADE, Esq., F.R.G.S.,
Sec.-Treas. Board of Trade,
New Westminster, British Columbia.

Since this letter was written there has been ample time for the inquiry by a tech-

nical officer indicated. I would ask what the result of that inquiry has been.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is asking about matters with which the Minister of Public Works has nothing to do. This belongs to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and if my hon. friend would defer this matter until we get into the Marine and Fisheries items I have no doubt the acting minister would be very glad to give the information desired.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Haven't we been providing aids to navigation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is in the Marine Department.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. You have been providing works like this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Some time ago I asked that the House should adjourn. I now ask the deputy Speaker to count the House out.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I would rather move the adjournment of the House.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING TARIFFS.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the Finance Minister whether he could give any information as to negotiations with Washington respecting tariffs. I am informed there are press despatches from Washington indicating that something important is going on there and there is some public anxiety to know whether the minister has any communication that can be made.

Mr. FIELDING. The matter is not in a position that would permit me to make any intimation to the House at present.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed on Monday with the naval debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 28, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to an incorrect report which appears in the edition of the Toronto 'World' of February 25 last. The statement reads as follows:

> Ottawa, Feb. 24.—(Special.)—If the Naval Bill is not withdrawn and held over till next session, it will not be the fault of a couple of western Liberal members, who are to-night circulating for signature a petition to Sir Wilfrid Laurier to do one of two things—either bring this naval debate to a sudden conclusion so that they can get to their homes by Easter or withdraw the Bill.
>
> It is impossible, of course, under the present conditions, to limit this important debate, and at the present rate the House cannot rise before June, even although future Wednesday evenings will now be requisitioned for the work of the Commons. Therefore the petition narrows itself down to a request for withdrawal of the Bill.
>
> Western Liberals in common with western Ontario Liberals are not enamoured of the Bill, and would gladly see it dead.

This statement contains only a semblance of truth. It is a fact that there was a petition circulated amongst the members of both sides of the House; it was not prepared by western Liberal members, but was prepared by Liberal and Conservative members who sit on both sides of the House. There was nothing stated in the petition as to the bringing of the debate on the Naval Bill to a conclusion before Easter, nor was there any statement with respect to the withdrawal of the Naval Bill. The petition was simply got up by a number of members on both sides of the House for the purpose of bringing the attention of the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to the desire of a great many hon. members of this House to get home by Easter, if possible, and to prevent them from being required to come back after the adjournment. I have in my hands part of a petition that was signed and which is a very harmless document. It is simply a request to the two leaders of the House that steps be taken to ensure the prorogation of the House before Easter. There is no attempt shown in the document to prevent proper discussion of the Naval Bill or any other matter of general public interest, and that the petition did meet with general favour by members on both sides, is, I think, demonstrated by the fact that the part of the petition which I hold in my hand was signed by seventy members on both sides of the House.

Mr. STAPLES. By how many on this side?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I think that before newspapers spread reports of this kind they should make themselves thoroughly familiar with the facts.

Mr. STAPLES. How many on this side?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. If my hon. friend will be quiet for a moment, the statement which I made will be corroborated by members on the other side of the House.

Mr. STAPLES. I simply rose to ask how many members on this side of the House signed the petition.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I have in my hand the pettions, except one that was circulated on the other side. I see on one the names of at least two members on the other side of the House.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am one of those responsible on this side of the House for starting and circulating the petition, but as the hon. member (Mr. W. M. Martin) said, our whole object was to bring to the attention of the leaders of the House the desirability of securing prorogation within a reasonable time. So far as I can learn there is very general discontent on both sides of the House at the long time which has elapsed since this House assembled and at the small amount of business that has been done. I am safe in saying that members on both sides would like very much to secure some better arrangement than we have at present for the meeting of the House and the prosecution of business after we do meet.

THE BANKING ACT.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the Finance Minister if he has any information to give to the House as to when we may expect the Banking Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. I had contemplated bringing forward a revision of the Banking Act, and it is in an advanced condition. I am aware of the representations made within the last day or two on both sides as to the desirability of curtailing the government programme and bring about an early prorogation, and I would like to know what progress is likely to be made in that regard before deciding definitely. I still desire to bring forward the Banking Act, but if there is to be an early prorogation the proposed Act might stand over until next session, as the bank charters do not expire until July 1, 1911. If the session is to be protracted the Bank Act will be brought forward, but if there is a desire to curtail the session it may remain over until next session.

RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LEWIS. I would ask the Prime Minister what progress has been made by the committee which he appointed for the revision of the rules with a view to shortening the session, if possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There has been one sitting of the committee, and it is intended to have another one this week.

MANITOBA FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. BRADBURY Eight or ten days ago I requested the Prime Minister, who is acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to bring down the proposed amendment to the Fisheries Laws for Manitoba. This is a very important question. I understand the fishery officers were called in from Manitoba and spent eight or ten days revising the regulations, and I would like to suggest that I should see the regulations before they are put into force. I presume they will not become law until an order in council is passed, and they should be referred to the Select Committee on Fisheries, who would have an opportunity to look into them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A Bill has been prepared, notice of it will be given to-day, and it will be submitted to the House immediately, covering the amendments to which my hon. friend refers. It is in relation to all fisheries.

Mr. BRADBURY. I think the minister hardly grasps my meaning. A commission was appointed to investigate Manitoba fisheries. They made a report, and on the strength of that report it is proposed to adopt new regulations, and it is of those new regulations I am speaking now.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the government has taken Mondays and intends to take Wednesdays. There are some motions on the order paper, and I wish the Prime Minister would arrange so that those unopposed motions might be taken up this week.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see no objection to that.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 140) for the relief of Frederick Joseph Gustin McArthur.—Mr. A. Haggart.

Bill (No. 144) for the relief of Jessie Mary Maxwell.—Mr. Boyce.

QUESTIONS.

CATTLE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Has the government Holsteins and Jersey cattle represented in the dairy herds at the experimental farms? If not, why not?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

No. Any more breeds than are there at present could not be satisfactorily dealt with.

HEATING OF RAILWAY COMMISSION BUILDING.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

1. Does the owner or does the government pay for the heating of the Railway Commission building, Queen street?
2. What has been the yearly expense of the heating of said building since the date of the lease?
3. What is the total number of cubic feet in the building?
4. Approximately from what date in the fall of the year to the spring of the following year, must the building be kept heated?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. The government.
2. Annual expense of heating, including salary of fireman at $55 per month:

1903-04	$1,170 38
1904-05	1,272 50
1905-06	1,311 00
1906-07	1,318 00
1907-08	1,216 50
1908-09	1,164 00

3. 166,777 cubic feet.
4. The building must be kept heated about eight months, say from September 15, to May 15.

MANITOBA—SALE OF SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. Was the N.E ¼ section of section 11, township 1, range 9, west of the 1st meridian, in Manitoba, sold at the last school lands sale at Manitoba? If so, at what price?
2. How much has been paid on this land, and when were the payments made?
3. If it has not been sold, when will it be put on sale?
4. What is the upset price of the land?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. The north-east ¼ section of section 11, township 1, range 9, west of the 1st meridian, was disposed of at the auction sale held at Manitou on the 30th of May, 1907, to Mr. W. J. Crosbie. The price at which the land was sold was $13 per acre. At the request of Mr. Crosbie, the sale was subsequently cancelled.
2. The amount paid on this land was $208, the payment being made at the time of the sale.
3. It is not possible to say at present when the land will be offered again, as it is not the intention of the department to hold any auction sales in Manitoba in the immediate future.
4. The upset price of this land was $10 per acre.

MANITOBA—FEDERAL SUBSIDY FOR SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

How much money was paid to the Manitoba government from the federal government, re school lands, from March 31, 1909, to January 31, 1910?

Mr. OLIVER: $221,056.52.

BAIT FREEZER AT INVERNESS, N.S.

Mr. RHODES:

1. Has the government established at Inverness, Nova Scotia, a cold storage plant for bait?
2. If so, by whom was it built, what did it cost when completed, and is it a separate building, or is it in connection with another building?
3. Has any bait been stored there? If so, how much?
4. How many fishermen are there regularly engaged in fishing at that port, what amount of fish and what kinds did they take last season?
5. What fishing station is the Inverness freezer expected to supply, and from what point will the freezer secure bait?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The government assisted in the establishment of a fishermen's bait freezer there.
2. The Inverness Fishermen's Association. $1,980.76. The department understands it to be a separate building.
3. Not yet, as the freezer was completed only last summer.
4. There are fourteen boat fishermen from Inverness and vicinity.

235 bbls. herring.
45 bbls. mackerel.
300 cwt. dried cod.
130 cwt. dried haddock.
70 cwt. dried hake.
100 bbls. squid.
90 bbls. coarse fish.
2,900 lbs. lobsters (canned).

These figures are for the year 1908-09, those for the year 1909-10 not being yet available.

5. Inverness and vicinity. Bait will be secured for storage in the freezer at Inverness and vicinity or neighbouring localities.

LIGHTKEEPER AT BAY ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BLAIN:

1. Who is the lightkeeper at Bay St. Lawrence, Inverness county, Nova Scotia, and how long has he held that position?
2. Has there been reported to the government any complaint against the said lightkeeper as an official of the government?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Charles Jamieson, appointed 21st September, 1893.
2. Yes.

49TH REGIMENT.

Mr. NORTHRUP:

1. Has a commanding officer been recently appointed for the 49th regiment?
2. If so, does he reside within the limits from which the men composing the corps are drawn?
3. If no appointment has been made yet, will the department, in making same, select an officer from those residing within the above limits?
4. Has the department consulted the officers of the regiment, or in any way learned their views and opinions as to the effect on the regiment of appointing a commanding officer who does not reside within the said limits?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3 and 4. The department is awaiting a recommendation from the officer commanding the eastern Ontario command.

ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is the manufacture of any Ross rifles, mark II. double star, now under contract? If so, how many?
2. Have such rifles been contracted for since the initial order of 500?
3. Will the manufacture of other patterns be stopped and future manufacture consist of mark II. double star?
4. In view of the greatly increased efficiency claimed for mark II. double star, as a target rifle, does the government consider that competitors are fairly treated at the Dominion Rifle Association matches unless the pattern is equally available to all competitors under similar conditions?
5. What action, if any, is the government disposed to take should the National Rifle Association decline to admit mark II. double star, for use at the Bisley competitions?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. An order is being given for the conversion of two hundred Ross rifles.
3. No.
4 and 5. These are matters which pertain to the Dominion Rifle Association.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

DUNKIN AND HIGHWATER MAILS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Was the contract for the conveyance of mails between Dunkin and Highwater, Quebec, recently awarded to one Charles A. Barnett? If so, at what rate per annum?
2. Was such contract subsequently set aside and the contract awarded to another tenderer? If so, at what rate per annum, for what reasons, and to whom was the work subsequently awarded?
3. Is the government aware that the communication awarding the contract to Mr. Barnett, was said to have been opened while in the mail before reaching its destination? If so, what action does it contemplate taking in regard thereto, and if not in possession of any complaint made in regard thereto, will due inquiries be instituted?
4. Does the person to whom the contract was re-awarded also occupy the positions of postmaster and sub-collector of customs?
5. Does the government consider it sound policy that one individual should occupy dual positions in the Civil Service, and at the same time become a contractor for work in competition with the general public?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1. Yes. $99.75 per annum.
2. Yes, the contract was subsequently awarded to Mr. Clinton R. Crowell at $100 per annum because the performance of the service by Mr. Barnett involved a change in starting point, to which the people interested objected.
3. No, but if a representation to that effect is made to the department, inquiry will be made, and if the case can be proven, the guilty party will be punished to the full extent of the law.
4. He is not a postmaster, and this department is not aware that he is an officer of the customs.
5. It is a fact that in many instances country postmasters are also contractors for mail service, and in some cases it has been considered advisable and convenient by the customs department that they should also be appointed as sub-collectors of customs. This practice is considered to operate advantageously to the public interest in every way, as doing away with the delays incident to the collection of customs on articles addressed to distant post offices.

In the case of services where the remuneration is small and where only a small portion of a postmaster's time is occupied in the performance of his work either as sub-collector or a mail contractor, it is considered an advantage to the government to have these services in the hands of the same person. Express provision is made in the Post Office Act, permitting the amalgamation of the duties of postmaster and mail contractor, wherever it is found advantageous to the public.

BOAR'S BACK POST OFFICE.

Mr. JAMIESON:

Has a petition been received by the Post Office Department asking for the opening of a new post office at Boar's Back, Digby county? If so, when was the same received, and what action, if any, has been taken thereon?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A petition was received at the department on the 7th September, 1901, and was subsequently reported upon by the post office inspector, but the circumstances were so unfavourable to the establishment of an office that the matter was allowed to stand. Looking over the case again it is found that an office has since been opened within a short distance of Boar's Back. and there would therefore be even less need for an office at Boar's Back than there was in 1901.

PEACE RIVER COUNTRY.

Mr. BEST:

1. What part or parts of the Peace River country are open for settlements?
2. What portion of Peace River country will be opened up this season for settlement, at what price per acre, and on what terms can land be purchased?

Mr. OLIVER:

1.

Township.	Range.	Meridian.
76	14	West 5th,
74	15	West 5th.
75	15	West 5th.
74	16	West 5th.
75	16	West 5th.
76	16	West 5th.
74	17	West 5th.
75	17	West 5th.
80	4	West 6th.
71	6	West 6th.

The following townhips have been surveyed, but the department has no record of the same having been opened for homestead by the local agent of Dominion Lands by notice and advertisement as required by section 7 of the Dominion Lands Act, that is to say:

Township.	Range.	Meridian.
81	24	5. Partly Indian Reserve.
82	24	5 Partly Indian Reserve.
81	26	5
71	3	6
72	3	6
73	3	6
74	3	6
78	3	6
80	3	6
71	4	6
72	4	6
74	4	6
71	5	6

Township.	Range.	Meridian.
72	5	6
73	5	6
74	5	6
77	5	6
78	5	6
79	5	6
72	6	6
73	6	6
74	6	6
77	6	6
78	6	6
71	7	6
72	7	6
73	7	6
74	7	6
71	8	6
72	8	6
73	8	6
74	8	6
71	9	6
72	9	6
73	9	6
73	4	5
72	5	5
73	5	5
72	6	5
73	6	5
74	9	5
73	10	5
74	10	5
73	11	5
73	13	5
74	13	5
74	14	5
75	14	5
77	14	5
76	15	5
77	15	5
77	16	5
80	19	5
81	19	5
77	20	5
81	20	5
77	21	5
78	21	5
77	22	5
78	22	5
74	9	6
71	10	6
72	10	6
73	10	6
74	10	6
71	11	6
72	11	6
73	11	6
74	11	6

2. The available lands in the townships above mentioned. Land can only be acquired under homestead entry, except in cases of fractional areas of 80 acres or less, which under the regulations may be sold at $3 an acre to the homesteader or owner of land lying alongside. In case the applicant is a homesteader, such sale would be made subject to the homesteader earning patent for his homestead.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the number of persons in the employ of each department of the government during the year 1909 under the following heads: (a) civil service employees at Ottawa; (b) civil service employees outside of Ottawa; (c) in stated and regular employ, but not under the Civil Service Act, giving the distinctive service of each group; (d) those in temporary or casual employment, giving the distinctive work of each group, and also showing the total amount paid under each head.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all representations made by business or commercial men or citizens of Winnipeg to the department or government since the contemplated action of the government in reference to closing or keeping open the post office to box holders on Sundays, and who made them; and of all orders given by the Postmaster General or his department to the postmasters in reference to this Sunday closing.—Mr. A. Haggart.

For a return showing all sums of money received by the 'Soleil' Publication Company, the 'Vigie' Publication Company, and the 'Daily Telegraph' Publication Company, of Quebec, from the different federal departments, and from the Transcontinental Commission, since the first day of March, 1908, and the respective dates of each payment.—Mr. Paquet.

For a copy of all correspondenec with the government or the Post Office Department in reference to closing or keeping open post offices to box-holders on Sundays.—Mr. A. Haggart.

For a copy of all correspondence, accounts, vouchers and reports, relating to the accident at Sault Ste. Marie lock in June, 1909, the number of vessels and tonnage, with port of destination, and number of passengers passing through the Canadian lock at Sault Ste. Marie, during the months of April to December, both inclusive, 1909.—Mr. Boyce.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Dominion government and the government of Manitoba on the subject of the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba since the resolution adopted by the House of Commons on the 13th day of July, 1908.—Mr. Molloy.

For a copy of the original field notes of the survey of Captain Jemmett, 1899, on Chu-Chu-Way-Ha, reserve No. 2, Similkameen district, B.C.—Mr. Burrell.

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, and petitions in reference to the changing of the post office at Windygates, in the province of Manitoba.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

For a copy of all reports and correspondence in reference to the appointment of the following frontier quarantine inspectors: Dr. Bradford, Dr. Carter, Dr. Duncan, Dr. Thornton, Dr. Wallace, Dr. May, Dr. McKenty, Dr. Little, Dr. Henderson and Dr. Scott.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe.

WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSIONS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That from this day to the end of the session, the House will meet on Wednesdays at three o'clock p.m., and that the sittings on such days shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other sitting days.

Motion agreed to.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, before resuming the line of my remarks, I would like to call attention to a sentence in the Halifax 'Herald' of February 25, 1910, which reads as follows:

> Order was at last restored by Mr. Devlin promising not to quote His Excellency, although he added with some bitterness, 'What did he send me his speech for if I am not allowed to read it?

I used no such language, and in the matter there was absolutely no bitterness in tone or otherwise. My words, and I give them for accuracy, in order that the organs of the Conservative party may sometimes speak fairly of gentlemen on this side of the House, were:

> This pamphlet was sent me, I do not know by whom, but I always presumed that it was sent by His Excellency for my benefit; and, as I found in it certain passages bearing upon the subject before the House, I was simply going to give the House the benefit of them.

When the House rose on Thursday night I was pointing out as well as I could that the attitude which had been taken by the government upon the question of the Naval Bill, which is now under discussion, was a natural and logical sequence to the different resolutions which had been introduced into this House by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the right hon. leader of the House. Since the first resolution was introduced peculiar scenes have been witnessed. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) constituted himself in matters naval, the leader of the opposition, but he had hardly given the word of command before the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) found that he also should give his word of command, which was more directly to be applied to the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) and other hon. gentlemen thought that they also should give a word of command which might differ from the word of command given by the hon. member for North Toronto, the leader in naval matters, and immediately the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. R. L. Borden) bolted from his party. The hon. member for Jacques

Cartier, (Mr. Monk), the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), went in search of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). The hon. member for Jacques Cartier found the hon. member for Halifax addressing the multitudes in the province of Quebec; the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton discovered him addressing the multitudes in the maritime provinces, and there he had a different creed; the hon. member for North Toronto found him addressing the multitudes in the province of Ontario, and there again he had a different creed. After these three hon. gentlemen heard the different creeds of the hon. member for Halifax, they marched him back here to the seat of government, and there made him expound his article of faith, which is to be found in the amendment which he proposes to the Bill now under discussion. What does he say? In speaking to the province of Quebec, the hon. leader of the opposition—I refer now to the hon. member for Halifax—says at page 3067 of 'Hansard':

I would invite my right hon. friend to-day to again respond to the popular will, and the will of this country to-day is that these different proposals ought to be submitted to the people and the people ought to be permicted to pass upon them before any permanent policy of this kind is engaged in.

Then, addressing the masses in the lower provinces, he goes on to say:

I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of that course. I am as strong as any man in this country in the belief that it is the duty of Canada to participate upon a permanent basis in the defence of this empire and to do our reasonable share in that regard.

But, addressing the multitudes in the province of Ontario, he says, at page 3068 of 'Hansard':

So, Sir, I say we should make our aid prompt and generous, so that it may bring to the motherland the assurance not only of material support but of courage, faith and determination which shall proclaim alike to friend and foe that whether in peace or in war, the empire is one and undivided.

These hon. gentlemen, after they had thought the matter over, as the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) told us, in the morning, in the afternoon, and while lying awake at night, prepared the ammunition which they were to discharge at the government, and, if I were permitted to use the words of Senator Beveridge, I would say that they engaged in what we on this side, and what the Canadian public are beginning to understand to be mere pot-shot warfare with wax bullets from air guns. Let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether they think that, in order to prevent the British empire from going to smash, we must immediately cable over a sum of $20,000,000 or the equivalent of two Dreadnoughts. The imperial House has been now in session some time, yet we find no mention there made of this imminent peril from Germany. But we need not go to the old country to find what is the opinion in England, we have had it expressed in this country; we have had it expressed in the press so fond of supporting hon. gentlemen opposite; we have had it expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) knows well that there is in this city a newspaper which has always supported the opposition. It is a fair newspaper, for which I have the greatest possible esteem, and which bears weight in this country when it speaks upon imperial matters. What did the 'Evening Journal,' on the 21st December, 1909, say, in a very important editorial, dealing with the question of the American colonies. It said:

England will make no further mistake in the old direction; but some of our own people now want to make that old mistake by forcing on the rest of our people the idea of sending our taxes to England to be spent there, and such a policy is as sure to produce the same old sort of festering irritation among ourselves against the imperial tie, though not so acute in degree, as did that old policy of one hundred and fifty years ago. A Canadian navy would be a continually growing powerful support to the empire, free from all complication as regards imperial finance. Periodical Canadian contributions to the navy of England——

Such as hon. gentlemen opposite advocate to-day—

—would not at best amount to shucks as an imperial asset in the long run, and would tend to stir up continual friction and turmoil in this country, which might ultimately go far towards smashing British connection.

Not only did the press speak in this manner but hon. gentlemen opposite, before they heard the speeches of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), gave expression to their views to the same effect, and in no unmeasured terms. We have for instance the utterance of one hon. gentleman who is prepared to do as much for the empire as any hon. member in this House—an hon. gentleman who risked his life for the empire, not only in this country, but on the battlefields of South Africa. I refer to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. S. Hughes). What did he say? On the 14th February, 1907, as you will see by 'Hansard', page 2898, he said, referring to the proposed sending of men and money from the colonies for the building of the empire:

That falls to the ground because we have no representation in the British parliament, and the principle is dear to the heart of every colonial that taxation carries the right of representation.

Nor was he alone. Another hon. gentleman in this House, and one who commands our respect as an ardent imperialist, gave utterance to his sentiments as follows: I am referring to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm):

In direct violation of that British principle it is suggested that Canadians should contribute to Great Britain's navy, which they have no means of controlling; that they should assist in British wars which they have no means of preventing, and that they should do all this without having any voice whatever in the expenditure of the money which they themselves would contribute for these purposes. Do the inhabitants of Great Britain imagine that Canadians will submit to something which they would not tolerate themselves?

We have also the opinion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) himself, when he introduced his resolution. That clause is to be found in the very wording of his resolution, which I wish again to read:

That in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

It is argued in this House that such an attitude taken by Canada in withholding ships from active participation in all the wars of the empire before the government has pronounced is disloyal. But if it be disloyal for Canada, it is equally disloyal for Australia. And in the Australian memo, we find this passage:

It is, however, to be understood that if the services of any of the coast defence vessels be desired in seas remote from Australia, the approval of the Commonwealth government shall first be obtained to their removal.

One hon. gentleman gave expression to views which were sound in great measure. He is a gentleman for whose opinion I have the greatest admiration, inasmuch as at one time he was a professor and at another he was a judge on the bench in the courts before which I have the honour to practise. Here is what he said in connection with the naval proposition:

The proposition I lay down is this: I may have the most implicit, the most unbounded, confidence in another man—I am glad to say that I count friends in whose honour and spirit of rectitude I have as unwavering confidence as in my own—but I have no right to hand over to the most trusted of these men the keeping of my conscience. And I say that this country has no right, however great, however implicit, however absolutely complete and perfect, her confidence may be in the imperial authorities, to hand over to their keeping her conscience.

That is exactly the position I take. I think it would be injudicious for this government to bind itself down to participation in all the wars of the empire before this government has had time to pronounce on the merits or demerits of those wars.

I would like to say a word on the proposition held out to us in the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), which meets with favour from his friends in the province of Quebec, but not from the great majority in that province. Not wishing to assume the responsibility of his acts as a member of parliament, apparently not understanding the responsibility of a member of parliament in coming to a decision, he tells us that this is a difficult question upon which opinions differ and that consequently it should be referred to the country. 'I have gone to my electors of Jacques Cartier—good, honest citizens—and they have advised me how to act; and I come back now and ask you to do the same'. The amendment says:

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion, that the Bill now submitted for its consideration changes the relations of Canada with the empire and ought, in consequence, to be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.

I unhesitatingly say that I fully appreciate the position which I hold in this House as a member of parliament, and I believe I have the right to give expression to my opinion upon this subject. I do not feel disposed to submit my judgment beforehand to any body of electors. I claim that, when the time comes, the electors will have the right, as a court of appeal, to express their opinion upon the vote that we shall give. I object to this amendment and oppose it because I do not believe, as it declares, that this Bill changes the relations which exist between this country and England. If the government measure were a direct contribution, then the sacred principle of 'no taxation without representation' would be violated, constitutional relations would be changed, and in that case, I should have absolutely no hesitation in supporting such an amendment as this. But I am opposed to this sub-amendment because I am opposed to government by plebiscite. We have duties to perform as responsible members of this House, and I

claim that we should perform them and should not shirk our responsibility. Other men have spoken upon this question of referring the judgment of the member to his electors. I may be permitted to refer for one moment to some words uttered, when addressing his electors of Bristol, by one of the greatest statesmen that Britain ever knew, Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke. He said:

> Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

He said also:

> To deliver an opinion is the right of all men; that of constituents is a weighty and respectable opinion, which a representative ought always to rejoice to hear, and which he ought always most seriously to consider. But authoritative instructions, mandates issued, which the member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote, and to argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience, these are things utterly unknown to the laws of this land, and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our constitution.

Following that argument of Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke, I say I shall have absolutely no hesitation in recording a vote against the sub-amendment introduced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Now, I come to the Bill. In beginning my remarks on Thursday I said that the time had come when Canada must assume the responsibility of a self-governing nation. We have our militia, which replaces the imperial troops in this country, and, for every British ship that leaves our shores, we shall have a Canadian ship to take its place. We need our ships. I am not one of those who advocate the principle that Canada is protected by the Monroe doctrine. I am too proud of my Canadian citizenship to ever go to the Stars and Stripes and seek aid from a foreign power when we have in this country strong arms ready to hold and defend our own. While I say I do not believe the Monroe doctrine applies in any one letter to this country, yet, even if it did, that is all the more reason for us to proudly hold up our heads as Canadian citizens and say we will protect our own flag with our own ships. The time will come when Canada will realize that the navy is one of the richest assets which this country can possess. It will develop our industries, will open up our mines, will give general employment, and will relieve us from the condition of dependency in which we now find ourselves. Therefore, I say, I have absolutely no hesitation in voting against the sub-amendment and against the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and in favour of the Bill introduced by the government.

Before I resume my seat, and for the sake of accuracy, I wish to refer for a moment to an impression which was thought to be conveyed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). I do this, not that I believe it worth while to go back to it, but simply to justify the poor, maligned Conservative party of the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Frontenac, on Wednesday last, quoted from the Winnipeg 'Telegram' a certain article which is not borne out by facts—in short, which is untrue. That article contained these words:

> Five hundred dollars were spent by the Quebec government to distribute this book as prizes among the children of the schools of Quebec.

Mark well the words 'as prizes among the children of the schools of Quebec.' The hon. member refers to Mr. Tardivel's work 'Pour la Patrie.' And the hon. member goes on to say:

> In my estimation, a wrong is accentuated when the legislature of the province of Quebec votes, as it did vote, $300 of public money to buy these books to scatter that treason throughout the province of Quebec.

And I have this further quotation at page 4184 of 'Hansard':

> I assert that $300 of the public money of the province of Quebec was voted for that purpose, and the proof of my assertion will be found in the Votes and Proceedings of the legislature of the province of Quebec for December 3, 1896.

I have no mandate to speak for the Conservative party of the province of Quebec; in fact, I find myself forced very often to speak against that party for some of their acts. I have no doubt that I should have condemned the act which they performed at that time—at that time, I say, at the time when the Conservative Provincial Secretary took from the vote the sum of $300, or perhaps more, to purchase that book, if I thought he had taken it. I know nothing about the book; I am not arguing about the merits or demerits; I did not read it. But if he undertook to distribute it as prizes among the children of Quebec I would have condemned that. But what are the facts? In 1896, the Conservative party was in power in Quebec. The Provincial Secretary was Hon. L. P. Pelletier, a gentleman who is not only usually but always found supporting the Conservative party, and who is its organizer in the province of Quebec. He took the sum of $300 from the money that was voted to purchase prize books in the province of Quebec and he purchased Mr. Tardivel's work, but let me hope that he purchased it in order to destroy it or in order that it might not be circulated in the province of Quebec. I find, Sir, that according to the Votes and Proceedings of the legislature of Quebec on April 5, 1909, a question was asked by Mr. Walker as follows:

1. Did the government of this province ever purchase, for distribution in the public schools, any copies of the work of J. P. Tardivel, called "Pour la Patrie"?

2. If so, how many copies were purchased, at what date, and by whom was the order given?

Answer by Honourable Mr. Roy:

1 and 2. On the 25th September, 1895, the Provincial Secretary, Hon. L. P. Pelletier, purchased 500 copies of Mr. J. P. Tardivel's work, "Pour la Patrie", at 60 cents per copy.

This work was not given as prize books, as appears by the answer given by the Provincial Secretary, not a Liberal Provincial Secretary but by the Provincial Secretary in the Flynn ministry, the Hon. Mr. Hackett, on the 3rd of December, 1896. The purchase price was paid out of the item 'prize books,' in the estimates of public instruction. Do you think by order of the legislature? By order of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec? Not at all, by order of the Provincial Secretary, the chief organizer of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, the Hon. L. P. Pelletier.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in the course of the remarks which he offered to this House upon the Naval Bill, for some reason or other—and I shall leave it to the judgment of the House what his reason was—made a direct onslaught upon two gentlemen, French Canadians by race, the late Hon. Mr. Mercier, whose memory is held in the highest possible esteem in the province of Quebec, and the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who is honoured and respected in the highest degree in that province. At page 3467 of 'Hansard' the hon. member (Mr. Foster) said:

He (Mr. Mercier) was allied with men in the United States of America, he drew his salary from them, he paid his expenses out of their collections. He travelled the country, as I said, enlisting French Canadians, and men of other nationalities, prominent American citizens, all in favour of the independence of Canada; and along with it was the propagation of continental union, and the union of Canada with the United States.

Further on he says:

Now, I ask my right hon. friend, and I ask this House: What would have happened in this country if my right hon. friend had been successful, and Canada had demanded and had obtained that power? There would have been no guarantee for the union of Canada with the empire for a single five years. It was a demand, not for autonomy, it was a demand for sovereignty, and a sovereignty which, if it were exercised, would make two nations where now there is the mother country and the Dominion under the mother country.

He goes on to quote certain words that were quoted by the right hon. the Prime Minister, and then he concludes:

These were not the outpourings of a youthful and immature imagination, these were the studied statements of an old and seasoned public man.

At page 3468 he says:

Up and down this country he has preached that doctrine. Why? To lessen the respect of a British country for its home country and its home government, to instil the insidious poison into the minds of young and growing citizens that the old country does not know what it is doing and has not treated us fairly. To-night, Sir, I cannot go into the matter of the record of British diplomacy, but I am willing to do it at any time, and I have not much use, I say it straight, I have not much use for a public man representing the highest position in this country who finds nothing better to do than to go up and down this country deriding and misrepresenting British diplomacy and wishing for the day when we may be rid of it.

We can understand the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) using similar language, because he is not supposed to be familiar with the history of Quebec, but I know of no keener, no abler student of political history in this country than the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and I say that it ill-becomes that hon. gentleman to cast any insinuation at all at the right hon. the Prime Minister, or at any French Canadian of the province of Quebec, because he reflects on them when he reflects on Mr. Mercier and the French Canadians who were supposed to have supported him. I take his opinion, and I am sure the people in the province of Quebec will take it at its full value, but I would like to oppose to that opinion the opinion of an eminent British statesman, a man who is really a statesman, I refer now to Earl Dufferin. Earl Dufferin, apparently, could not have been very well acquainted with the hon. member for North Toronto, or the hon. member for North Toronto could not have been very well acquainted with the Earl of Dufferin, because they do not seem to hold the same views on the subject. Let me refer for a moment to Earl Dufferin's words uttered at Windsor on the 18th of August, 1874. I need offer no apology for quoting them in French. He said:

J'ai écouté avec une satisfaction toute particulière l'adresse que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de me présenter. Je suis bien convaincu que nulle part dans la puissance Sa Majesté n'a de sujets plus loyaux, plus fidèles et plus intelligents que ses sujets de race française et je me réjouis de l'occasion qui m'est donnée d'exprimer mon estime et mon respect pour les représentants de ces héroïques pionniers, à la hardiesse desquels nous devons, en grande partie, l'héritage dont nous jouissons.

Mais ce n'est pas à un seul titre que nous sommes obligé envers la race française. Il ne faut pas oublier que c'est à son élévation d'esprit, à son amour de la liberté et à son exacte appréciation des droits civils contenus

en germe dans la constitution primitivement accordée par l'Angleterre au Canada, que nous devons le développement de cette autonomie parlementaire dont le pays est fier à si bon droit....

I submit the two opinions to the judgment of this House. I further say that if hon. gentlemen opposite find that the Hon. Mr. Mercier, at one time Prime Minister of Quebec, sinned, at least he sinned not for his own material interest, he sinned through loyalty, and for the people that he loved so well. Let me ask the hon. member who represents North Toronto, and other hon. gentlemen who wish to carry on this warfare against the province of Quebec to study a little into the history of their own party. Are they familiar with a certain manifesto which was published in this country and which was sent broadcast asking not for independence, not that Canada should remain the home of Canadians, but asking for what is described by the words which are found in the sixth clause of that manifesto?

Of all the remedies that have been suggested for the acknowledged and insufferable ills with which our country is afflicted, there remains but one to be considered. It propounds a sweeping and important change in our political and social condition, involving considerations which demand our most serious examination. This remedy consists in a friendly and peaceful separation from British connection and a union upon equitable terms with the great North American confederacy of sovereign states.

A manifesto in favour of annexation with the United States. The hon. member for North Toronto says that he has no use for a man who would proclaim a doctrine in which there could be conceived words asking for the severance of the tie which binds this country to Great Britain. Why, Sir, he would in a moment support such a man if it suited his own interests, because he not only supported, but he formed part of the Cabinet of a man whose signature appears first upon that manifesto. I regret to have to bring his name here, but since hon. gentlemen opposite have gone into the graves of the dead and have brought the dead forth in their struggle against the government and the Prime Minister, I am compelled to say that the hon. member for North Toronto formed part of the government of the hon. Sir John J. C. Abbott, the Conservative Prime Minister of Canada in 1891, whose signature we find first attached to that manifesto asking for annexation to the United States. But, Sir, the hon. member for North Toronto and hon. gentlemen opposite supported that gentleman. They studied and they believed in the doctrine enunciated by two other gentlemen who lived in this country, but who unfortunately are now in their graves. I refer to Sir John Rose, a Conservative Finance Minister of this country, and I refer to Sir A. T. Galt, another great Finance Minister, both members of a Conservative cabinet, both great lights in the Conservative party, and both of whom signed the manifesto asking that the British tie should cease, and that this country should become annexed to the United States.

Some people should read the history of Canada, before casting insinuations right and left at our friends from the province of Quebec. If they value their title of British subjects as much as they appear to do they would learn that if Canada is still a British colony, it is due mainly to the loyalty of the province of Quebec, and it is due mainly to the loyalty of the French Canadian people of that province. It is well known that at the time of the war of Independence, the English population in the province of Quebec was only a handful. The French population was in the great majority. What happened in that year? In 1775 an army invaded Canada under the command of Montgomery and Arnold. That is a well known fact, but, as appears by this discussion, some people never knew, or seem to have forgotten, that this army of English speaking people took three cities in Quebec by surprise attack when they were not defended—the city of Montreal, the city of St. Johns, and the city of Three Rivers. General Carleton, and his name is familiar to every hon. gentleman opposite, was bound to fly from the city of Montreal, and he had to do it during the night time, because the city was in the hands of the Americans. He was taken down the St. Lawrence in a canoe by two French Canadian officers. He could not go by land, because both sides of the St. Lawrence at that time were in the hands of the Americans. They succeeded in bringing him successfully to Quebec, travelling at night on their difficult journey, and Carleton, with the help of a Scotch regiment and French Canadian volunteers under Chabot and Dambourges, organized a defence of the city which was stormed during the night of the 31st December, 1775. It was due to the bravery of these two officers and to Colonel Nairn of the Scotch regiment, that the invaders were repulsed and there ended the campaign. Who can gainsay that if the French Canadians had not taken part in the battle Carleton would not have been able to withstand the invasion of the American people and Canada would have been known to-day as one of the states of the North American continent? But, that is not all. I give this history and I give it willingly that hon. gentlemen op-

posite may go upon the same platforms where they have been decrying the leaders of political thought in the province of Quebec, and give to their hearers the benefit of some of the history of their own country. During the following year Congress sent over to Canada three men whose names are well known in the history of this country—Franklin, Chase and Carroll —whose mission was to try to persuade the French Canadians to join the rebels. The people, following the advice of their clergy and of the seigneurs who had become attached to British connection and British institutions, refused to join hands with the rebels. Later on Admiral D'Estaing and General Lafayette, appealed to the French Canadians, tried to work on their sentiments and recalled to them the ties of kinship to induce them to fight against the British army which had so recently conquered them, but again the French Canadians were true. What was happening at this time in the province of Quebec—in this disloyal province of Quebec? That great old community the Ursulines so well known throughout this country, under the direction of Monseigneur Saint Onge, the Vicar General, caused to be chanted in the churches the anthem Domine salvum fac regem—Lord preserve the King. Was this disloyalty on the part of Quebec? Are these disloyal acts? Look at the history of the war of 1812, and you will find the same evidence of loyalty and attachment to British institutions brought forth during that war. I have no hesitation in saying that if again the French Canadians in the province of Quebec had not been true to their loyalty to Great Britain and had refused to take part in this war Canada might have become a part of the United States. Refer for a moment to the bravery and courage of de Salaberry with his band of faithful, loyal and courageous French Canadians upon the banks of the Chateauguay. I refer to these facts of history, because I know no time in this discussion when they might be more appropriate. I know of no time in the history of this country when the people displayed to greater advantage their loyalty to British institutions than the year of 1812, when Frenchmen, Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen from the Highlands and the Lowlands joined hands to protect the flag of Canada. So also, if needs be, they will be found together bravely fighting for the flag which waves over this parliament, the emblem of our constitutional rights, sacred to you, sacred to me, protecting all races, protecting all classes and protecting all creeds. Let us live down our prejudices and our passions and unite in upholding the dignity of Canadian citizenship. I beg of all hon. members of this House to cease racial appeals and to place country before province, to place country before party, to place country before self. This land is not the home of the Frenchman, it is not the home of the Englishman, it is not the home of the Scotchman, it is not the home of the Irishman; it is the home of the Canadian. It is a grand heritage that has been bequeathed to us; it is a noble heritage bequeathed unencumbered by sterling patriots; men who have fought for it, men who have died for it. Let us live for it, let us protect it, let us if needs be die for it, that our children may enjoy the same freedom and the same liberties as we have, proud to proclaim their nationality as we are proud to proclaim ours: Citizens of Canada and Canadians, first and always.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) who last spoke is possessed of a very excellent virtue; he is sensitive as to anything that may be said against his province or the character of her people. As I am practically a native of that same province, having lived there my earlier years, I must confess that I too am somewhat sensitive in that regard. I believe, however, that the hon. member (Mr. Devlin) was over sensitive when he imagined that the hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) in his address the other evening had been attacking the people of the province of Quebec. I did not so understand him; I considered that his criticisms were levelled more against some political methods that he believed prevailed in that province, methods which are not good for the people of that province or for the people of any other portion of Canada. I did not follow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) very closely in his remarks but I understood him to say that the book published by Mr. Tardivel had not been distributed as prizes to school children but that the edition had been brought up, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) told us that the gentleman who purchased it was a Conservative. I must say that I commend that gentleman's conduct in that respect.

Now, Sir, this debate has dragged along for some weeks and it is evident from the appearance of the House that it feels it has heard enough of the subject. In some respects that may be so, but so far as I am concerned I have not yet heard as to what this proposed navy is going to mean to the people of Canada, or, the relationship which is going to exist between it and their pockets. Now, Mr. Speaker, some months ago I was to a slight extent brought into the limelight because I had the hardihood to go out and talk to the public on this question, and ventured to express what appeared to me to be some very ordinary common sense views on

the navy situation; views that were primarily directed against the construction of any local navy. I was quoted in some journals as wishing to contribute $10,000,000 to the motherland, the contribution to be spread over a period of some few years. It is true that I used these figures but did so purely for the purpose of illustrating my idea. I assumed that our government had some clear and definite idea as to what this new navy departure was going to mean to our tax-payers, but up to the present I have failed to glean any very intelligent idea as to that feature of the question. Our government had this matter before it for some months when parliament assembled in November last, and we were allowed to remain here for nearly two months, we were allowed to leave for the Christmas holidays and up to that time our government had not the courage to come out into the open and expose their plan to the public upon whose shoulders they are placing this burden whatever it may turn out to be. I assumed that our government would be able to inform the people that this project had certain definite things in view, the accomplishment of which would mean a certain expenditure. I assumed we were aiming to assist in overcoming an emergency, of which, I will speak presently, and as Canada is not engaged in the building of warships, nor am I particularly anxious to see her engage in such an industry—it appeared to me, the only thing we could do was to make our proposed expenditure by way of contribution spread over some few years so that the burden might rest as lightly as possible upon the shoulders of our tax-payers. I was not attempting to lay down any naval policy for this country; I was and I still am strongly opposed to any local navy project until we at least know if the British empire is going to be launched on some more stable basis than that of sentiment alone. And, Sir, for my purpose in discussing this matter from that point of view, $10,000 would have served equally as well as $10,000,000.

The right hon. the Prime Minister does not appear to be very sure of his ground in the matter of imperialism. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am an imperialist—that is, if it means one who believes in the firm welding together of the British people on a permanent basis. Unlike the right hon. gentleman I shall discuss present day conditions in dealing with this question. I am not going back to the wars of the Roses, I will not concern myself about the vagaries of Peter the Hermit, nor shall I theorize as to the results on the development of the Anglo Saxon people, had Julius Cæsar when he landed on the coast of Britain been encased in woollen socks. And, yet Sir, if I should so disport myself I would be as near the subject under consideration as the right hon. gentleman was during three-fourths of his address. I repeat Sir, I am an imperialist, because I believe from the very depths of my soul it is best for us and best for civilization. I suppose I should make that admission with bated breath as there are some few men in this country—and now my thoughts are very far from the right hon. gentleman—men who take themselves more seriously than do their fellows; men who strut our streets and imagine the cosmopolitan population landing on the shores of this country, are ready to kneel and cry out: We want to share your citizenship, when as a matter of fact, if they are even being noticed it is probably with the thought, expressed in the vernacular: Those guys are struck on themselves. Sir, in the upbuilding of a young country a necessary factor is that spirit found in the imperialist; men filled with a desire to unite their race; men who are active in the assimilation of the people who come to the shores of their country, and unlike some of these others, to whom I have referred, who might as well remain in bed the entire 24 hours for all the use they are in that respect and who have to put out their hands to feel so as to discover if they are awake.

Sir, that spirit is as necessary in Cuba as in the British empire. Where is there a greater evidence of that spirit than in the United States of America? See what they have accomplished in binding together the elements that have drifted thither. Then, Sir, we occasionally hear some snears cast at the waving of the flag. In that respect I think we can take a few lessons from the United States. When we realize that the vast masses of immigrants landing on the shores of that country must naturally regard the flag as so many yards of material, and that they are there but a few years when they commence to appreciate the benefits they receive under that flag, and soon are joining in the procession that keeps it afloat. In a new country, it is absolutely necessary for us to keep the flag before the people. I do not want to be offensive to anybody in regard to the waving of flags, but if we feel that a national emblem is of any consequence in this world, I do not see that we should be ashamed of it.

I do not know what the right hon. gentleman's conception of imperialism is; but I do know that he has seen fit to cast slurs at those who have an abiding faith in it; I do know that he has referred to the Pharisees of imperialism. Still, I am not aware that one holding the high and important position of premier of Canada adds to his cause by such methods. If, however, it pleases him, if he feels it is going to bolster up this peculiar naval mea-

sure with the people of Canada, then he and I have formed very different estimates of the character of our citizens.

I am not going to discuss the material benefits that accrue to Canada as a member of the British empire, as I believe all hon. gentlemen are of one mind in that respect. If there are selfish reasons why we should be in that empire to-day, it appears to me that there are the same reasons why we should go down into the future as a member of that family. If it is to the advantage of the sovereign states of New York and California, situated as they are some five days apart in the matter of travel, to be firmly fixed in the same union, it appears to me that there are equally good reasons why Great Britain and Canada should be likewise situated. If it is to the advantage of New York and California to have a single navy, I cannot see why that same principle will not equally well apply to Great Britain and Canada. While the ocean may not be receding, it certainly is being rapidly narrowed in the matter of the time it takes to cross it. In the current of this young country's life there will be many shoals and many rapids to pass over; and instead of guiding it by clean, strong and wise statesmanship, the only evidence I can see is that it is not only allowed, but actually encouraged to drift on towards the rocks of independence, while our government chants some dirge about autonomy very much like the Indian who feels that he is warding off some evil spirit by singing a few meaningless phrases as he jogs past some cemetery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming nearer to the question under consideration, what is the situation in Europe to-day? There, there are some 415 millions of people, some few millions of whom have never known a full stomach, and yet the very vitals are being ground out of them by the tax gatherer for the upkeep of armaments for the maintenance of peace. What an extraordinary situation! There are only two positions open to those nations. They must recede from the position they are taking or with taxes bounding upward, the breaking point will be reached, which means bankruptcy, which means fight to wipe their fellows off the face of the earth. There is an extraordinary condition of things on that continent. I say there is an emergency. When we find the two political parties of Great Britain practically receding from the methods of taxation which have been in force for many years in order to extract more money from the taxpayers for the purposes of the navy, then it appears to me we have that dollars and cents argument that an emergency does exist, and an argument which we cannot overlook. It was this condition that awakened the several elements of the British empire last spring, and it is this condition which is responsible for the Bill now before us, whatever it may be. I wish to lay down an axiom, that Canada as Canada, with her comparatively small population of seven million people, with her vast natural resources requiring all the men and the monetary energies that we can command for the development of the country, for the betterment of the conditions of the people that we have and for preparing for the people that we hope to receive—I say that Canada, standing alone to-day, has as much need of a navy as a resident of Hades has of a buffalo overcoat. But Canada lies within British North America, and we are British subjects. Then it is not only a question of duty but of decency for us to go to the aid of the British people, a people who during the past hundred years or more have contributed at least $500,000,000 to the welfare of this country. It is, therefore, a duty that we owe ourselves, a duty that we owe to the empire of which we form no inconsiderable part, and, on higher grounds, it is a duty we owe to civilization. The greatest calamity that could happen to the human family would be the disintegration of the British empire. It would mean the putting back of the hands of civilization. Great Britain cannot be permitted to go under. Britain has her faults; so has every individual who goes to the making up of the smallest community; but Britain has been standing out for the best in mankind. Her doors have been open to the religious and politically oppressed of every European nation. Hers are a free people, a self-governed people. The great nation to the south of us is a free people, a self-governed people. Free people cannot be permitted to go under. I hold it would be the duty of Great Britain to go to the aid of that great nation to the south of us if its life was in any way endangered. The best thought in the United States realize that Britain's strength must remain unimpaired. They know as well as we know, that if disintegration should set in, in the British family, the white man's burden would be thrown within narrower limits for support. Then Canada has a part in this very serious matter, and we should act promptly, and above all, act efficiently, and without committing this young country to any definite policy of a Canadian navy.

A Canadian navy would not, in my opinion, be in the best interests of this country, or meet the want of the moment. The present stress and trial through which Britain is striving, cannot last many years; and my cry is, let the over-seas dominions put their shoulders to the wheel and push the motherland through this emergency, thereby giving other nations clearly and distinctly to understand that it is absolutely useless for them to attempt

to jeopardize the life of the British people. But above all things, I am convinced we should not now attempt to saddle on this young country any Canadian navy proposition, especially when we can render much greater and more effective service by the proposed contribution to the British navy and at a greatly reduced cost to our taxpayers. Have I any justification for that statement? It is only necessary to refer to the first paragraph of the British admiralty report, in which it is declared clearly that the maximum effect at the minimum cost can only be obtained through a central navy. And the report then goes on to say, that owing to political and other consderations, some of the oversea dominions cannot support a central navy. Then for the first time the question of separate navy units is discussed.

For my part, I cannot quite understand what is meant by political and other considerations. Some gentlemen oppose a plan of contribution on the ground that it is unfair for us to ask the British people to do our share of the fighting, while others take the view that we cannot afford to send our taxes to Britain for the building and upkeep of a navy. I am not disposed to quarrel with either of these sentiments. As the matter appeals to me, the British navy is built, operated and controlled in and from the British islands, simply because the British taxpayer supplies the money; surely it must appeal to us that if the various elements of the British empire should decide to support a central navy, conditions would be at once changed and that navy would pass out of the sphere of a British navy and become imperial in character..

There is only one place where a man puts his money and does not follow it. That is in charitable work. But this is not a question of charity. It is a question of insuring our existence on this sphere, it is a question of protecting our own commerce or, to put it in another way I might say it is a question of returning to the motherland but a moiety of the vast sums she has expended on our behalf at various periods in our history when we were unable to help ourselves. Therefore I cannot see how intelligent people can conceive that by supporting a central navy our money would be expended in England alone. That position appears similar to the one taken by an individual who, on being invited to join in a large enterprise, refused because, having no voice in its management before he invested therein, by some peculiar reasoning reached the conclusion that he would have nothing to say in its direction afterwards, and that man wandered down the wayside and started a corner grocery of his own.

In short, if the British navy should become an imperial navy, it will be built, operated and controlled in and from the British empire, and its moneys expended in the erection of docks throughout the empire while contracts will be given for the construction of vessels wherever facilities have been created for such purposes. The taxpayer in Canada is not particularly concerned about owning fighting ships. What we want now is something that will have the greatest fighting capacity for the least money, and that we can only have through the British navy; I cannot conceive how any Canadian would fail to point with pride to the British navy and say that is my navy, and I venture the opinion that that is the navy to which some of those adherents of a Canadian navy would rush to get behind in the event of any trouble. This young country has neither the means nor the energy to waste in buying experience on the high seas.

Some hon. gentlemen have taken the attitude that because we have our land forces, we should have our sea forces. The two are not analogous. Our land forces operate within our own territory; they are always at home. Sea forces operate within the barn yard of the nations of the earth, where the one people put up the one front on the one sea. We have heard a good deal during the course of this debate about a section in our Militia Act which provides that our militia shall not leave Canada without the consent of the Canadian government. I am not particularly concerned about that feature, but some hon. gentlemen seem to think that, because it is in our Militia Act, it should be in this Naval Act. We all know that our land forces can only assist Britain in land wars. And Britain's land wars have in recent years been practically wars of colonization. They have been wars which never really endangered her life. Take, for instance, the South African war, which was carried on for months and years. Her life was never really threatened during that conflict; but any man who does his own thinking must realize that the moment Britain fires the first gun in her defence on the high seas, from that moment until the trouble is ended, her life will be hanging by a very slender thread. We all know that no nation or combination of nations will undertake to challenge her on the high seas unless they felt confident that they can cripple her, and we ought to know that the back of a naval war might be broken inside of six days. And here we have before us a Navy Bill which undertakes to provide that Canada's navy will not go to the aid of the mother country until this parliament is assembled, and we, in our wisdom, pass upon the justice of Britain's

cause. To my mind the proposition is a preposterous one. I say in all seriousness to the right hon. gentleman that I do not believe it would be possible to bring a measure into this House containing a more objectionable feature. My doctrine, as a British subject, is that wherever we may be on the face of the earth, we should 'pull, pull together, in all kinds of weather'; and my policy, as a British subject, is to jump into the breach and go to the aid of my fellow British subject, wherever on this earth he is, and discuss the righteousness of his cause afterwards. Before I would accept that feature in this Bill, I would throw down my British citizenship and take up some other. No matter what government presented that most objectionable feature to me, I would not take it in that shape, because it puts a bar to our giving aid to the mother country, which would make us absolutely helpless. Any assistance we may be able to give is one which can only be of use when Britain is threatened on the high seas, and the assistance provided in this measure would be utterly useless in such an emergency. And to advance the argument that because such a feature is in the Militia Act, and should be in our Naval Bill is preposterous as conditions are entirely different. I trust I have made myself clear in that respect.

Coming back to the question, which after all appeals to our taxpayers, that is, the question of cost, by the contribution asked for in the amendment of the leader of the opposition, we know exactly what we are giving and where it ends as well as the positive service it will render. By the government proposition now before us, the future is a sealed book. What it involves, our taxpayers cannot know. The expenditure will be a growing and a most serious one. Again I repeat we have no money for such experiments. But some gentlemen will say: You are providing for the present emergency. I say, Sir, is not that enough? Let us turn our eyes inward and continue to develop this vast country. The British empire must get down to some business arrangement, if it is going to stand, and if that does not come before another emergency we can meet it as British subjects should. I wish to say with all the force within me that we Canadians are dealing too much in theories; we are dreaming pleasant dreams. Gentlemen pass through this land and tells us that we are a wonderful people. But the vastness of our virgin wealth will be an obstacle to our becoming a strong, clean people, unless we are cautious. And, we continue to dream on. 'We are making our own treaties,' and the same authority in the next breath will tell us that we are 'one of the sister nations.' These two ideas do not harmonize with my view of the situation. I realize that we must control our own domestic matters. I realize that we know better than those outside of Canada what we have to trade and what we want in return. But I realize that there must be some revising board within the empire to pass on our negotiations before they become effective; otherwise we shall get out of the British empire. If all the sister nations are to make treaties, to do as they see fit, then the end of that empire is in sight. In my judgment we have reached a point in empire development, when one final forward step is necessary for us to become a great empire world power. Changes come rapidly in these days. Who will prophesy as to what will occur in the next ten or twenty years? I believe they will be most momentous in the history of the British empire. Therefore, let us not try to push too far into the future in this matter.

So far as Canada is concerned, it is not a theory that faces us, but as Cleveland once remarked, it is a condition, that confronts us. The fact that some gentlemen in London hold the opinion that what is good for Australia is equally good for this country—a separate naval unit—only shows, in my opinion, that those men are not familiar with Canadian conditions. It is not the London view point that we should pay the greatest heed to as that is practically uniform as respects the various elements of the empire, but it is the individual viewpoint of each of the dominions that must be carefully scrutinized and studied if we hope to maintin the integrity of the British empire. Canada is not an island like Australia whose new people from the moment they land on her shores are for ever separated from their old associations and old political affiliations. Canada lies side by side —nay, to a certain extent, is surrounded by—one of the largest and greatest nations on earth, peopled by probably the greatest aggregation of intelligence to be found within the confines of any country in the world. Of course, that does not injure us. Canada's immigration, which is to make Canada large and populous is to come largely through, or from the United States of America. We cannot get away from that. If there were time, I believe I could satisfy any hon. member as to the soundness of that view. There, then is the condition with which we Canadians are sleeping today.

Mr. Archibald Carey Coolidge, a prominent political economist associated with Harvard University, in a recently published book, 'The United States as a World Power,' refers to Canada, and to Canada's future. Mr. Coolidge has reached the conclusion that 'Canadian public opinion is inclined to look forward to ultimate independence, with friendship and perhaps alliance with Greater Britain.'

Japan is an independent country and an

ally of Great Britain. Is that the destiny some gentlemen have marked out for this important country? I believe that Mr. Coolidge is justified in reaching his conclusion. He is standing outside this country, without any interest here, looking inwards, forming his opinion, not, unfortunately, from meeting our people, but from the views which are expressed from time to time by our public men, some of whom, especially some members of our government who do not appear to be able to get on any public platform without making some reference to Canada as a 'nation.' Before giving Mr. Coolidge's views on western Canada, let me point out to the House that our immigrants are settling east of the great lakes, are locating around our important cities, where their political sentiments can be moulded and controlled, that is leavened by the centres to which they attach themselves. But that is not the situation in western Canada, where our new people are spreading out over a vast area, building up their own centres of population, and carrying into them their own political sentiments. Mr. Coolidge is willing to admit that some portions of eastern Canada are loyal to British institutions. Here, however, is what he has to say with reference to the people settling on our western plains. Speaking of loyalty to Britain, he says:

> It is an exotic plant, too delicate to flourish in such soil. In these new regions, with their mixed population imbued with a materialism of frontier life, the whole tone is latter date American rather than English. The people are too matter of fact, too much taken up with their everyday affairs, to indulge in such luxuries as loyalty to a distant throne ; to them it seems very unreal sentimentality.

Now, Sir, Mr. Coolidge has failed, in my opinion, to grasp the true conception of the situation. It is not a question, in the British empire, of loyalty to thrones, but it is the reality of a constitution which allows free people of every race, every tongue and every creed to stand together on the highest known plane of citizenship. And, if the millennium were here, no further steps would be necessary to bind together the self-governing element of the empire more closely than they are today. Our new people do not come to us from any knowledge they possess of our constitution, and our American citizens do not leave the United States from any dissatisfaction with that country's constitution. They make good ciizens. But there is a citizenship in the British empire different from any other in the world. He who goes to Australia will be essentially an Australian; he who comes to Canada will be essentially a Canadian until we show them what our enlarged citizenship means. To what extent are we engaged in doing that work? Absolutely nothing that I can see when we have our public men talking so much about 'Canada as a nation.' I say that if we want to remain in the British empire, if we want to be a living, burning entity in the empire, standing out for peace in this world, if we want to push forward civilization, then we must become more active in bringing together the various elements of the empire into some closer compact than mere ties of friendship, which is practically the condition to-day. And if we do that we will have less time to prate about 'Canada as a nation,' 'Canada making her own treaties,' and 'the one final act in the rounding off of our nationhood.' Loyalty based on sentiment, is doubtless, of the highest order, and if nations grow by natural means, that is by an excess of births over deaths, that loyalty will seep down through many generations, but where ethnical conditions are in an almost constant state of change as is the condition in Canada today and will be in the younger elements of the empire, then we will have to weave in with that friendship, some business into the empire fabric, if it is to stand.

Now, Sir, doubtless I will be accused of wishing to deny Canada the right to hold up her head and proudly proclaim herself a nation. I will be accused, Sir, of wishing to deny Canadians what the Patagonians possess. I understand some hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to what the Patagonians are accomplishing in the matter of a navy. I am not aware that the Patagonians have been advanced in scale of importance among the peoples of the world because they can say their country is independent of any other. I am not aware that the rounding off of Patagonian nationality by means of its toy navy has added to its pre-eminence though that is practically the view that one member of our government has taken in connection with this proposed Canadian navy. I do not wish to deny any one the right of a membership in a nation. As a Canadian citizen I am a member of the British nation and I venture the opinion if some of those gentlemen who are so anxious to talk about our nationhood should find themselves in Russia, and their rights being invaded the talisman they would employ would be I am of the British nation. They would not be shoving forward at that particular moment any idea of Canada's nationhood. This is but an instance of the value of that citizenship which some people in this country appear to be only too anxious to shove into the background. The word 'nation' is quite unnecessary in its application to Canada at the present time. We know we are a free people, a self-governed people. How can

we explain to our new people that we are of the British nation while we are pouring into their ears all this talk about Canadian nationhood. There is no necessity to play with words or phrases. The right hon. gentleman has frequently become poetic in referring to the attitude of Canada to the empire, an attitude which he has affirmed of filial affection. When we realize that our doors are wide open we must realize that the household will become filled with step-children and adopted ones and that filial affection to which he has referred will probably find itself in a heap in the back yard. The methods in vogue are not likely to instil very much filial affection in our adopted children.

I have already given my reason for supporting this contribution, because in the present emergency it renders the motherland the most effective aid at the least cost to our taxpayers. I am opposed to a Canadian navy because we do not want any such extravagant appendage at the present time. I am opposed to it on the still more important ground that I regard it as a step away from the motherland, I cannot see that it is a step closer. I look on it as a step towards disintegration in the British family. Some hon. gentlemen will say no, but they must realize that there are men in this country who believe that Canada is to be an independent country, and of them there is a certain proportion who feel that it is our duty to do something now. I venture the opinion that every one of these gentlemen will be found holding up his hands for a Canadian navy so that to use the phrase attributed to the right hon. gentleman, when the fruit is sufficiently ripe to drop from the tree Canada will step out as a nation with her full-fledged navy. If through our vain-glory, I will not add hypocrisy, though at times I am disposed to doubt our own sincerity, if we continue to dream on, if we fail to begin right now to knit the steel into the concrete which is going into the structure we are upbuilding on this North American continent. If, in short, Sir, through our sins of omission, we and the other self-governing elements of the empire fail to do our duty and the glory of that empire, upon which the sun never sets, be allowed to pass away, thereby causing the people who will then control the destinies of this land to work out its national status, I say that in this age of centralizing of power which is growing stronger year by year, the result will be a fusion with the great nation to the south of us.

An important question for consideration is, what are we Canadians looking forward to, are we not building a structure on this continent? If so, what is it to be. An intelligent builder, from the moment he puts his hand to the foundation, has some

clear idea as to his ultimate aim. Is Canada going to be permanently fixed in the British empire or is she to withdraw from that empire, dreaming of an independence which will ultimately lead to absorption by the United States. If that is our view let us be honourable and get out now. If we are to take the purely animal view, let us retire from that empire and put aside all ideas of a navy, imperial or otherwise, as under existing conditions, with our present resources this country does not need a navy. I feel that the proper place for us is to be firmly fused into the British empire, and it is to that end I wish to see Canada, the premier dominion, work. The other elements of the empire will surely follow us. If we believe that the civilization of Britain has reached as advanced a stage as that of any other country in the world, if we believe that Britain has been standing out for the best in mankind, then realizing that the stronger that people is made, the stroner these influences for peace will grow, it seems to me our duty as a people is quite plain. The question which has absolutely no answer to me is where better could the Canadian people find themselves than in the ranks of such a family.

May I be permitted to indulge my fancies for a few moments. Is there any visible reason why Britain and her first-born on this continent could not be now living in the same union. It was not the Boston tea party alone that was responsible for that unfortunate separation. There were dissentions among the colonies, there were vain glories then with a single eye to local importance only. If, however, mistakes had not been made on both sides, and those two peoples had continued together down through the last century, what would be the situation to-day? Simply this, instead of having two powerful nations standing out separately for practically the same principles, we would have their forces united, and whatever influences there are for peace to-day those influences would be practically doubled. With such unity existing who is there to suggest that America would be sending taxes to England for the building and upkeep of navies? Who is there to suggest that the United States would be asking England to do her share of the fighting? It might mean that while Britain's domestic affairs would be handled at Westminster, imperial matters would be dealt with more frequently at Washington than at London. In the days of the separation England and America were removed by a long and perilous sea voyage of fifty to seventy-five days. If that position had remained constant the United States might have remained insular, but

conditions have changed and she has become a great world power. Her founders could not foresee that situation any more than we can see what is ahead of our people. Distances are measured by the time it takes to overcome them. Britain and Canada are closer to-day than the exterior members of the thirteen colonies were a century ago.

Let us not try to disguise the outcome of this navy move. It is the result of a desire on the part of certain citizens to do something to help the motherland. I cannot congratulate the government upon the manner in which they have met that request. I realize the force of Mr. Bourassa's statement, that if Canada is to take part in Britain's wars she must have something to say in the making and settlement of them. It appears as if there will have to be some systematic business arrangement within the empire as it will not stand on sentiment alone, and if we cannot see its solution clearly to-day, it will unfold itself, if we press forward having our minds resolutely made up, that its accomplishment will be best for us and best for civilization. Then, that accomplished, there will in course of time, be fusions with other people in the great march forward of civilization. We are pushing into the forefront a Canadian navy with no intelligent idea where it will be found in the event of certain emergencies. It might be the very instrument to drive us out of the empire if we should refuse its aid to other elements of the empire. Sir, I consider that we are starting at the wrong end. Let the self-governing elements of the empire first decide the responsibility to be accepted by each, in the event of trouble and follow that up with some unified policy for naval development within the empire. Then it will be time enough to talk about a Canadian unit of the imperial navy. Meanwhile let us refrain from taking any step which will make the accomplishment of that desirable end more difficult than it is at the present time and evidently it is difficult judging from the manner in which this Bill has been brought before us.

Now, Sir, to repeat, if Great Britain is forced into a naval war her life is in jeopardy it is our duty to give her effective aid. The Russo-Japanese war is sufficient evidence that naval engagements are not advertised in advanced-like auctions. The only indication of a possible war is the evidence of activity on the part of other nations, we can have absolutely no confidence in their professions during these trying times. The British taxpayer knows that. We have the dollars and cents arguments to which I have referred. That is sufficient evidence for me. I do not want to take any more chances, and therefore, wish to put on some more insurance by throwing into the fighting line a couple of Dreadnoughts. Then I say let us turn our faces inward and continue the development of this country. We have heard some vague rumours that the starting of this Canadian navy is going to develop the shipbuilding industry in Canada. I see no objection to encouraging the building of docks as well as the development of our merchant marine. If that service has not been keeping pace with the development of our inland transportation lines, there is good reason for it. We know that we cannot find sufficient money to enable us to engage in developing all the varied interests in this vast country. The natural result is that those interests are allowed to remain stationary, which can be supplied by sources outside of the country. If there are merchant ships of other countries available to carry our products it is altogether likely our merchant marine will not be actively developed until we are looking for opportunity to invest capital. That, however, is not to-day, but it will surely come. And, for my part, I cannot see that by having shipyards constructing the few naval vessels which our government say will be ready in five years, that that is going to force forward the development of our merchant marine. Do some hon. gentlemen opposite believe a few capitalists walking by our navy yards will be attracted by the sound of hammers and like children gazing at a shop window loaded with toys, go in and order a few vessels. After all, Sir, it is an economic question. And, so far as Germany is conecrned I have had nothing to say about the German scare. I will say this, however, that no nation should be allowed to develop both fighting arms to the highest efficiency. Germany has the greatest army in the world and unquestionably she is ambitious to have a navy equal to the most powerful on the seas. If she is allowed to reach that point she at once becomes a menace to the rest of Europe. To whom in Europe will she be a real menace? Any school child knows that it is Britain, because outside of Britain she can now practically dictate her terms to any of the other nations.

In concluding my remarks there is another feature to which I will briefly refer, and that is Canada, in years gone by, has appealed to the United States for reciprocity, but without success. The next request, I believe, will come from our friends to the south of us and perhaps much earlier than we imagine. Now, I realize that it is not our place to interfere in the politics of Great Britain, but I would like some of our free trade friends in Britain to keep that feature in view when studying Canadian conditions, and upon which I have attempted to throw some light to-day. Again I say there is too much drifting, too much running to political corners to sift out the winds of temporary political ad-

vantage too much placing of ears to the ground to listen for the rumblings of discontented vote manipulators, too little thought of great principles and the willingness to go down and out for them, too little effort to create a strong healthy public opinion in this country to deal intelligently with all large issues. The next few years will determine whether the British empire is going to enter upon the greatest epoch-making period of its history, the greatest epoch-making period in the history of the world. Canada had an epoch-making period. I refer to the days immediately preceding confederation. There is a confederacy in the balance, greater than the world has ever seen. And it is for us to do our duty—to-day, not to-morrow, it may then be too late. I say then, let us play up! play up! and play the game as members of the great British family.

Sir, we are engaged in the building of a ship—the empire. Civilization also demands the strengthening of the union of the elements of that empire throughout this world, therefore let our constant cry be:

Sail on, O ship of state!
Sail on, O union strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations upon this question, I feel encouraged to do so from the importance that has been given to the subjects by the leaders on both sides of this House. We have the authority of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) for saying that this is the biggest and most important question that has come before this House for the last 25 years. I do not quarrel with the hon. leader of the opposition in the position which he has arrived at upon that point. But, referring to the observations of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Magrath) I have very little quarrel with him when he says that he is an imperialist in the sense of being loyal to British institutions and in addition loyal to Canadian institutions as far as they contribute to our strength in our connection with the mother country. He cannot be any stronger in this regard than I am. Therefore, in lauding himself, or his party upon that ground, I have no quarrel with him. I have not come across any member of the Liberal party in this country who has failed in his support of these principles. But the hon. gentleman thinks that on the government side we have not shown a great deal of courage in dealing with this question. Well, Sir, if courage means that we are taking the initiative, that we are prepared to put a measure through this House upon our own convictions, I think that we possibly were more courageous than the hon. gentlemen opposite who say that they cannot undertake anything until they can ascertain what their respective constituents have to say about it. The proper principle is that statesmen, that leaders, should lead public opinion and not that public opinion should lead statesmen.

If we are doing what is right, there is no occasion for us to go back to our people to direct us. They have sent us here to do the business of Canada, and it is our duty to carry out their mandate. Now, there were a few things said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Magrath) to which I call attention. Sir, in loyalty to the British empire and in strong conviction as to the necessity for maintaining British institutions, the Liberal party are as strong believers as is the hon. gentleman. He tells us there is an emergency, that there is danger to Great Britain, and that something should be done on the spur of the moment, and suppose we do accept his advice and hand $25,000,000 over to the British authorities, the idea no doubt would be that they should start to build a Dreadnought. But do gentlemen on the other side say that Great Britain has not money enough to build Dreadnoughts as fast as she can build them; do they assert that the British exchequer is exhausted, and that, therefore, we must turn on the tap, as some would say? Why, Britain has abundance of money to build her warships as rapidly as she can build them, and it is, therefore, unnecessary for us to give aid in money. Would it be any proof of our loyalty if we gave this contribution? Does any Conservative member in this House assert that Britain does not believe in the loyalty of the Canadian people, and that it is necessary to come with a sacrifice of $25,000,000 and place it on the altar to prove our loyalty? I am as anxious about Canadian loyalty and British supremacy as any man in Canada, but I do not believe there is any emergency. I do not believe that the supremacy of Great Britain requires this money, nor do I believe that it is necessary to prove our loyalty to His Gracious Majesty the King or to the people of the motherland. We have shown our loyalty whenever the occasion arose, and we will show it again when it is demanded from us. Are we of the family of the empire, or have we to go aobut guessing what the conditions are? What would you say of a son who is told that his father is ill and needs a physician, and who would think it necessary to go about the streets to ascertain from strangers if the report be true, instead of ascertaining the facts in his father's house? Have we not political institutions in this country in close touch with the political institutions of Great Britain; have we not the King's government in Canada as well as in the motherland, and can we not learn

directly what are the necessities of Britain without seeking haphazard to find them out second-hand? If there is need in England, why proclaim it from the housetops, when we can know it privately through the machinery of government, and if help is wanted Canada will give her help in the proper way and through the proper channels.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the hon. gentleman expect the English people to come to Canada as beggars for a contribution?

Mr. McKENZIE. If Canada is one of the family of British nations; if Canada is a substantial part of British territory, governed by His Majesty the King, and if the protection of the great empire requires a contribution from Canada, then, Sir, I would not regard it as an act of beggary that the motherland should ask our aid; when the hon. gentleman calls it beggary I resent such a term. I would not regard it as beggary; I would regard it as a duty on our part.

Mr. LENNOX. Or the payment of tribute.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not talking about tribute, and when I come to talk about tribute I can do so without any unseemly interruptions from hon. gentlemen who seem to be here for no other purpose than to interrupt members on this side when they are addressing the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I ask the hon. gentleman's permission to speak for a moment. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that during this debate I have not interrupted a single gentleman until I made the interjection just now, which I am very glad appears to have annoyed the hon. member very much.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the hon. gentleman —I forget the county he misrepresents— thinks it is his duty to let every one else go without interruption and to interrupt me, that does not help the situation very much. My experience with the hon. gentleman is that he was never in this House when I spoke but he interrupted me, and if he turns up 'Hansard' he can prove that this statement is correct.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a compliment to you.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not regard his interruption as anything at all. I do not regard his interruption as intellectual or otherwise, and if he chooses to indulge in interrupting me, and if he thinks that I am a person that he can with impunity interrupt it does not bother me at all. Well, Sir, as I was proceeding to say when interrupted, if the government of Great Britain needs any assistance from the Dominions beyond the seas we have a perfect right to expect that that necessity will be made known to us through the proper channels, and then it will be time for us to act. I am not aware that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Magrath) has said much more that I wish to criticise, but I would direct attention to the very striking difference between himself and his leaders on this question. He says there is no more need for a navy in Canada than for a man to wear a buffalo coat in Hades. The hon. gentleman has chosen to put it in that very forceful language, but I would remind him that there are some who describe Hades as an extremely cold place and possibly a buffalo coat may not be too much of a burden for the hon. gentleman to carry if he expects to travel in that direction. Now, as to the difference between the hon. gentleman (Mr. Magrath) and his leaders. Last year the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) brought down a resolution to this House—a resolution which was on the order paper for months, and which he had plenty of time to consider—setting forth that the time had come when the people of Canada should provide a navy for the protection of Canada and for Canada only. It may be said by him that what he meant was not only the protection of Canada, but the protection of every part of the empire.

If there was any lingering doubt on that point, he made it perfectly clear when, in speaking in this House on the tenth of this month, he said that he had nothing in his mind when he moved his resolution except the protection of Canada. The hon. leader of the opposition spoke on this subject a little over a year ago, and again a little over a month ago, and in one of his speeches he committed himself to every word uttered by the hon. member for North Toronto, saying that that hon. member had spoken by his authority, and with his approval. We have thus the hon. leader of the opposition approving of Canada having a navy, and for the protection of Canada alone. Therefore, when the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) says that there is no more necessity for this navy than there is for an inhabitant of Hades to have a buffalo coat, he is going very far from the leadership of these hon. gentlemen.

Other hon. gentlemen made some observations to which I wish to make some slight reference before coming to the main question which I wish to discuss. We were given a great treat of constitutional law a few evenings ago by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan). He put himself forward as a great constitutional lawyer, and gave us to understand that the passing of a Naval Bill in the shape of this Bill would be disrupting the empire and in direct violation of the Canadian constitution. In support of that contention, he offered an

argument which he thought put the whole thing in a nutshell, so that nothing more could be said about it. He had it completely proven by reading section 15 of the British North America Act, which says:

The command-in-chief of the land and naval militia, and of all land and naval forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

The hon. gentleman has very little knowledge of the force and effect of constitutional law and usage in this country if he thinks that the mere fact of these words being in the British North America Act gives any greater power to the King to control any public property in this country. For example, the highways of my province, as I presume in the province of Ontario, are vested in the King. Is anybody silly enough to say that the King could put fences across the public highways or streets and keep people from using them, because, forsooth, the title to them is in the King? The Crown lands in my province, as I presume in the province of Ontario, are vested in the King. So are the public lands in the Northwest. Does anybody say that that simple fact gives the King any right or control over them? They are simply vested in the King as the trustees of the people, subject to the control and management of the representatives of the people, acting through this House, through the provincial legislatures and through the various municipal bodies down to the minutest part of the machinery of government in this country. Is there any different law to apply to a navy? Because the military and naval militia are vested in the King, does that mean that the King can order these forces to war, and that they must automatically go wherever he may point? Nothing of the kind. The same principle of ownership applies as in the case of the Crown lands. If the hon. gentleman who, with such a flourish of trumpets, read this fifteenth section of the British North America Act, would just turn over a few pages and read section 91 of the same Act, he would come to a different conclusion, if he was capable of reaching any logical conclusion from any set of facts. That section says:

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated.

Mr. McKENZIE.

Then it gives twenty-nine different subsections, the seventh of which is 'militia, military and naval service and defence.' That section covers the subject before us at the present time, and is a straight and positive mandate from the parliament of Great Britain to deal with this very subject. I say again that this question of military and naval service is not a new one in this country, because if it were not a live question at the time of confederation, would we not find it provided for in this Act? That, as far as the law is concerned, ought to satisfy my hon. friend from Vancouver that there is no foundation for the objection he raised as to the constitutionality of this Bill. I might further give him the authority of the Privy Council for saying that the legislative power of this parliament is as great as that the parliament of Great Britain itself in regard to the different subjects given to us to legislate upon. That being the case, we are not restricted in any way in dealing with this subject or in providing for the control of this naval force, or deciding where it shall be used. There have been attempts to make little of the fact that the Militia Act is the same as the Naval Act, and to show that they were different and that while one was a good law and constitutional, the other was wrong. I submit that is good reasoning. If hon. gentlemen will turn to the Militia Act, they will see that section 4 of that Act is the same as section 4 of the Bill now before the House:

The command-in-chief of the militia is declared to continue and be vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty or by the Governor General as his representative.

That is word for word the same language as is used in the present Bill. Let me quote further from the Militia Act:

The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of an emergency.

That is exactly the same language as in the present Bill.

Mr. DANIEL. Does that require the matter to be brought before parliament?

Mr. McKENZIE. Certainly.

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia, or any part thereof, on active service, if parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of parliament within fifteen days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit and

act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

In time of war, when the militia is called out for active service to serve conjointly with His Majesty's regular forces, His Majesty may place in command thereof, a senior general officer of his regular army.

That is word for word the same language as we have in the Act now before the House.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McKENZIE. Immediately before adjournment at six o'clock, I was explaining the provisions of the Canadian Militia Act for the purpose of showing that there was no material difference—in fact, no difference at all—between these and the provisions of the Naval Act now before the House, in so far as these provisions have reference to the services to be rendered by the naval forces in support of the British empire, or to be put at the disposal of the British empire when an emergency should arise. The definition of 'emergency' is the same in this Act as in the Militia Act and the other sections, although not numbered the same, are alike in their provisions. Section 4 of the Naval Bill now under consideration, says:

The command-in-chief of the naval forces is vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty, or by the Governor General as His representative.

That is exactly the same as the Militia Act. Section 17 of this Bill says:

The Governor in Council may place the naval forces or any part thereof, on active service at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of an emergency.

And sections 18 and 19 are as follows:

18. In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

19. Whenever the Governor in Council places the naval service or any part thereof on active service, as provided in the preceding section, if parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall issue for a meeting of parliament within fifteen days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

These terms are identical with those of the Militia Bill; I can find no difference at all between them. If, for the last forty years, we have had a law on our statute book, in connection with our land forces and land protection, which was acceptable to both parties, acceptable to every man who lives in Canada. I do not understand why it should be considered an act of treason, an act of disruption of the connection between the mother country and Canada, or a violation of the constitution, to have the same thing, word for word, applied to the sea or coastal forces. Such an objection has no valid force, and, when examined, it will be perfectly clear to any person that it is used for a purpose, that it is not in the best interest of the country, and is not worthy the best thought of our people. If there is anything wrong about this law, would it not have been the duty of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) who, for thirty years has occupied a conspicuous place, and who is a very capable lawyer, and, of course, loyal to the core, to call attention to it, and propose a suitable amendment? The old Militia Act is a product of the Conservative administration and of Conservatives, as I take it, they were then as loyal as they are to-day. If it was so satisfactory to them in those days, and during the twenty or more years when they ran this country, I submit that a similar Act, having reference to the sea forces, should be just as satisfactory to them as this old law. I mention this in order to do away with the argument that is being strongly put forward by speakers on the opposition side, who endeavour to show that we are departing from the customs in vogue in this country and are legislating in a way that has a tendency to break the close ties that now exist between the mother country and outside.

I wish to make a few slight references to the observations made by some of the gentlemen who have already spoken on this question. First, I should say a few words concerning the speech of the hon. member for St. Anne division, Montreal (Mr. Doherty). That gentleman has dealt with the question very soberly, and in that judicious manner in which we would expect him to approach a question of this kind. In its last analysis, there is not a great deal in his speech. The hon. gentleman dealt particularly with two or three points. The first was that, before we do anything in this country towards the establishment of a sea force that will be intended in any manner to take part in empire wars, we must have our constitution so amended that we in this country shall have an equal voice with the mother country in deciding when war should be declared. That is the condition precedent that he lays down before we can do any-

thing at all in the direction of having a navy. If there is an emergency, or if there is a necessity for an early start in providing this navy, the condition precedent that the hon. gentleman lays down would preclude any action along this line. I submit, the day is not yet in sight—and I venture to say that few of us, perhaps, will live to see the day—when such machinery will be put in operation between the mother country and the colonies, or the dominions beyond the seas, as will put us on an equal footing with the mother country in international questions, and the declaration of war. I think that our proper course is to develop our own country and—to use a military term—to make Canada a complete unit within the empire, and to equip her for every duty she may have to discharge, as well as the Canadian people can bring that about. I submit that the condition that the hon. member for St. Anne lays down would make it impossible for us to do anything in this country. The next proposition which he makes—and he makes it with a view to pleasing some of the super-loyal friends of his party who sit behind him—is that we should give money to the empire.

But he does not put it upon a footing that would please his friends of the opposition. His friends of the opposition say we should come with gifts in our hands, we should come with sacrifices to the throne of the mother country and say: Here, if you have any doubt about our loyalty, if it is though that we in Canada are not in sympathy with your navy, in sympathy with your progress, in sympathy with your ideas of empire, here we are with $25,000,000 as a gift to prove to you beyond peradventure that we are loyal. That seems to have been the doctrine put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite. If that is their doctrine, the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) does not agree with it at all, he puts it on an entirely different footing, upon a commercial footing, absolutely commercial and selfish. He says: If we are in partnership with this big concern on the other side, and if we are satisfied that it will fail, it will drag us down with it. That is the argument he used: if the empire is going to pieces we will be dragged down with it, and entirely apart from the question of sentiment or loyalty it is a question of business with us to give the money, to lend that big concern money to keep it afloat. We will give them a letter of credit, that is his language, to the extent of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000, and we will give it with the distinct understanding that it is not to be used, the money is not to be used at all.

Mr. DANIEL. Did he say that?

Mr. McKENZIE. With the strong pro-

bability, that is his language, that the money is not to be used. That is what the hon. gentleman said, it is on 'Hansard.' I know too much about my duty to the gentleman who has preceded me to say anything but exactly what bears the construction that can fairly and reasonably be put on the language he used. That is the proposition, you cannot give anything until you have an equal voice in the disposition of matters in the old land, you cannot do anything at all, and if you want to do anything now it is a commercial transaction, you can promise this money and the probabilities are that you will not have to use it at all. That is the position which was taken by the hon. member from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty). But although a great deal of time was taken in giving us the very able speech of that hon. gentleman, he did one thing for which he will always have my gratitude and for which he should have the gratitude of every hon. gentleman in this House who wishes for the best to happen this country and who wishes for the true welfare of Canada, he rebuked his colleagues in this House for the trend that they have followed in connection with the so called disloyalty of the French Canadians. I was delighted that the rebuke came from the source it did, from a member of the Conservative party, whose loyalty to that party could not be questioned, and from a gentleman living in the province of Quebec who could speak with authority on that point, and I have been delighted to find that the speeches made since he gave them that wholesome rebuke have been largely purged from this unwholesome element that was found in all the speeches from the hustings and in the House by the opposition members before the rebuke was administered. I believe that if the hon. gentleman from St. Anne never did anything else in this House that would be of note, except that he has given that well deserved rebuke to his colleagues in this House and has put an end to this very undesirable if not reprehensible conduct on the part of those who want to make political capital in their own counties and provinces against the people of Quebec, by continually insinuating that they are not a loyal people, he would deserve our thanks. Nothing could be more calculated to injure this country in its every interest than to have it go abroad from this parliament that if not one half at least a large third of the population of this country was not loyal to the Crown and to the institutions of this country. It is useless to think that we can assimilate large populations coming into this country and gain their sympathy for British institutions, British government and British laws, when the leaders of the Conservative party in this House and from the hustings proclaim to

the newcomer that a certain class of citizens who have been living under our institutions for 150 years, are still disloyal and not true to British institutions and the British Crown. If that is to go abroad in this country and to be believed by the foreigner from Europe and other places, it must have an unwholesome effect in relation to the assimilating to our institutions of the people who are coming into Canada. I submit that there ought to be enough patriotism, enough loyalty in the members of the opposition, even if they believe it is going to bring them to power, to prevent them resorting to such tactics. The remedy is too drastic to be applied in this country. I thank fortune that in the province from which I come such a thing is never heard as accusing any citizen of disloyalty. We have Acadians, French Canadians in Nova Scotia, but nobody ever dares to think of using such language in reference to them. The same thing applies to New Brunswick. I never heard of it in Prince Edward Island. Such a thing is never mentioned in Quebec, and I believe that when you pass the boundary between Ontario and Manitoba the disease stops, such language is used in the west. Am I to be told, am I forced to believe by this geographical elimination, that the great premier province of Ontario is to be fed on such food as this stuff meted out to us in this House, about the disloyalty of people in this country? In other matters Ontario has a right to claim leadership in its wealth, population, education, and very many other excellencies. Is it to be said that that province shall be the last to drop this pernicious system of attributing disloyalty to citizens of Canada? I repeat to the credit of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) that if he never did anything else in his life except the meting out of this rebuke to his colleagues and supporters in this House, he has not lived in vain.

We are told by hon. gentlemen that nothing should be done until we appeal to the country, we should go with this proposition to the Canadian people and should get their verdict upon this new departure of a navy. I submit that the doctrine laid down by the representatives of this country in England in 1902 were well known in every part of Canada from that year down to the present. They were well known by every leader of either party from the time they were laid down in the conference. I will not say, for it would not be right for me to say, that the leader of the opposition did not know in 1902, in 1903 or in 1904 what those principles were or what Canada intended to do with regard to the establishment of a navy or extending aid to the empire to which we belong. That policy was well known. If it was not satisfactory to him or the party which he leads, did he not have an excellent opportunity in 1904 of submitting this question to the people? The leader of the opposition is not a novice at making platforms. He could very well have adjusted his platform and have put a plank in it in 1904 representing this very question, declaring that the principles and rules laid down by the representatives of Canada at the conference in 1902 were not satisfactory, and that therefore the people should pronounce upon them and vote against the Canadian government. I repeat that the hon. gentleman is not a novice at making platforms, and he makes his platforms always on the extension table principle, so that he can put this in and take that out as it suits him and suits the company in which he speaks. Therefore, what was to prevent hon. gentlemen opposite, if they thought we were not doing right in connection with the preparation for the navy in 1902, from submitting the question to the people? The argument in use about 1902 can also be used about 1907, for it is perhaps a strange coincidence that in 1908 we had another general election. The hon. gentleman and his party had the experience of 1902 and 1907 as to what the intentions were. In 1908 there was a general election, when there was an excellent opportunity of putting that policy before the people and getting a pronouncement upon it. I submit to you that if they did not submit that question to the country in 1904, and if they did not submit it in 1908, they had really no desire of submitting it to the country at all, and were perfectly satisfied with the steps taken by the government and the platform and principles laid down by the representatives of this country at both conferences.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend say that it was a leading plank and the policy of the government of which he is a prominent supporter, in either the general election of 1904 or 1908?

Mr. McKENZIE. I did not say, Sir, that it was a platform at all. I say that it was the well understood policy of this government, as represented and as disclosed to the world by the representatives of this government who were present at the conference in 1902. From that day down to the present the policy of the government was well known and there was no need to make a platform about it. It was an understood matter and the hon. gentleman opposite did not make an issue of it. When the hon. gentlemen who were leading the opposition party in the country will not raise an issue, the strongest and the only logical conclusion to be drawn is that the principles disclosed and the line of action laid down by the government are satisfactory to them. That is the contention which

I make here, and that I think is the only logical conclusion to be drawn. If to-day hon. gentleman opposite think that it is necessary to submit this question to the people as to whether there should be a navy at all, or, if a navy, what should be the size of it and that sort of thing, the proposition of the navy, its size, and all that have been before the people, there has been knowledge of the question since 1902, if it is a proper thing to submit to the people to-day it was a proper thing at either or both these elections, and if they did not think it proper to take advantage of the opportunity, I submit that they are not sincere to-day when they are asking to make of this an issue to go to the people with. We had this question very well threshed out less than a year ago. The hon. member for North Toronto placed the first resolution upon the order paper the very first day of the sitting. From the little knowledge I have of that hon. gentleman, obtained since I have occupied a seat in this House, I venture to say that the bringing down of that resolution was not the first thing he did in connection with it. I submit that he gave it careful thought, that he looked at it from every standpoint, considered it carefully and possibly wrote a great many resolutions before he found one that suited him. The resolution with which he came down to the House remained on the order paper for seventy days or thereabouts, and it was well considered by every hon. gentleman on both sides of the House, I presume. When the time came to discuss it, he discussed it fully and pointed out clearly and unequivocally that his intention was to make a start in the direction of having a Canadian navy for the protection of our own people and for no other purpose. The leader of the opposition agreed with him that that was the thing to do. The right hon. leader of the government stated clearly and distinctly that neither he nor his party, was going to depart in the slightest degree from the lines laid down in 1902 and 1907, and that he would not be stampeded by any false cry that might be abroad in the country. After hearing that clearly and distinctly laid down, the hon. leader of the opposition said: I fully and emphatically agree with the position taken by the leader of the government. That is the position that he took then. The leader of the government said: We cannot afford to lose any of the privileges which we have to-day as a country. We must have the same control over our own affairs that we have now, and we cannot and will not have any less. The leader of the opposition agreed with him and said: We have well earned every privilege that we have in this country. They are not favours, they are rights, and the government cannot go as far as, or any farther, than I will go, in fully sustaining and upholding every privilege and every bit of the autonomy that we have in this country. These are the statements made by the leader of the opposition in his speech of the 29th March last. His words are to be found in 'Hansard,' and if it is to-day a dangerous thing to retain the powers which we have in the Militia Act, if it is to-day a dangerous thing and tends to disrupt the happy relations between the empire and this country, were the dangers less a year ago? If there was any difficulty at that time the leader of the opposition, if he was sincere then, or if he is sincere now, should have stood up and said: These conditions must not continue; everything should be left entirely at the disposal of the British Crown, and we will not now undertake to exercise control. But that was not his position nor the position of his party. They were unanimous in support of sustaining the conditions which we have now and which we have had for the last forty years. We have heard no reasons for such a right about face on the part of the leader of the opposition and his friends in connection with this matter. There is not a reason to-day that was not in existence a year ago. Whatever discussion took place in the English House of Commons about the German scare, so-called, took place ten or twelve days before the resolution was brought down. I think it was on the 20th or 22nd March that Premier Asquith made his speech on the subject in which he made reference to the necessity of further provision for the navy in Great Britain and I think he made some observations from which it could be gathered that there was some difficulty in that country. That period has passed, explanations have been given, and the excitement had subsided before the leader of the opposition and his followers made their speeches. We are now told by the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto that we must all of a sudden have a tremendous navy that would be able on the first day of its appearance on the water, to cope with any of the great navies of the world. That is an extraordinary position to take, and it is very different from the position taken by them less than a year ago.

Mr. DANIEL. Did the leader of the opposition ever make such a statement as the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) has attributed to him. If so, when and where?

Mr. McKENZIE. I did not attribute that to the leader of the opposition. If the hon. member (Mr. Daniel), wants to know who made that statement, I may tell him it was the member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath). My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel), may rest satisfied that

I do not belong to the class or tribe that misquotes people. If he has anything else to do he can rest content that he has nothing to watch in me, because my training and experience in life has been along other lines, and I have made my living in situations where it would be little benefit for me to misquote, because I would be brought to time very soon for it. On the other hand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) belongs to the medical profession and he may be able to hide his mistakes under the ground, but those in my profession cannot do that.

Mr. DANIEL. That is a very old chestnut.

Mr. McKENZIE. Not much older than the hon. member. To say that we must not have a navy until we have a great big one is like the old lady who told her grandson that he must not go near the water until he learned to swim. If my hon. friend will follow the speeches of the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), he will see that that hon. gentleman said last year, that, the proper thing for us to do is to have a navy of our own, that the matter of a contribution was out of the question, that it had been a failure wherever tried, and that we should make a small beginning in our navy. But less than a year after the hon. member (Mr. Foster) advised the House in that direction, the House would hardly believe such a change has been wrought in his views. I submit that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) advised the House that the proper thing to do was to make a small beginning with a navy of our own and develop it as every other enterprise in this country had developed, he was stating the wise course for us to pursue, and when he departed from that advice he departed from the path of wisdom, and is not taking himself seriously. If there was any necessity for further proof that such was the idea in his head a year ago, it is to be found in abundance in his speech where he told us: To sow the seed in the soil, to start something to which we could look with pride and which we could develop, to start something that would train up our young men so that they would take pride in the defence of the empire, and not to leave to other people to do that which we could do best ourselves. We have heard it said that in Canada we have not the capacity nor the means, or the experience to build a navy. But, would not the same argument be applicable in the initiation of some of the greater enterprises, which have obtained such an enormous growth in Canada. We have no canal in existence for instance at all comparable to what the Georgian Bay canal will be, and yet I am satisfied that we have talent and industry and ability in Canada sufficient to successfully complete the Georgian Bay canal. When the Canadian Pacific railway was started there was nothing in this country in any way commensurate to the vastness of such an enterprise, and yet the Canadian Pacific railway grew and the country grew wih it, and the Canadian management of that railway is capable of giving the best service in the world. All this goes to show the immensity of the capabilities of the people of Canada when the occasion demands. I submit too that the history of the maritime provinces justifies us in believing that the shipbuilding industry can be developed there just as well as in any country in the world. Sixty years ago we had in Cape Breton and other parts of Nova Scotia men who went to the woods and cut the timber, brought it back and built the vessel, rigged that vessel, found cargo and passengers for her, and then took command and sailed her in two oceans to New Zealand and Australia. Such men we had by the score in the maritime provinces and we have their descendants there today, competent to utilize all modern appliances for the construction of ships equal to any that sail the ocean. I have no fear but that there will be found in Canada men competent to build a navy, to man it, and to command it. I read in the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe that in one of the ports on the great lakes they have a ship building plant capable of turning out vessels 500 feet long and of 7,000 horse-power. If that can be done in one part of Canada, why cannot it be done in another. I am glad to see that there is a thriving ship building industry on the great lakes, and I have not the slightest doubt in my mind, but that the industry can be pursued in the coastal harbours of the maritime provinces and of British Columbia, with just as much success as in any other part of the globe.

The hon. gentleman from Simcoe pointed out that we have at Sydney harbour, in readiness for the building of steel ships, one of the finest plants in the world, fully equipped and ready to produce the necessary material. The premier of Australia, in the speech he made at the conference of 1907, pointed out to the Lords of the Admiralty that the coastal service in Australia would be of great efficiency and usefulness to the home government in getting ready the supplies that may be necessary for the fleets of that station—that it would protect the coal and other supplies that might be necessary, and furnish men if men were required. All this is true with reference to British Columbia and Nova Scotia, where we have coal in abundance, and I would suggest to the government that the very first duty of government is to put the security of

these magnificent coal supplies beyond peradventure. It ought to be made impossible for any foreign ship or squadron to take possession of our coal supplies. I do not know how it is in British Columbia, but in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton the coal fields are on the coast within gunshot of any vessel that might come near; and for that reason it is entirely necessary, if this country is to maintain full control of her coal supplies in the eastern part of Canada, that the protection usual in cases of that kind should be put up. It may be said that we have not a sufficiency of these things to launch upon so great an enterprise as the building of a navy. Let me tell you that the largest coal seams and possibly the largest coal fields in the world are in the province of Nova Scotia. If you ask me where the largest coal mine in the world is situated, I tell you in the province of Nova Scotia and in the island of Cape Breton. If you ask me where are the largest iron and steel plants, which would be a basic necessity for the building of this navy, I tell you that one of the largest in the world is to be found in the province of Nova Scotia and in the island of Cape Breton. We have also the people who are equal to any emergency, and who will educate themselves for any conditions that may arise. Our steel works in the Island of Cape Breton are not more than seven or eight years old, and 4,000 or 5,000 people are necessary for the working of those plants, largely experts, skilled labour. You ask me where we get them. We get them in the island of Cape Breton and in the province of Nova Scotia. Our own people, with very few exceptions, have in that short time educated themselves to do whatever is necessary in connection with these plants. The same thing can be said about the handling of our coal mines. The engineers, the underground managers, and all the managers to be found about these works are our own people. There is not in the world any people who will more quickly and readily come up to any of these requirements than the people of Cape Breton. The building of this navy is but another step in the opening up of new avenues for the development of the dormant powers of many of our people. It gives an opportunity to the poor man as well as to the rich man to gain for himself a position. Under the conditions that will prevail in our navy the poor man's son will have an opportunity to make a name for himself as well as the son of the rich man. That being the case, if it was for nothing but the chances it is going to give to our people to develop themselves along these lines, the starting of this navy would be justified. It was less than a year ago that this House unanimously decided that the building of a navy by our own people with our own money was the proper course for us to take. Nothing has happened since to change in any way the conclusion we reached on that occasion. And why should there be a turnabout of this kind? Possibly the explanation is given by the 'Canadian Courier', a paper which I believe is independent in politics, but is edited by a strong friend of the leader of the opposition and of his party. That paper says of the opposition:

> The situation is absolutely senseless. Their attitude betokens either a sad loss of reason and judgment, or else a weak-minded resort to a dangerous political expedient. So far as Mr. Borden is personally concerned, we believe that he is too well informed and has too much 'horse sense' to justify the resolution on any other ground than political necessity. However, definiteness and unity cannot be expected from a party which is so sadly divided on a question as the Conservatives are on the proper policy for Canada to pursue in naval matters.

That is the position which this independent journal takes, a position with which I entirely agree; and if the hon. member for Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty) had made his speech last year and had declared to his colleagues in this House that this cry of disloyalty had to be eliminated from the utterances of the leaders of the Conservative party, and from the rank and file of that party, I believe we would not have the break that we have at the present time. One of the reasons is that those who won their elections on the cry of disloyalty raised against the Prime Minister and his supporters in the province of Quebec, would find themselves in a very awkward predicament if they should accept his policy on the naval question. They could not very well then go among their own people and raise the cry of disloyalty against the province of Quebec.

Mr. OWENS. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question? Does he think it right to lay at the door of all the members from this side of the province of Ontario the statement that the followers of the government who come from Quebec are disloyal, simply because one or two have made it?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, and I am only judging those who have made the statement.

Mr. OWENS. The hon. gentleman should name them.

Mr. McKENZIE. I can assure my hon. friend that I did not have him in mind at all, and entirely acquit him from any imputation of the kind; but if he will read the rank party press of Ontario and follow

those who undertook to speak for his party in Ontario, he will find that the affirmation I make is only too well founded. I am a Scotchman, and a Nova Scotian, and a loyalist from away back, as far as there is anything to be spoken of, and for that reason I have no love or standing for any such thing in this country as charging my fellow countrymen with being less loyal than myself. I regard such a charge as most pernicious, and in that connection I cannot do better than quote the language of so distinguished a Conservative as the late Mr. Chapleau, who said in this House that the man who starts the cry of disloyalty and racial and religious prejudices is a traitor to his country and his God. That was the language of so distinguished a Canadian as Mr. Chapleau, and I am sure that there is not a man on the opposition benches who thinks himself a bigger Conservative that was that distinguished gentleman, and that was his measure of the contemptible line of action which we find followed to-day in the interests of the opposition. I repeat that if the Conservative party were purged of that element, if no cry of race or religion were raised in one part or another, the leader of the opposition would have stood manfully to the position he took less than a year ago, which he reaffirmed in England and which he afterwards repeated in his own constitutency of Halifax and the city of Toronto. I for one thought that he would have stood by it, I thought he had the backbone to do so, but others said, no. Wait, they said, until the psycological moment arrives and you will find that the barnacles will drive him as they please, just as they did before. Events have since proven that those who thus predicted knew the leader of the opposition better than I did. A year ago that hon. gentleman was perfectly satisfied with the course followed by the government. He had heard that policy declared clearly and distinctly by the Prime Minister, there was nothing hidden, he knew it all, and he agreed with every word of it. I do not regard the decision of this House as a trifling matter, even a majority decision. But when the high court of parliament deliberately, after all the facts are before it, comes to a unanimous conclusion, I cannot look upon the breaking of that compact or the reversing of that decision as at all a light matter. Why should we reverse to-day the position then taken? No new principles of law have since come into existence nor have any new facts, nor has any new light appeared. If there were any reasons in subsequent events to justify the decision we took a year ago, one would understand this change of front. But nothing has occurred since to alter the position. There has been no change of facts or law, we are exactly in the same position, and I ask hon. gentlemen on the opposition benches where they would find themselves now if they had to go back to their constituents and explain this sudden change of opinion and doctrine on their part in less than a year. I submit that the only explanation of that thing is party expediency as stated by the 'Courier,' which I quoted a moment ago.

Mr. BLAIN. Would my hon. friend permit me to say that the Conservative party last session were in favour of giving Dreadnoughts.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not recollect that there is anything in the resolution to that effect.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not say there was anything in the resolution, but that the Conservative party had declared in this House that they were in favour of giving Dreadnoughts in the emergency now before the country. If my hon. friend wishes, I will quote the language of the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. McKENZIE. I remember well that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) at the very end of his speech, in a very milk and water way, said that if there should be an emergency he would agree to provide for it, and that he was sure hon. gentlemen on this side would stand by him in that proposition. But the hon. the leader of the opposition did not say anything at all about it, except that there should be a door left in the resolution which would enable us, if an emergency should arise, to come to the rescue of the mother country. Language to that effect is in the resolution which could be construed to give us the right to make that provision should an emergency arise.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie). He is very gentlemanly in the debate. But would he permit me to place on 'Hansard' the statement by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with the concurrence of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden)?

Mr. McKENZIE. I had intended to put a number of the pages of those speeches on record, but time will not permit. I have no objection to my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) reading what he proposes.

Mr. BLAIN. It is just a word or two. In the speech delivered on January 12 this session——

Mr. McKENZIE. I was talking about March 29 last.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes:

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said in that debate with my concur-

rence: 'Let me say to my right hon. friend that, if after careful consideration, he proposes to this parliament a means for meeting that emergency adequately, now and as it should be, whether it be by the gift of Dreadnoughts or the gift of money of this country, this side of the House will stand beside him and stand for Canada in supporting that measure.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) think, or does any hon. member on the opposition side think, that the opposition are more desirous of maintaining the British empire in its integrity and full power and prestige than are the supporters of the government? Does he think that we would hold, any less than they, that any check that might be given to the indisputable power and prestige of the empire as it stands to-day would be a blow to us? Do they think that we are indifferent to the position occupied by the mother country? If that is their opinion, the sooner they dispel it the better. When an emergency arises in this country—as, for instance, in the South African war—do you find any nationality, or any creed not rushing to their rescue, or doing what we can to maintain the integrity of the empire? I am glad to say there is no such thing. Grit and Tory join hands in maintaining the integrity of the empire so far as that could be done by the Canadian people. The suspicion that there is less desire and anxiety amongst Liberals than amongst Conservatives to maintain the empire is a fallacy and a mistake without the slightest foundation, or fact, or even in appearance. I have said already and I say it again—and I think I say it on the basis of constitutional usage—that we have government machinery in this country, and in the motherland under which the looking after of the defence of the empire is a matter in the hands of the government of the old land, and looking after any thing that would be done in co-ordination and unison with the home government towards the protection of the empire at large is a matter for the government of this country. And I say that if confidence does not exist today between the home government and this government by which the interests of the country can be properly communicated from one government to another, that is as it should not be, and the sooner we are put in a position to know exactly what is necessary for us to do in case of an emergency the better. We have a High Commissioner in London, a highly honoured gentleman, a man in whom the whole country has confidence. He is right in touch with the English government, with English officialdom. It would not be difficult for him to communicate with the Governor General of Canada what the Canadian people should do. We should then have it in an official way and could do what was necessary to be done. I submit that the wishes, the interests, the policy of the mother country in regard to anything that requires the money of the people of Canada is not to be conveyed to us by stool-pigeons, or something that might carry a letter, or a newspaper in its mouth. That is not the sort of relationship that must exist between this country, and the mother country. And, until we are properly informed, and it is put beyond peradventure what the conditions and necessities are I, for one, would not speculate on what money we should put at the disposal of the mother country. That money is not wanted. They have abundance of money. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. T. Chisholm) said it was rather absurd for us to have to go to the mother country to borrow money and then give it back. But that is the position. If we are to get money we have to go where the money is, then either bring it here and send it over, or pass it over when we have borrowed it. Do hon. gentlemen think that the credit of Canada is better than that of England? Can we borrow cheaper than England can? Nobody would say we could. They have abundance of money and the facilities to build these Dreadnoughts. Our money is not necessary, except to convince any unfriendly power that we are behind the mother country in case of an emergency. I should say that pointing to our record when necessity arose would be the best way of doing that. If Germany is the great enemy in this emergency, Germany knows all about us in the South African war. It does not need twenty-five millions of money, or any other sum to convince any power in Europe that Canada, Australia, Newfoundland, and the other dominions beyond the seas are behind the mother country in case of an emergency. I submit that the position we have taken from the beginning is the proper position, and, for my part, I am prepared to stand to it.

I have heard with a good deal of regret in this discussion assaults, more or less trenchant, made upon the leader of the government along the line of accusing him of not being the right stamp of Canadian, not being, perhaps, what he ought to be in many respects. I have here a clipping from the Montreal 'Witness', an independent paper, a paper that is very much respected in this country, a paper whose views on matters of public policy are not questioned. I wish, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to read the independent view of this paper of the much honoured Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and of the standing of the country in several regards. I read it the more readily, because it deals with the growth of this country and, in showing its growth, shows the justification for starting upon this new enterprise upon which we are about to enter. It says:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been continuously in harness as Prime Minister of this country for the past fourteen years.

During the whole of that period, and for a number of years before it, his labours have been incessant and all on the heroic scale, a few months of which is enough for most men.

His vacations have been in homœopathic doses, unless we count among them those progresses abroad which have made such strenuous demands upon his powers as few men could cope with.

During all that time he has kept up his reading, has kept in touch with the world of events, and has maintained a general correspondence with all and sundry.

For a man who in his first prime was accounted unusually delicate, this is a surprising record. He used the recent Ash Wednesday holiday, not for rest, but to look after things in Montreal.

Some who then saw him remarked on his placid, untired, unwrinkled, unruffled appearance, as though of a man who, although he had many a thought, had never a care.

To all, the fact that he has had even momentarily to withdraw from the active guidance of affairs will be great matter of concern, for there is no element in the country that does not respect him, and few who do not honour him. His record as a ruler of the country has been a marvellous one.

Under him Canada has made amazing strides in material prosperity and political importance.

The population has increased from under 5,000,000 to 7,500,000, or 50 per cent; the total overseas trade has increased from about $240,000,000 to $650,000,000, or more than 2½ times; the bank notes in circulation have increased from about $30,000,000 to $70,000,000 odd, or more than double; the total deposits of the people in the banks have increased from $193,000,000 odd to $711,000,000 odd, or between three and four times; two new flourishing provinces have been added to the older ones; industries have sprung up on all sides, and some of them are now of international importance; river channels and canals have been deepened and widened and harbours fitted for the exigencies of modern commerce; public utilities have reached a high state of efficiency in the cities, and thousands of miles of railway have been built or are projected all over the country.

All this has happened during the Laurier regime.

Sir Wilfrid's continuous reign as Prime Minister has only twice been equalled in British annals—in the case of Walpole and the younger Pitt, though the thirteen years of Sir John Macdonald's last reign follows close upon it.

Gladstone was Prime Minister of England four times, but his longest term of office was but six years and altogether he was Prime Minister only about twelve years, as compared with Sir Wilfrid's fourteen years, which we hope may extend indefinitely into future years.

No one can deny that Sir Wilfrid's regime has been wonderful and glorious; and it will surely be remembered with goodwill and thankfulness so long as the history of Canada and the British empire endures.

It has not been all sunshine—there have been clouds; it has not been all success—there have been failures; it has not been all applause—there has been disapprobation from the patriotic as well as from the paid claqueurs.

But, taking it for all in all, the period has been 'an age of gold.' Canada has had the good fortune to have her destinies presided over by a great man.

That, Sir, is an impartial verdict reached by what I understand to be an impartial paper. When we think of that career and when we know that this is a digest of public opinion if truly expressed in this country, and when, on the other hand, we think of the parties who in this House and out of it, undertake to make political capital by attacking the premier, we cannot help but think of the oft-repeated metaphor of the boy with the squirt gun storming Gibraltar. The one is just as likely to have success as the other. I would say to my Conservative friends—that there are two things to which they might as well make up their minds. The first is, that if any gentleman on the opposite side wants to make a reputation for himself in this House he should do it by some other means than attacking the Prime Minister. Another thing is that if they expect to strike a policy which will bring them into power that policy will not be the abuse of the Premier of Canada. For my own province, the greatest thing we have on which to appeal to the electors is the pure, lofty name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and I hope we will have it for many years to come. I am sure that the same thing is true in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and every part of the maritime provinces, and the results for the last thirty years in a great many elections all over the country show that there is that same confidence, with few exceptions, throughout every province in the Dominion. I am satisfied that we are making the proper step in the right direction in starting this navy, in the hope and belief that our finances will enable us from time to time to enlarge it until at last it will be a navy of which we may all be proud, equal to the navy of the United States or any other navy with which we have a right to compare it. That being the case, I hope that this is but to be another step under the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the development of this country, and as we have developed our railways and canals, as we have developed our immigration system, as we have developed the proper administration of our laws and everything else that comes in the scope and influence of this government, so will we also bring to maturity and success the development of this important project of which we are now entering.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). Mr. Speaker, the intense importance of this Bill and the effect which it may have on the future history of Canada, and of the great empire of which we form a part, justify me in speaking on this question even at this late stage of the debate. Personally I feel a very deep interest in anything which has relation to naval defence. The constituency which I represent is on the Atlantic sea-board, and in the event of a naval combat between Great Britain and any country which has accumulated seapower enough to attack her supremacy on the seas, if unfortunately that other navy should be successful, the constituency I represent would probably be the first to feel the fatal effects.

As far as I am concerned, I am deeply interested in this, not only as a citizen and a British subject, but especially as representing a constituency down by the sea. Now, Sir, I intend to make my remarks brief and as much to the point as I can, and before coming to them I feel myself bound to reply to some few observations of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McKenzie). In the first place, he spoke about there being no necessity for sending this very important proposal back to the people. He said that we were here elected by the people to represent them and to decide on these questions. Under ordinary circumstances I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, but what do we find in this case? This is the most important matter that we have ever had to deal with in this parliament, and the people have never had an opportunity of giving any expression of their views upon it. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat knows as well as any member of this House that this question has never been proposed to the people in any shape or form, and how he can intimate that such has been the case is something I do not understand. We have never had a proposal about a navy for this country until this very session, and it is the proposal that we are now discussing. How any hon. member can say that the people have had an opportunity of discussing and deciding this question is more than I can understand. He also made a reference to the fact that leading members on this side of the House have hitherto confined their wishes and desires to a navy for the purpose simply of defending our own shores. He quoted my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) as stating that my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had made a statement when the resolution was passed in 1909 which had met with his concurrence. He intimated that the statements that were then made by the hon. member for North Toronto were devoted to the advocacy of a fleet simply for local defence. I had always thought that the hon. gentleman was one who prided himself on being a gentleman who did not misquote or misrepresent the language of another. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read what the leader of the opposition said, and I will give the quotation that he made from the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto. The leader of the opposition said:

One of the criticisms which has been made upon the resolution is this: That parliament did not then proffer to the empire in the hour of peril anything more than an expression of a desire to co-operate and an intention to perform. Well, Sir, so far as we on this side of the House are concerned that is not our fault. My hon. friend from North Toronto said, in that debate, with my concurrence:

To-day peril stands at the gateway. It is not for me to say how great it is, but I cannot brush it aside. To-day it impresses itself upon the greatest statesmen of the old country; to-day it appeals to Australia until public subscriptions are taken, and the government is being importuned to do even more than its settled policy to meet the emergency; to-day little New Zealand gives one Dreadnought and offers a second, and to-day Canada faces that position of peril and emergency. Let me say to my right hon. friend, that if after careful consideration he proposes to this parliament a means for meeting that emergency adequately, now and as it should be, whether it be by the gift of Dreadnoughts or the gift of money of this country, this side of the House will stand beside him, and stand for Canada in supporting that measure.

I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House, whether the hon. member for Cape Breton, in making the statement he did, quoted the hon. member for North Toronto and the leader of the opposition correctly. The hon. member also spoke to the effect that we had never been asked to assist the mother country in this emergency. That they did not come over and ask us to give them some money, that they should have sent a request for funds through the regular channels or in some other way. I would like to know in what way the hon. member would expect the statesmen of the mother country to intimate to this country that they would be glad of assistance in the emergency that is now before the whole British empire. I should imagine that a gentleman of his standing in the legal profession, one who has occupied a seat on the bench, if he wished to give a judicial statement in regard to the matter, would have studied the question to some extent so as to satisfy himself that the remarks he was going to make were actually based on fact. I am sorry to make these quotations because they have all been placed on record before, but the statements of the hon. gentleman make it absolutely necessary. Lord Tweedmouth's statements have been already quoted, and I suppose that even the member for Cape Breton will allow that

Lord Tweedmouth was in a position to speak for England because he was at the conference of 1907. Speaking to the representatives of the empire at one of these notable conventions, he said:

To the representatives of the empire——

Those from Canada included.

—we ask you to take some leading part in making the national defence of the empire more complete. We thank you and recognize the free, unstinted help already given. One reservation we make, and one only, that we hold the command of the naval forces for the defence of the empire for which we are responsible. Unity of action, unity of command. We want you to give us all the assistance you can.

Is that not plain? Is that not distinct? I wonder if the hon. member for Cape Breton wants anything more than the language to which I have just alluded that the mother country would be glad of our assistance in this great emergency?

We want you to give us all the assistance you can, but we do not come to you as beggars. Whether you help or not we are still to protect the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

The people of England are not beggars. They will defend themselves and they will defend this whole empire until the last shilling or the last man is used up in the fray rather than go on their knees to Canada or any other part of this empire and ask them any more plainly or openly for funds than they have already done. Then there is Lord Rosebery. He also made some remarks, I think at the press conference, and I quote the following:

When I see one country alone asking for 25 millions of extra taxation for warlike preparations; when I see the unprecedented sacrifices which are asked from us on the same grounds, I do begin to feel uneasy as to the outcome of it all, and to wonder where it will stop. . . . Gentlemen, we can and we will build 'Dreadnoughts' or whatever the newest type of ship may be as long as we have a shilling to spend on them or a man to put into them. All that we can and will do, but I am not sure that even that will be enough, and I think it may be your duty to take back to your young dominions across the seas this message and this impression: that some personal duty and responsibility for national defence rests on every man and citizen of the empire. Yes, gentlemen, take that message back with you. Tell your peoples — if they can believe it — the deplorable way in which Europe is relapsing into militarism and the pressure that is put upon this little England, to defend itself, its liberties—and yours! But take this message also back with you—that the old country is right at heart; that there is no failing or weakness in her; and that she rejoices in renewing her youth in her giant dominions beyond the seas. For her own salvation, she must look to herself, and that failing her she must look to you.

Surely, in view of these two quotations from eminent statesmen holding responsible positions in Great Britain, surely the position of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) is untenable when he says there is no need for a contribution from Canada or any other part of the empire to aid the motherland in this emergency. The hon. gentleman tells us he does not believe there is an emergency, but the answer to that is that there are none so blind as those who do not wish to see. He reminds me of that story in sacred writ where some Hebrews from a distant part of Judea came to the Saviour and stated that they wanted a sign; the Master told them they had Moses and the prophets, and if they would not hear them, they would not believe even though one rose from the dead. I take it that no matter what evidence is submitted to my hon. friend he would not believe even though one rose from the dead. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that the British North America Act places the control of the naval and military forces in His Majesty, and I would point out that if the British North America Act is in force, then clause 18 of the Bill is of no effect, and it being of no effect, why insert it? The very fact that clause 18 is in the Bill determines me to vote against it even though I should be in favour of some of its other features. Clause 18 says:

In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service or any part thereof.

That seems inconsistent, for if under the British North America Act His Majesty has command of these forces, why should the Governor in Council be in a position to place them at his service or not just as they think fit. The inference is, of course, that if the government did not wish to place the naval force at the disposal of His Majesty they need not do so. If clause 18 does not mean that, it has no effect at all, and that being so, I object to it. To my mind that clause gives the Governor in Council a chance to declare the independence of Canada whenever it should think that it was a fit and proper time to do so. I say, Sir, that this parliament has no mandate from the people of Canada to go to any such length as that, and whether this Bill is submitted to them for their judgment or not, they certainly must have a final say on such a momentous question. Such a radical change as that in the constitution of the country, this parliament, I submit, has no power to bring about without the consent of the people. That is the great reason why I shall vote against this Bill. The hon. gentleman from Cape Breton admitted that the British North America Act

is in force, and as that gives the command of these forces to His Majesty, what is the good of clause 18 of this Bill at all? To my mind it gives the Governor in Council the power of making an Act of separation for this country. If the Governor in Council should choose to allow this navy to take part in the wars of the empire; if they wish the navy to be put under the command of His Majesty, then they are to call parliament together, but if they think that the navy under no circumstances should be placed under the command of His Majesty, then parliament is not even called together. Parliament is to have no say in such a contingency; it is entirely a matter for the Governor in Council. And, as the member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) said: It was not the King's navy, or the Canadian navy, but the Governor in Council's navy. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) stated that the members of the opposition have changed their mind since the resolution was passed by the House last year, but I may tell him that it is because the proposals of the government, as contained in this Bill, do not carry out the terms of the resolution that we object to it. Here is what the resolution says:

> This House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy along the line suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire, and the peace of the world.

That resolution recognizes our imperial responsibility, and it provides that any aid we may give for imperial purposes should not be simply a little local defence flotilla that we are going to keep under our own care and prevent from taking part, under the command of His Majesty, in the general defence of the empire. The proposal in the Bill is a complete negation of the resolution that was passed unanimously by the House last year. We have good reason indeed to vote against it, and to submit to this House such an amendment as that proposed by the leader of the opposition, which if adopted will afford to the people of this country an opportunity of expressing their views on such a very radical change in the constitution. The hon. gentleman referred to the remarks of the hon. member for St. Anne division, Montreal (Mr. Doherty), and intimated that if this money were sent over, it would be sent with the intention that it should not be used. In my memory the hon. member for St. Anne never said anything of the kind. The remarks of that hon. gentleman evidently referred to by the hon. member for Cape Breton, are these:

Gentlemen, to meet the imminent needs of the empire, we put at your disposal this sum of money. Mr. Speaker, if that money is drawn under those circumstances, it will be done by men in whom this government has implicit confidence, and upon their testimony that there is imminent need. Will anybody here impute to the government of Great Britain the flagrant dishonesty of drawing money that is put at their disposal when there is no imminent need for it, and that she will take it only to put it in her pocket? When hon. gentlemen tell us that we are throwing $25,000,000 across the Atlantic to these people, giving it away as a pure gift, as the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) said—that is an imputation upon British statesmen whose testimony we are willing to accept as the testimony of men who know what the truth is with regard to the question of urgency. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this money is drawn, I say we have conclusive evidence on the most reliable testimony of the need of that money, if it is drawn we have given it when there was imminent necessity; and even the right hon. gentleman and his government say that in case of imminent necessity, of course, we ought to give immediate assistance.

I would like to know where the hon. member for Cape Breton finds in that speech or in these words any statement that could give any one with ordinary judgment and common sense the idea that we were sending this money over with the knowledge and expectation that it was never to be used. Yet the hon. member once or twice congratulated and felicitated himself on the fact that he never misquoted other people.

The hon. gentleman also brought in the loyalty question. Now, I do not care to talk on the loyalty question. When a man is easy in his own mind with regard to his feelings of loyalty to the empire to which he belongs, he is not ready to suspect others of disloyalty. I had the privilege the other morning of attending the annual meeting of the Dominion Rifle Association, at which there were present militia officers from all parts of the Dominion, and I think one of the most loyal utterances I heard on that occasion came from a colonel commanding one of the regiments in Quebec. He said that if this matter of a navy could only be left to the militia officers of the country, they would soon settle it in a way that would be agreeable to the people and provide properly for defence, or words to that effect, and he was cheered to the echo. I have no doubt at all of the thorough loyalty of the people of Quebec, and never have had, and certainly since this matter has come up, if any one had any doubt about it, that doubt must have been removed by the expressions of loyalty that we have heard on all sides from gentlemen from that province. Outside and beyond that, and appealing only to

self-interest, if there are people in any one province in Canada to-day who more than any other should have a feeling of loyalty and reverence for the British Crown and the British power, it is the people of the province of Quebec. They hold a position unique in the whole British empire. They have treaty rights which no subject of the Crown in any other parts of the world have; and if the power of Britain were broken and Canada separated itself from the British empire, those rights would pass away, and be as if they never had been. So I say the people of Quebec, loyal as they are, have more business reasons for loyalty to the British Crown and for a desire to support and strengthen it, than the people of any other province in the whole Dominion of Canada. So much for the remarks of my hon. friend.

With regard to the question before the House, one of the hon. members, in discussing the ideas of the members of the opposition, endeavoured to poke a little fun at us by saying that no matter how we on this side might criticise the proposals of the government, this was the first time anything practical had been offered to be done. Supposing for a moment that is true, I reply that this is the first time there has been any necessity for anything of the kind to be done. The rise of the nations of the world owning navies has been of the most recent date. The navy of the United States is only a comparatively few years old; Japan is a new nation; while Germany as a sea-power has risen into prominence only within a very few years. The Royal Navy has been patrolling our North Atlantic ocean up to within the last three or four years, when a new policy was inaugurated by Sir John Fisher, the new Lord of the Admiralty. Before that Halifax was the naval station of the North Atlantic squadron in summer and Bermuda in the winter. It was a larger and stronger fleet than the one proposed by the government in the Bill now before the House. This fleet or parts of it visited different parts of the country, including Quebec and Montreal, and it was not until that fleet was withdrawn and until Germany had been showing its determination to have immense power on the sea as it has on the land, that there has been the slightest necessity for Canada to go to any expense, large or small, for naval purposes. I think there is no doubt about that, so that in the circumstances I take it nothing has been done hitherto because there has been no necessity for anything to be done. But now all that is changed. A new naval programme has been given to the world. Germany has announced her intention, in most unmistakable terms, to dispute the supremacy of the sea and wrest that supremacy from Great Britain. That she will succeed I do not believe, for England will spend her last shilling and her last man before she will allow Germany or any other nation to get the upper hand. But the war, if you call it war, is on now. It is a war of construction and must be kept up. The people who advocate making every endeavour to keep up with this great war of construction which is going on, are not militarists and jingoes. This rapid building of new battleships and Dreadnoughts is not for the purpose of making war, but for the purpose of preventing war, and that is the only way war can be prevented, especially with such an enormously wealthy and powerful country as Germany. I came across the other day a statement made by a Chinese Minister of War some five centuries before the christian era, and what did he say. He said:

> To fight and conquer one hundred times is not the perfection of attainment, the supreme art being to subdue the enemy without fighting.

That is the reason why this building of Dreadnoughts as rapidly as possible is being carried on. It is in order that war may be prevented and the enemy conquered without fighting.

With regard to our connection with Great Britain in the empire, that appears to me one of the most important subjects in connection with this debate. I take it that our interests are bound firmly with those of Great Britain and the rest of the empire. Britain is our best customer. The men who, out on the great rolling prairie, are gathering in those enormous harvests, find a market for their product in the old country. We can say the same of the products of the east. Who are the people that buy our lumber and the other commodities we have to export? The British people take by far the largest part. So that outside of the bonds of heredity, tradition, history and affection, there are the bonds of business interests, which unite us to the mother country. And this vast business can only be safely carried on if protected by a navy. And for that protection we have to depend on the British navy, or rather, I would say, if my wishes were carried out, the navy of the empire. The supreme law, in connection with governing bodies, is the safety of the people. The safety of the people is the highest law of all, and in order that this empire may be safe, the royal navy must be supreme. Destroy that navy and you put an end to the empire.

Take this Navy Bill we are discussing, what is the object of a navy? Is it for the purpose of establishing ship-building plants or docks? I should say not. I quite agree that the establishment of shipbuilding yards is important because shipbuilding is a great industry which will give employment to a great number of people.

I take it that docks are necessary, whether we have a navy or not, but the great reason for a navy is strategical. The great object of a navy is defence, so that in considering what is the best kind of navy to have, I take it that the strategical reason is the one which should come before all others. But if we want a navy for strategical purposes we must have a great imperial navy. That is my idea of a naval force—a navy of imperial dimensions, a navy for the defence of the whole empire, a navy under one control. In that connection the Prime Minister of New Zealand gave expression to a sentiment which appeals to my mind as absolutely correct. He said:

Recognizing how important it is for the protection of the empire that the navy should be at the absolute disposal of the admiralty, Your Excellency's advisers do not desire to suggest any conditions as to the location of the ships, as they are confident that the truest interests of the people of New Zealand will be best served by having a powerful navy under the independent control of those responsible for directing it in time of peace or war. What the government does feel concerned in is, that the navy in whatever part of the world it may be, should be under one control, so that the most effective results for the defence of all portions of the empire may be assured.

Those most effective results can only be obtained by one navy, one control and one flag. We are an immense chain of countries, a chain surrounding the globe, separated—no, not separated—bound together by the sea, and immense possibilities open out before us when we consider what may be our destiny as part of this great British empire.

Away off to the south we have Australia, an island it is true, but a continent as well; some four millions of people there now, but to become many millions; with, at this moment, two transcontinental railways projected to run from the southern part of the island to the north bringing into cultivation and opening out for settlement the immense territories some of which have hardly ever—I suppose some even never—been viewed by white men. And we have stretching away across this ocean, New Zealand. It appears to me that the very dream of such an immense empire as this will become, if we are true to ourselves, is sufficient not only to fire the imagination but to warm the heart of every well-wisher of the flag that flies over us and of the country to which we belong. Such a navy, an imperial navy, should be, in so far as we are concerned, supported by all the wealth which we are able to give to that end. It will be just as important for us in the future as it is in the present for the great heart of the empire in the old country that this navy should be great. I do not look for it in my life

Mr. DANIEL.

time, but I think of the time in the years to come when Canada will be the dominant partner in this great British empire if we are so minded as to draw closer the bonds of union and not separate them or loosen them as, I am very much afraid, this present navy Bill will do—and that is one reason, and a great reason, why I am opposed to it. I have spoken of one navy. That does not mean at all, and I do not mean to convey the impression, that we should not have the opportunity of building the ships for that navy, or of our part of it, in Canada. I see no reason why, when we provide the facilities in this country to build vessels of war to become part of our navy and thereby part of the great imperial navy, they should not be built in this country. On the contrary I see every reason why they should be built here. The same thing applies to the manning of the navy. For that purpose this legislation is not required. The old Militia Act divides the militia of this country into land forces and sea forces. Under the Act the militia of Canada is divided into active and reserve militia and the active militia consists of (a) corps raised by voluntary enlistment; (b) corps raised by ballot. Included in the active militia are seamen, sailors and persons whose usual occupation is upon any steam sailing craft navigating the waters of Canada. It even makes arrangement for submarine work. So this naval militia is not confined to the present Act, but as a matter of fact, years ago, there were companies of naval militia in Canada. There was a company of naval militia in the port of St. John and not only that, but they had a training ship there loaned from the royal navy, the old 'Charybdis'. She was there for quite a long time, an old full-rigged sailing ship with some auxiliary steam. But she was not popular with the naval militia there and the movement finally died out. But the fact that these naval militia corps were in existence and that we had the training ships show that we had and have sufficient power to train men for the sea, to utilize training ships and all that that implies. We have had that power for years. Since I came to this House, I have noticed the vote of $10,000 for naval militia. But it was shown that part of that vote for one year was spent in paying for the trip to Paris of the then Minister of Marine. That much I have been able to find out, but not how the rest of the money was expended. But there is the fact—the appropriations were made showing that we have the power to enrol and train naval militia. I say, let us stick to that. This Act gives us power to establish a naval college. Let us establish it. And let us put our trained men on the ships that we

build, after we get facilities to build them, and make these ships part and parcel of the great imperial navy. Another thing is that, if we have the naval college, and ask young men to go through, take the training that that college affords, we must be able to offer them a career when they fit themselves for these positions. Such a navy would give a magnificent career to any young man passing through the naval college, because he would not only have a little navy such as the government propose to establish, but he would have a career in which the whole imperial navy would open out for his ambition. And, if we have an imperial navy, there must be some voice in the making of war and controlling the policy the navy is intended to carry out. This would require an imperial council, and we may hope that this could be formed. I do not doubt that the authorities in the old country have had that under consideration. A scheme could be devised under which, if all the nations of the empire took part in making a great imperial navy, arrangements could be made by which each portion of the empire would have its say in the control of that navy. If we are to get the best and the most for our money, to offer the best and brightest career for our young men, giving a chance also to the men who would not be officers but would man the fleet and giving to every one an opportunity to become a member of that fleet, this would be the best course. It would be a navy which we could call our own; it would not be like this little local fleet that we are proposing to build, but we would have a share in this great imperial navy which even now is by far the strongest that the world has ever seen. Therefore, I think it is a matter which ought to be given every consideration.

We have had a number of quotations from writers in the Fortnightly 'Review.' I wish to quote from an article in that periodical by Mr. J. L. Garvin, in a note entitled 'The Dominions and the Navy.' He says:

> It may be asked, what of Greater Britain? Canada is founding a navy of her own. A few decades hence it might begin to be a serious force in the world if the territories of the Dominion are still under the same flag——

It would look as if the significance of clause 18 of this Bill had travelled across the Atlantic, and the people over there really understood its meaning.

> —if the territories of the Dominion are still under the same flag. There is lively dissension on the whole subject. Some Quebec Liberals are still against all naval expenditure. Many Conservatives denounce 'tinpot navies,' and are strongly in favour of direct contributions to the imperial fleet, but there seems not the slightest chance of unanimity in this sense. Australia is also creating a federal navy, which will not be able for many years to throw a sensible weight into the strategical scales. With the system of direct contributions, New Zealand is not entirely satisfied. South Africa, as yet, is not moving. One conclusion is clear. What was called last spring the 'awakening of the empire' upon the naval problem has not been very effective for strictly imperial purposes. Under the systems they have decided to adopt (and it may be conceded that, in view of the present state of sentiment in Greater Britain, no other course was possible), Australia and Canada can neither save themselves nor effectually help us.

I would call the attention of members to this statement:

> Stern experience may teach the people of the Commonwealth——

I presume that should be commonwealths.

> —the necessity of larger sacrifices and closer combination with the mother country and each other. Meanwhile this island must go forward by its own strength, and upon that the whole empire depends. Australian and Canadian squadrons can do nothing to affect the issue in the North Sea. Our efforts in the North Sea may mean all for them. That is the situation, and we must rise to it. If we have full determination to keep the sea, we can keep it. Though the price will be high we can pay it, and nothing in our history will be greater than the spectacle of this little island staking all its resources once more for naval supremacy, wearing down a more formidable rivalry than we have ever met, and holding on at all costs through peace and, if need be, through war until events, far hence, perhaps, shall compel, as they will, the fighting partnership of the whole English-speaking world.

By this Bill, in addition to a naval militia, provision is made for a naval college, a permanent force and its control. Of course the important features are the permanent force and its control.

The Prime Minister, on the 15th November, speaking on this subject, said that we should look on this matter not alone as Canadians, but as British subjects. He said:

> We are Canadians, but we are something else also, we are British subjects as well. We have to consider this subject, not only from the standpoint of our status as Canadians, but we have to approach it from the standpoint of our status as British subjects. If we have duties to perform as Canadians, we have also duties to perform as British subjects. If we have rights, privileges and responsibilities as Canadians, we also have rights, privileges and responsibilities as British subjects."

In another part of his speech he says: 'I am for Canada first, last and all the

time, and then he introduces this Bill, and in it puts a clause which gives him or his successor the power to say that we will not go to war, and that the navy shall not be placed under the command of His Majesty unless the Prime Minister and the government so decide. It appears to me inconsistent and contradictory for the Prime Minister to state at one time that we should consider this matter as British subjects and then introduce a Bill which gives him power, if he chose to exert it, to run his knife into the very heart of British connection and cut it off, making in fact a declaration of independence. That is what he has done. You may well say the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are those of Esau. We have had no mandate from the people for any declaration of independence, we have had no mandate from the people to give the government of this country the power to separate us from the rest of the empire. That is the reason we on this side say that this matter should go back to the people, that they should have an opportunity of declaring themselves and of directing their representatives in parliament so that their representatives should know their will before taking such an enormous step in advance, a step which I believe the majority of the people do not approve, of which I believe they will express their disapproval at the very first opportunity. That is my great objection to this Bill. We have no mandate to pass any such legislation as this. It is taking advantage of the people. It is giving them no opportunity of expressing their opinion or indicating the kind of legislation they would like to have passed. I feel, however, as far as my judgment goes, that the majority of the people would prefer to keep up the connection with the empire, to draw closer those very slight bonds which already bind us, not only the bonds of sentiment, tradition, heredity and affection, but the bonds of business interest, the bonds which shall give us an opportunity of growing and developing in a way that no independent existence could assure to us. That, I believe, is the wish and the desire of the people of this country, and before I would consent to any such declaration as is contained in the Bill before us to-day, I would say: Send this Bill back to the people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I intend, on that account, to vote for the amendment which has been introduced by the leader of the opposition. I think that is the only fair thing. I think it is only treating the people squarely and fairly to give them an opportunity of expressing themselves on this, the most important question that has ever been brought before this House. This Act, and especially clause 18, are in entire

disagreement with the spirit and words of the resolution which was unanimously passed by this House a year ago in March. The expression which is contained in this Bill, and especially in clause 18, is one, in my opinion, of offensive bluntness. If we had wished to inform the people of the old country that we are considering the idea of separating from the empire, surely we should have chosen some other time than a time when England is stretching forth every power that she has, vital and financial, to secure her own existence and ours as communities in this family of nations. We should have chosen some other time and some other form of expression rather than put it into such a Bill as this and in such an offensive and blunt way. That is my view of it, and I think that will be the view of a great many of the people of this country. I cannot consent to bring myself to vote for any such proposal. I think it is opposed to the best and truest interests of this country, and I believe it is opposed to the wishes of the majority of the people.

There is one other point that I would just like to glance at in passing, which we have not had referred to by any member of the government, I think, so far, but which is significant in this connection, and it is the question of the flag. At page 27 of this pamphlet relating to the imperial conference there is this statement:

> The question of the flag was discussed, and it was arranged that the admiralty would give the matter consideration and would communicate its views at a later date to the Canadian government.

There is no question of the flag in connection with New Zealand, there is no question of the flag in Australia, but there is a question of the flag apparently in regard to this Dominion of Canada. What does that mean? No member of the government has referred to it. It goes without saying that no vessels of war, not under the command of the admiralty, could fly the admiralty flag on the high seas. This very question of the flag adds point and poignancy to clause 18 of this Bill and shows conclusively that there was in the minds of the gentlemen who were our representatives at this conference the idea of using a separate flag from that which we have been so proud of all our lifetime. That is a matter that must receive more consideration and more explanation. The people of this country are not going to lose their flag with any such complacency as that. There will be something doing before they allow the Union Jack to be hauled down from the masthead, and when this matter is fully thought out and laid before the people, they will have something more to say than they are apparently saying now, and they will know more about the true inwardness

of this Bill than they have been allowed to know up to the present time.

We have spoken of the emergency. The emergency appears to be so apparent that it seems almost a waste of time to dwell on the matter. We have had the statements of the Prime Minister of England, of the First Lord of the Admiralty, the man who probably has a better idea than any of them of the conditions in so far as naval affairs are concerned, of the Foreign Secretary and others within and without the government, and they all tend in the same direction. Is it for any in this House, who has not had an opportunity and never will have probably of being intimate with the conditions with which these gentlemen whom I have named are intimate, to question the information which they give us? They know far better than we do what the royal navy is up against, what it has to contend against, and they know what they have to prepare for. There is no doubt in regard to Germany. Germany is a country of most intense ambition. Its military history proves that. It has made itself the dictator of Europe, and now it is trying to make itself, through the supremacy of the seas, dictator of the world. Let me read a short statement taken from a letter written on the 18th March last by Mr. Frederick Harrison, who is a well known publicist, what has no political affiliations whatever on one side or the other, and who has been a consistent anti-militarist. Speaking of Germany, Mr. Harrison said:

The German navy is not built for distant voyages. It is built to act only as the spear head of a magnificent army. No, whenever our empire and maritime ascendancy are challenged, it will be by such an invasion in force as was once designed by Philip and Parma, and again by Napoleon.

It is this certainty which compels me to modify the anti-militarist policy which I have consistently maintained for forty years past. The conditions are now changed; new risks involve fresh precautions. The mechanical as well as the political circumstances are quite different from what they were in the days of Wellington, or even of Palmerston and Gladstone. To one now it is no question of loss of prestige, no question of the shrinking of the empire; it is our existence as a foremost European power, and even as a thriving nation. To talk of friendly relations with Germany and the domestic virtues of the Fatherland is childish. Who in 1860 knew that Prussia was to be the dominant power in Europe? Who in 1864 imagined that she was to defeat Austria? Who in 1868 foresaw that in two years she would be in Paris? Who in 1888 dreamed she would be our rival at sea? And what impelled the cultured realm of the Hohenzollerns to break out in 'blood and iron' to smash Denmark, to humiliate Austria, to overwhelm France, to defy England on the sea? What was the motive, or the cause? What but the thirst of national glory?

It cannot be that the ambition of Germany in naval construction is simply for the purpose of protecting her mercantile marine, because the United Kingdom and her colonies own a total of 9,181 steam and sailing vessels with a tonnage of 18,826,442 tons, while Germany owns only a total of 2,171 steam and sailing vessels with a tonnage of 4,266,703, or less than one-fourth of the tonnage of the British empire. And yet Germany is straining every nerve and with feverish activity is building Dreadnoughts in an attempt to equal the navy of Great Britain herself. Three years ago Germany had only two slips capable of turning out Dreadnoughts, but to-day she has 17, and in the Krupp concern there is an army of 38,000 men producing guns, equipment and armament for the German navy. I need not give any further reasons to show that there is an emergency facing the people of the empire. Now, supposing our amendment were carried, it is said that our contribution for two Dreadnoughts would be $25,000,000. It would make no matter to me so far as my vote is concerned whether two Dreadnoughts would cost $25,000,000 or not, but I would point out that the first Dreadnought cost $8,811,866 when completed in 1906, and that in 1909 the 'Superbe' cost $8,147,930.94, and the 'Temeraire' $8,510,559.84, which included the armament and equipment of these vessels. The proposal in the amendment is to send an amount sufficient to supply the Royal Navy with two Dreadnoughts or their equivalent, and I do not think Canada should be mean or finnicky or small in a matter of this kind. We should give sufficient to attain the object we have in view, and that is in this emergency to supply the Royal Navy with two Dreadnoughts at our expense. We propose this, Sir, not that England will not supply herself with sufficient ships, because even though we did not send a dollar we know she would take precautions in that respect, but we have been told by responsible statesmen in Great Britain that the weary Titan staggers under the load. It is sufficient for me to know that the mother country is in need, to cause me to vote cheerfully for sending to the motherland an amount sufficient to build two of the most modern Dreadnoughts or super-Dreadnoughts to be added to the Royal Navy, so that when the time of stress comes as it may before long, we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that in the firing line Canada will be represented by two of the very best of the fleet. If Canada is represented in that conflict we shall feel a pride in the achievement of these ships, and we shall know that we have helped in the success which I have no doubt will attend the arms of the empire. We took an interest in the Boer war because we had our own men

there. We had a personal interest, in many cases a family interest, in it. The war was ours because our own people were interested in it.

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I intend to vote for the amendment of the leader of the opposition. I take it that the statements that have been made with regard to the immense efforts that Germany is making, the feverish rapidity with which she is struggling to make herself the equal or the superior, if she can, of Great Britain on the seas, are something that we must take to heart. The preparations of Germany, already a great colossus of military power, with a million of men under arms all the time, and four millions to call upon whenever she needs them—not raw recruits, but men who have passed through the landwehr or similar school of military training—are something that we should take to heart. It is a matter of as much interest to British subjects in Canada as to British subjects in Great Britain or to British subjects in Australia. I for one will never vote to haul down the Union Jack from this country. I will not vote for the passing of any Bill which can be turned into a declaration of independence or an Act of separation from the empire of which we form a part; but I stand for British connection, for a closer consolidation of the various portions of this empire, so that we may look forward to the realization in the future of that dream of which I have spoken already, when these great countries, and as they will be in time these populous countries, bound together by ties of interest and blood and affection and sentiment, shall become the greatest galaxy of nations in the world, able not only to protect ourselves from injury, but to uphold the peace of the world.

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). (Translation).—Mr. Speaker, after listening to the numerous speeches which have been delivered in this House on the momentous question now occupying our minds and that of the people at large for the last few weeks; after witnessing the thrusts exchanged by hon. gentlemen, and listened to the sharp words bandied from one side to the other; finding what precious hours were being taken up by that wordy warfare, I have come to the conclusion that in the interest of the country one should be as brief as possible. Accordingly, I shall take up only very little of the time of the House with the object of discussing this proposal from another viewpoint, one that has not been very much in evidence until now, I refer to the economical and social aspect of that important question.

So then, Mr. Speaker, in rising to take a hand in this important debate, I would like to be endowed with as much courage and enthusiasm as was shown by the class I represent in its efforts towards securing national and social peace.

I shall take the liberty of speaking in the name of those 60,000 persons who were left derelicts, on the shores of the St Lawrence in the seventeenth century, as was so well stated by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), in his speech at the opening of the debate on this question. That community left single-handed, and with stores of courage and energy as their only means of defence, were abandoned by their then leaders, as we learn from history.

I speak in the name of those who, with a real spirit of sacrifice and abnegation have not ceased propagating the idea of and respect for just vindications in favour of national and social peace and freedom. I speak in the name of those 150,000 organized men who are a powerful factor towards the buoyancy of our national finances. I speak in the name of 750,000 people who make up the families of those Canadian workingmen, and on their behalf, I say: Let us have peace. I speak on behalf of the people at large, and I pray the advisers of the nation to set the example of a peaceful community, without any thought of aggression, intent only on developing the resources of the country, on increasing its population, on making the most of its immense possibilities, in short, on applying their energy to promoting the happiness and the welfare of the inhabitants of our young and beautiful country.

In view of the coming celebration of the centenary of peace between Canada and the United States, in 1912, the termination of one of the happiest periods in our history, I entreat the representatives of the people on this momentous occasion to pause and realize that our naval armaments will be a dangerous provocation in days to come. And lastly, I beseech the advisers of the nation to show respect for the principle advocated by modern democracy, with its millions of voices loudly protesting against the threatening armaments effected by civilized people.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that in speaking thus, I lay myself open to the charge of being sentimental; but I notice that from the outset of this debate, appeals to sentiment have been more numerous than arguments bearing on the proposal under consideration; so, I shall follow in the footsteps of those who have spoken before me. I shall dwell on a few facts which I desire to submit to the House and to the country and, I shall take the liberty of stating my humble opinion as to the future of our nation, though in no wise posing as a prophet.

In a general way, hon. gentlemen have

concerned themselves with the dangers threatening us in a more or less distant future, as well as with our obligations towards the mother country and the commercial and business interests of the country. I conceive and the fact was apparent on more than one occasion, that private interests have sometimes exerted a decisive influence on the trend of our legislation; and large capitalists, with a view to protecting their own interests proclaimed loudly that we should in the first place safeguard our trade by providing a navy, and with that object in view a large expenditure is incurred, while at the same time our coasts are at great cost protected against attacks from outsiders. To that danger of invasion, the right hon. leader of the government referred as not at all immediate. On the other hand, the hon. leader of the opposition points to that danger as imminent and urgent enough to induce us to donate at once two Dreadnoughts to the empire. In the third place, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is desirous that the question should be submitted to a referendum. We are then called upon to consider these various proposals and come to a conclusion in regard to them.

I regret to find, Mr. Speaker, that very few hon. gentlemen apparently realize the importance of the part played by the labouring people, in the settlement of those great social and economic problems, and particularly this one. The labouring classes in this country as elsewhere make up the great majority of the people, and, to my, mind, they should have, if not a preponderating influence, at any rate, the right of voicing their opinion. Being the sole representative of labour in this House, I think it is incumbent upon me to speak on their behalf, and to advocate as far as possible the opinions and contentions specially dear to the labouring community. I shall endeavour, within the scope of my feeble attainments to acquit myself of that task, feeling that I am voicing the views of thousands of my fellow-citizens.

We are justly entitled to inquire who are the promoters of warfare. Surely, they cannot be the people who are sent out to fight and who, from that very fact, bring on misery to their families. Those who meet death on the battlefields are heroes, but through their death, women and children dependent on them are made miserable and exposed to the direst privations. The instigators of war are seldom, if ever, those who bear its burden or suffer from its disastrous results. In what class of citizens are soldiers recruited? Among the masses, among existence of hardships, and who give up their lives, mown down by unmerciful guns rather than remain the object of the perpetual scorn of the classes.

Numerous are the examples of wars brought about through the ambition or selfishness of eminent people. Numerous rebellions have been provoked as a means of forwarding selfish objects. And who are the unconscious tools in those wholesale slaughters of human beings? The destitute and the workingmen. So I am justified in saying that the views of labour, and especially of organized labour, should be taken into account when questions of armament and of the establishment of navies are being considered.

Who are those who bear for the greater part the hardships of war? Is it not a fact that the masses are mainly its victims? Is it not a fact, as history shows, that war in a great many cases is nothing else but downright robbery in the interests of the few and at the expense of many? Is not that fact demonstrated from day to day by our most eminent men?

Look at the steps which are taken in our times with a view to conciliating capital and labour, or bringng about harmony through the settlement of those far-reaching and terrible strikes, which after all are the outcome of the persistent rivalry of conflicting interests between individuals or classes. It is actual warfare under a new form, and not the least disastrous.

The settlement of those conflicts between capital and labour should occupy a greater place in the minds of persons in authoirty in all countries. and surely it is not by making preparations for war, by building warships. that we will succeed in humanizing the people and developing widespread ideas of peace, harmony and good-will.

Legislation in our country, in the United States, and I might add in most other countries bearing on the settlement of labour disputes through conciliation and arbitration, is evidence of the people's desire for peace, and goes to show that throughout the world it is within the ranks of democracy that this yearning for peace is mostly to be found. Should we engage in a policy of militarism, we may well expect agitation as a result among the masses in the near future and it would be unwise on the part of the government to close their ears to the protests which will be forthcoming from the people.

The time will come when we will be confronted with the enormous expenditure incident on militarism and when we will have to impose a tax on revenue. Then, the great financiers and captains of industry, the wealthy holders of the nation's resources, will be obliged to contribute their goodly share of the expenditure. Then, will loud protests and recriminations be heard. We all know what has been going on of late in England, and I refer to it as evidence of the truth of my contention. What did we see going on in the mother country, when the government in a spirit of fairness de-

manded a just and equitable contribution from those who in every part of the empire had called the people to arms? Indignant clamours will be forthcoming from those who in justice should pay their full quota towards the maintenance of these engines of war and destruction; but the least we can do is to recognize the right of the masses, who make up the bulk of the army, to say to the wealthy classes who are not represented in the rank and file: Pay your share of the expenditure required for defence purposes.

What has just occurred in England and what is occurring in other countries, will also happen very soon in this country, we may rest assured; and if ever we are under the necessity of imposing a tax on revenue in order to meet the cost of this undertaking, the welkin will ring with the protests against armament emanating from these wealthy men; in the very near future we will be the witnesses of the revolt of capital against militarism.

Now, Sir, one of the reasons given in the course of this debate, in support of the measure, is that armaments are necessary in order to maintain peace. The principle thus laid down seems dangerous to me: peaceful dispositions cannot be expected from a nation armed to the teeth. It is the same with nations as with individuals: citizens going about unarmed are not objects of fear. Their means of intercourse are reason and good will, while those who go about armed, are intent on violence and destruction. Fortunately, we find to-day that it is more difficult to enlist men than formerly, and that may be the reason why in our schools inducements are offered to the youth that they may take a liking to arms and warfare. Nevertheless, persons in authority and organizers of our militia corps know how difficult it is to recruit men, bloody warfare being repugnant to human nature in general and particularly so to the workingmen.

Why then should we incite our people to wage war? Would it not be better to educate the people and satisfy them as to the benefits of peace as compared with the horrors of war. This century is the century of peace, harmony and good will among civilized nations. Jealousy and envy are less rampant; hands are extended in brotherly friendship in a common endeavour to put a stop to those troublesome conflicts of individual and social life.

Now, what will be the outcome of that policy of militarism about which we are about to enter? Can it be reasonably expected that the proposed expenditure represents the maximum of the yearly outlay? An amount of $15,000,000 is laid down; to my mind, $25,000,000 would be closer to the mark. But the actual amount is not

of great importance just now; a more serious matter is that of knowing exactly what will be done later on. We will go on increasing the navy, increasing the land forces; that will be deemed indispensable. And when we have reached the point when we are unable to spend any more, we will then be ready for the fray, and as soon as there arises some trouble in diplomatic intercourse, a matter readily brought about through the influence of one or several of the magnates of finance, we simply will have to fight in a great many cases. I need not dilate, Mr. Speaker, on the ill results of war, on the disasters they bring about, and which are known to all.

A weighty argument in favour of the present policy, in the eyes of the working classes, it is the prospect that these ships will be built in Canada and be the means of ensuring much employment to our people. Of course, we may be allowed to hope that Canadian workingmen will get employment in those great dockyards required for the building of those warships; but as a matter of fact, will it be so? Are we in a position to shut out foreign labour? Far from it, alien labour will be resorted to more than ever; skilled labour and even large numbers of unskilled workmen will be on hand, and as a result a lamentable condition of things will ensue; wherever one man is needed, ten will be offering, and thereby the army of unemployed far from diminishing will increase in numbers. And when we are through with that work, what will become of that army of workingmen thrown out of employment? It may be answered that they will take to farming, to various forms of industry, or enlist in the navy. Unfortunately, many will be constrained to do so; and I am satisfied that the thought had already occurred to the advocates of armaments, that such a contingency will do away with, or at any rate postpone, conscription. It should also be well understood that a goodly proportion of these employed have no qualification whatever for the calling of the farmer; after engaging in an industrial calling, they will be unfit for agriculture. Some will object that these men may be available for the building of our railways. Alas, the number of workingmen is already quite sufficient, and the great corporations which have all the men they can employ, will have no pity on these poor unemployed vainly asking for work and left a burden on public charity. Such will be the mournful situation before our eyes.

Now, sir, I intend dealing with that question from another point of view, to which apparently very little attention has been given, although its interest is paramount: I refer to the economic value of each individual producer as a unit in the producing power of the nation as a whole.

It is a well known fact that nations entering on a policy or armament have to face on that account an ever increasing expenditure. That is a foregone conclusion, as from the very necessity of the case each nation strives to outstrip its neighbour in that respect. Such expenditure is not limited merely to the pay and maintenance of the forces on land and on sea; the cost of armament, plant, ships, &c., reaches a much higher figure and the employment of a great many more men is required in consequence.

It may be even reasonably expected that the army, the navy, the dockyards, workshops and manufacturies will soon, in a country such as ours, occupy about 180,000 men, that is to say about 25 per cent of our working class. Of course, that proportion will not be employed from the first; I am speaking of the time when the system will be well established and in full swing. We all know that European countries have exceeded these averages, and that soldiers and sailors there number several thousand men. So that the figure given above, though approximate only cannot be considered excessive, and is probably a very conservative estimate.

In round figures, and taking the census of 1901 as a basis it may be said that on the average the workman earns $387.16 per year. For the 180,000 workmen required for militarist purposes, that would give a total of $70,000,000. Then, it should not be forgotten that these workingmen will be of a high class and that in consequence their salaries will be higher on the average. If to this amount in the shape of salaries, is added the cost of maintenance —which is always heavy under government control—it will be seen that the above amount should be doubled to say the least, and that even then the estimate would be on the low side. Of course, when attempting to figure out the loss inflicted by militarism the full salary of the workingmen should not be taken into account; but the difference between their normal earnings and the salaries paid by the State, should be debited. That difference will probably amount to twice the normal figure, if conditions prevalent on our continent hold good; it should not be less than abut $50,000,000, that is somewhat less than two-thirds of the normal salaries which give a total, as we have seen, of a little over $70,000,000 for 180,000 workingmen. That would mean $50,000,000 applied to unproductive work. That same census of 1901 showed that the total production of our workingmen amounted to $992,719,000, that is about $1,090 for each workingman.

Mr. Speaker, I have just roughly indicated the cost of militarism to the country once established on the lines proposed. Now, to be fair, and not to take undue advantage of the meaning of such figures the very statement of which might at first sight cause anxiety to the most hardened consciences—I must admit that credit should be given, on the other hand, for amounts to the extent of which the various industries and trades in the country will be benefited through militarism I may be allowed to point out in what measure the country will, from the financial standpoint, profit through militarism.

In the first place, I allow $200 for board to each man, it being well understood that the state must provide the required food for the sustenance of the men, and that trade will profit thereby. In the same way for clothing, I allow $50 per man, maintenance, 50; heating and lodgings, $50; arms, $50; transportation, $50; management, $45; contingencies, $50, which makes up a total of $545 per head, that is one half of his value as a producer.

Now, that amount of $545, representing the expenditure entailed per year by each of these men as a unit in the forces, should be multiplied by 180,000, representing the number of men which militarism employs at unproductive tasks. The total expenditure on account of the men so employed amounts to $100,000,000, which should be deducted from the total of $200,000,000, leaving a net loss of $100,000,000 per year.

Then, Mr. Speaker, if we were to take into account the waste of ability and education to the detriment of productive callings, we will realize that the loss to the country under that head is difficult to estimate. Surely, if hon. members could have afforded to give some time to the study of the economical and social aspect of the question, I am satisfied that we would have listened in the course of this debate to many an expression of broad views favouring peace and condemning armaments.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent on me to take a stand against all militarist proposals made in this House, satisfied as I am that, such a stand is the only means of liberating our generation from a state of slavery which is unjust, cruel and unworthy of modern civilization, and the only means also of promoting democratic ideas existing in the latent state among our people.

It was stated previously and justly so that we can have peace only in so far as democratic ideas are deeply rooted in the public mind, and I take this occasion to enter protest against militarism on behalf of modern democracy. However, as far as I am personally concerned, as between the two proposals submitted to this House, apart from the referendum, I believe our Canadian workingmen would object more strenuously to the granting to the empire of the equivalent of two Dreadnoughts than to the providing of a navy strictly and sincerely Canadian in character.

I must say besides, that organized labour in Europe and America have solemnly resolved never to fight one against the other for the protection of private interests, and it is that resolve that causes anxiety to governments and makes them fear that the day has come when free and independent men will refuse to murder their brethren, will consider it a crime to be the accomplices of those who favour war between men through motives of jealousy, of hatred, of vengeance, or for the upholding of private interests.

The hour may not be far distant when the people, the genuine people, borne down by too heavy burdens, harassed by the hardships and the misery of every-day life rendered more and more difficult to bear, will refuse to assume the enormous burden of militarism, and will cry out in powerful tones: 'Non serviam.' And then where will we find soldiers? I shall leave the answer to those who are more particularly entrusted with the care of studying and solving social problems. That cry may seem revolutionary, and no doubt organized labour will be accused of being disloyal to His Majesty. But, in our opinion, the loyal subject is the man who keeps peace with his fellow-citizens, who observes the golden rule, and works towards ensuring the general prosperity of the country. The loyal subjects who have fallen on the battlefield have left us noble example, and their names will live in history. During their lifetime, they have contributed to the wealth and welfare of the nation, and being desirous of following in their footsteps, workingmen for that purpose request that militarism be done away with.

In so doing they have still another object in view, the very thought of which is distasteful to me; so I shall be content with mentioning that militarism is in many cases and in many countries a very active factor of immorality and degradation. I shall only refer in passing to the misfortunes and shame inflicted on families under circumstances when soldiers judge that everything is allowable to them.

I may say in closing that I could not help being aggrieved at hearing hon. members cast aspersions on the French nationality to which I am proud to belong. Accordingly I feel bound to protest with all the energy that is in me on behalf of my constituents against such insults.

I am happy to proclaim highly that my constituents of various nationalities and religious beliefs have nevertheless enough liberality in their ideas to understand that we are one same people under the same flag, and free from all racial or class prejudices. They certainly will be surprised and aggrieved on learning in what narrow and mean disposition that debate was carried on in this House.

Mr. VERVILLE.

The French Canadian, on account of his numerous and brilliant qualities, is surely entitled to the respect and esteem of his fellow-citizens of different origin; and it is regrettable, to say the least, to find that men occupying a seat in this House take every opportunity of casting aspersions on the French Canadian name.

Mr. Speaker, I love my fellow-people above all and I know that this same love of country and of our institutions is deeply engraved in the hearts of the workingmen I represent; but at the same time. we have a great respect for the British flag which protect us. What we wish for as French Canadians, it is equal rights with our English-speaking fellow-citizens and the respect if not the esteem to which as fine and strong a race as ours is entitled. True, as a workingman, the whole world is my home, for labour is required everywhere, finds refuge and protection under all flags.

Therefore, I shall vote with all my heart against any military proposal which will come before this House, and with the full persuasion that I am fulfilling my conscientious duty as a representative of the working classes. But being the representative of an important constituency made up of all classes of society, and having heretofore spoken on behalf of my fellow-people who make up the great labour organization, I shall now give an opportunity to those outside of that organization of expressing their views; and consequently, I shall close by stating that I will vote in favour of the sub-amendment.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin). This question, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most important that has ever come before the people. What strikes me as very inconsistent on the part of the hon. members on the government side is that while they insist on telling us that there is not the slightest danger of any nation going to war with Great Britain, still they want to put this young country to the enormous expense of building a navy. The reason why I rise to oppose their policy is that I believe it is the first step towards separation. In the first place the cost to be incurred will be enormous, and then the navy, when built, will be of no use in time of war, and we certainly shall not need it in time of peace. If I could go east to the rising sun and west to the setting sun, north to the north pole, and south pole, I believe it would be almost impossible to get the opinion of any man which has not been already expressed in this House at least a dozen times; and in almost every case, the opinion would be that Germany was preparing to go to war with Great Britain. That is another reason why I want to oppose the Bill of the right hon. the Prime Minister; and the reason why I intend supporting the amendment of my hon. friend the

leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is that I believe in the imminence of that danger, and that we should help Great Britain in time of war. From nearly every hon. member opposite, we have heard that there is no danger of war, but that is an opinion which is not concurred in by Englishmen of prominence. The majority of English authorities believe that war between Great Britain and Germany is imminent, and that opinion is largely shared by Frenchmen. Already the greatest military power in the world, and having no proportionate commercial interests on the ocean, and no extensive and important colonies demanding overpowering naval strength, Germany is building a navy which, it is her avowed intention shall equal—i. e. excel—the British navy; and this, in the face of a long standing explicit warning that Great Britain shall regard any challenge of her command of the seas as a menace. And if the storm breaks, and when it breaks, we shall, nolens volens, be within the disturbed area. Every hon. member of this House believes that Germany is building a powerful navy.

We cannot maintain British connection and stand aloof from Europe. Nor can we turn Turk and run at the first note of the bugle and thereby escape the consequences of the war! What says history? In 1775 Canada was attacked. Why? Because England was at war with her New England colonies. In 1812 Canada was attacked. Why? Because England and France had offended the United States by issuing the Berlin Decrees, and the Americans struck a blow at England by invading Canada.

What then? Shall we surrender our connection with the mother country, and take independent rank among the lesser powers? That will avail nothing! The weaker powers are under the aegis of the greater, and exist on their sufferance! Practically it would mean transferring our allegiance from the mother to a stranger! And would the stranger's hand lie lighter than the mother's? Weakness has never saved a nation from attack. Civilization has not reached that point where it is counted immoral for a strong nation to attack a weak! In the wars that have occurred between two white peoples, in the last quarter of a century, the inequality in the strength of the combatants has been enormous. There is no corner of the world so remote that we could retire thither, live at peace, and escape the notice of the spoiler!

In dealing with the main question, 'Shall Canada possess a fleet?' Let us note, first, that Canada is young, and in her growing time—that all her energies, all her resources, all her wealth of men and money, are needed in laying her foundations secure and well, and building up her nationality. She needs railways and canals, and docks and harbours—she has to secure settlers for her unoccupied territory and build roads for the pioneers! To make surveys and prepare maps of her lands, and charts of her water-courses; to light her coasts and streams, and make them safe for her merchantmen; to draw closer together the outlying boundaries of her scattered population, by an efficient and frequent mail service; to open up new markets and avenues of trade; and to commission swift ships to carry her commerce and correspondence across the seas. She must provide the means for carrying on the work of government, and for carrying out government undertakings. She must build and endow colleges and universities. hospitals and asylums, and provide for the destitute and maimed; she must administer justice, redress wrongs, relieve the oppressed and punish the evil doers, to the uttermost ends of her Dominion. She must care for and support the native race whose heritage she has usurped. She must protect her people from pestilence and the ravages of infectious diseases attacking man, and beast, and tree.

Farther: It is of the gravest importance to Canada that Great Britain should maintain her ascendancy at sea. We would emphasize the fact, that we have but one market for our agricultural produce—our most valuable exports. Close it, and our farmers become impoverished, our whole industrial system paralyzed. We know too well that the United States, in the arranging and adjusting of her tariff, has ever done so to our annoyance and loss. We know that no other country than Britain stands for an open door and equality in trading in her home markets, in the markets of her dependencies, as well as in the markets of the world, and that no other country requires so much of what we have to sell. All our interests centre in the conservation of the British markets. In 1908 our exports by sea were $156,000,000, by land (United States) $90,000,000. Apart altogether from any feeling of loyalty, or gratitude, we are compelled in our struggle for existence, to keep open the British markets for our produce. Let us ever bear in mind that what we do to aid Britain, we do primarily for ourselves; and if, in our endeavour to secure buoyancy for our own life-boat, we aid Great Britain in breasting the storm, we are none the poorer. We have but to contemplate for a moment the condition of affairs if Great Britain were defeated, and, assuming the impossible, that we survived. Where could we place our wheat, our beef, and our dairy produce? We well remember how our markets were paralyzed, in so far as they were affected by the McKinley tariff—and how prices fell to the vanishing point before we secured a footing in England, and that because of an increased duty on a few minor commodities.

This is the situation that faces the people of Canada to-day, and recognizing its importance, and importance which may at any moment become very acute.

And here, I think, will be found the key to the position. Canada cannot hope to be able to engage, successfully, in a naval contest with any first-class power that is likely to attack her. She has not the men; she has not the money. She cannot build battleships, ton for ton, with the United States or Japan, or any of the greater European powers. And so far as the United States is concerned she can never hope to overtake her, either in population or wealth; or to excel her in the skill and energy of her citizens. And, if a quarrel is put upon her by her greater neighbour, which can only be settled by the arbitrament of war, whether the attack be by sea or land, the result can at no time be in doubt. Should that unfortunate event ever occur, we may rest assured that the whole power of Greater Britain will be sent to our assistance; and that we shall not be vanquished while a gun and a man remain under the British flag.

I believe, Sir, that the government should not assume such a large expenditure without first submitting it to the people in some way.

The hon. the Prime Minister tells us that this proposed navy will cost the people of Canada $15,000,000, and the annual maintenance will be about $3,000,000, and that it will not be of much use in case of war for at least five years; $3,000,000 a year for five years will be $15,000,000, and the initial cost of $15,000,000 will be $30,000,000. And if the cost increases the way it has since the 12th of January until the hon. Minister of Militia spoke a few days ago, and the way the expenditure on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the Quebec bridge increases, at the end of five years the people would have to pay between one and two hundred million dollars.

I believe that the farmers of Canada are willing to aid Great Britain in time of war. And our best way is to send either a money contribution, or Dreadnoughts. The farmers of Canada pay fully two-thirds of the taxation of this country. Last year, about $1,000,000 was spent in agriculture. I claim, Sir, that the government should try to build our canals and make railways so that farm produce would reach the consumer as quickly and as cheaply as possible. I have been taught from my youth that we are British subjects. I have always believed that a man was free while he was on British soil so long as he obeyed the law. Imagine my surprise when, a few days ago, I heard the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) throw it as a taunt across the floor of this House that we on this side were thinking for ourselves. Sir, we think for ourselves and speak for ourselves. I am glad to know that I belong to a party that dares to express its own opinions. If ever I was proud it was to have this assurance from a member on the government side that the party to which I belong was a party of independence of thought and speech. I hope the day will never come when the members of any party in this country will be afraid to speak for themselves. We are British subjects. We love the land of our birth, and the great empire of which we form a part; and I hope the day will never come when that great empire on which the sun never sets will be dismembered or divided.

Mr. M. J. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation). The present debate, Mr. Speaker, is one of the very greatest moment and to few questions has the House given greater attention. This is not because the subject of the debate is a new or an unexpected one; it is indeed nothing more than a normal step in that evolution which confederation has prepared. Canada, conscious of her power and of her obligations and gradually taking her place among the nations of the world, must continue to complete that national organization becoming the position she claims as a nation within the British empire.

The fathers of confederation, whose patriotic wisdom is conceded, understood that the bright future of Canada depended upon the union of the provinces under a central government; divided they could never have been properly organized and would not have developed sufficient strength to secure respect. An undefended country would be in the position of a private owner in a land without courts or officers of justice, and it is needless to say that no nation was ever held to be of any account without the possession of adequate defences by land and sea. Modern improvements and discoveries have so far failed to reveal any other means of attaining the noble aims of nationhood.

That the creation of a navy as well as of an army formed part of the scheme of confederation cannot be more clearly established than by the words of Sir George Etienne Cartier in 1864, speaking at the time as the leader of the Conservative party, to the people of St. John, N.B. This is what he said in explanation of the advantages and of the necessity of confederation:

> Another consideration of the highest importance is that of the defence of the country. In our present condition one province cannot claim the assistance of another in case of attack, but with confederation we shall have an army of 200,000 men, a navy of 60,000 men and we will be in such a position that England will be much better disposed to help us than if we depended upon her alone. We should do our best to explain these matters to the people.

On the same day, 14th September, 1864, 'La Minerve,' the Conservative organ in Montreal, printed the following:

With a federal government the central power might dispose of powerful armies and fleets and develop imposing strength in dealing with foreign nations. The government and the nation thus protected would be sure of being respected.

And further on:

It will thus be seen that the object of the federal system is to conciliate the outward strength of a great nation with that respect and care for private interests which under governments embracing too extended a sphere can scarcely be secured.

The same idea was present in the mind of Cartier when at the military camp at Niagara on the 17th June, 1871, he spoke as follows:

A nation can never expect to become great if it is not in a position to resist the enemies who may threaten its existence. The imperial government has been blamed for so promply withdrawing the regular troops from Canada. What ever may be our views on that point, it should not prevent the government and the people of Canada from organizing and maintaining, according to the means and resources of the country, a sufficient military force to secure respect.

If half a century ago the leader of the Conservative party recognized the necessity of a naval force of 60,000 men, how much more urgent must it be to-day to organize a small nucleous of 3,000 or 4,000 men? After the arguments advanced by the champions of confederation in support of the idea of a central government, after the provisions contained in the British North America Act concerning a Canadian navy, similar in all essentials to that creating the land militia, after the revision of the Militia and Defence Acts of 1883, incorporated in the Revised Statutes of 1886, providing for the establishment and the maintenance of a Canadian naval service, it is by no means fitting to speak of the present measure as 'A new departure,' or a 'turning point in our history.'

At the imperial conference of 1902, the Canadian representatives rejected the idea of a contribution in money to be made by all the self-governing colonies of the empire towards the maintenance of the army and navy, and they expressed their views in a document from which I will read the following extract:

At present Canadian expenditure for defence service are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well. On the sea coasts of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that at an early day a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.

In conclusion, the ministers repeat that, while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which he now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of experienced imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

This clear and definite attitude on the part of our representatives stating that although we were not disposed to contribute sums of money towards the maintenance of the imperial army and navy, we were none the less ready to establish a navy of our own, was approved of throughout the country and the delegates on their return to Canada were, as we all know, received with distinguished marks of approval. Then came the elections of 1904 and the government's policy as defined by their representatives in 1902, was ratified by a majority of the citizens of the country. There could be no doubt as to the trend of Canadian public feeling at that time, nor is there any reason to believe that it has altered since.

Afterwards came the conference of 1907, where the same principles were laid down but with greater precision, and once more the people of Canada manifested their unequivocal approval of the conduct of their representatives, not only by the manner of their greeting them on their return, but also, as in 1904, by granting them renewed confidence at the election of 1908.

What has happened since which might cause us to swerve from the line of conduct followed on these different occasions?

The resolution of the 29th March, 1909, adopted unanimously by this House, was a complete endorsation of the stand taken by our representatives in England in 1902 and 1907. The third paragraph of the resolution reads as follows:

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation ot the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential of the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

Sir, the importance and exceptional nature of the present debate is the result of

the stand taken by the majority of hon. members to our left and their present predicament shows us to what extremities the partisan spirit may lead.

It is hard to believe our ears when we hear to-day the hon. leader of the opposition, who was one of the framers of the resolution of the 29th March, 1909, and the hon. members of the opposition, who were unanimous in their approval of it.

What else has been done, what else is now proposed, but to implement that resolution of the 29th March? What was unanimously decided has been faithfully carried out, but it is apparently considered wholesome and proper to oppose every government measure and the hon. members of the oposition refuse to be bound by their former consent. That is the only reason—and it is a very bad one—for their present oposition to the government Bill.

It is quite reasonable to debate upon details of the Bill, but it appears to me unreasonable and even ridiculous to question its principle after its unanimous endorsation by the whole House. It will be difficult to persuade the public that such an attitude can be sincere.

There are in this country many different opinions on the question of the navy—many of which are sincere and respectable, but others inspired by less patriotic feelings and which scarcely can be prompted by the national interests. There are people in the province of Quebec who, whenever matters of an imperial nature arise seem inclined to decide them as if the province of Quebec was the whole of Canada, as if we were still living under the gloom of 1837, when the bureaucracy and the family compact did everything to persecute, humiliate and exploit French Canadians. They never stop to reflect that circumstances have completely changed and that we are now enjoying peace and justice in the land of freedom 'par excellence,' under the shadow of the British flag, which protects those liberties; yet even those who refuse to defend that flag would dread to see it disappear. Such people would, none the less, declare: 'We are loyal,' as if their lip loyalty were of any avail, when every sacrifice for the navy or the very idea of defence is refused.

Some of those who hold such opinions or who at least profess to hold them, are influenced purely and simply by political considerations; they are by no means convinced, but they desire to pander to a feeling which they think they discern in the province of Quebec; they are most fortunately mistaken as to the sound and judicious opinions prevailing among the masses of the Quebec population, who have time and again shown their desire to live in peace and harmony with the other portions of the country and their readiness to assume uncomplainingly their fair proportion of the national duties and obligations.

As for those who, desiring to avoid any direct contribution, are asking for a plebiscite what is their position? Is it a reasonable or a rational one? Can any man having listened and observed hesitate as to the sentiment which existed in the country previous to the resolution of the 29th March, 1909? It is to that period that we must go back if we would understand the inconsistency of those who, being opposed to a direct contribution, desire an appeal to the people. That resolution of the 29th March, 1909, had the useful result of modifying public opinion by reminding the citizens of this country that Canada is a self-governing nation. Is it not true that the great majority of the country before that time favoured a direct contribution that the great majority of the people of this country, swayed by sentiment rather than by sound common sense, would have desired to offer Dreadnoughts, &c. A plebiscite would then have meant neither more nor less than a direct contribution, and as I would be ready to admit the apparent logic of a request for a plebiscite on the part of those who favour a direct contribution, but not, however, an appeal to the people, being apparently so sure of public opinion that they desire to impose it immediately; so also do I deny to the opponents of direct contribution the right of complaining that the government has not acceded to their request which is ridiculous when the inevitable result is considered. I am convinced that a large number of those who are clamouring for a plebiscite are doing so because they are convinced that the thing is impossible after the resolution of the 29th March, 1909.

Mr. Speaker, when I consider the consequences of a plebiscite, the popular passions and the racial hatreds it would let loose, I look upon it with the utmost alarm, and I would consider such a measure a crime. And at this point, I have a word to say to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has not taken in this debate a position consistent with his avowed principles. He is asking for a plebiscite. Would he respect the verdict thus rendered? I do not think so. The hon. member has seen fit in the course of his speech of the February 3, 1910, to go over the details of the Manitoba school question and of the Alberta and Saskatchewan questions. Now, we have had plebiscites, and very important ones, on these questions at the elections held in 1900, 1904 and 1908. Does the hon. member respect these expressions of public opinion and submit to the popular verdict? What security does he offer that he would respect it better in the present case, and where is his title to pose as a champion of the rights of the people as expressed by plebiscites?

As to the contention that, constitutionally speaking, we have no right to act without consulting the people, I think that it is quite unfounded, and no more sincere than the demand for a plebiscite. The representatives of the people have received a mandate to administer the affairs of the country during five years, and as the question we are debating is not even a new one, I may now say this: that we are the mandateries of the people and that our mandate is a general one enabling us to vote and to act to the best of our judgment and ability, with the sole obligation of rendering an account to our constituents; our action in so doing will be constitutional and legal. I will quote, by the way, a passage from a book by Raymond Poincarré:

> In a free democracy no government can enjoy any other authority but that resulting from the general will, and in the exercise thereof they are responsible yet subject to control. This does not mean that a government must remain the passive instrument of popular caprice or of every wave of opinion. Like every mandatory and administrator such a government has its obligations and especially the duty of carrying on the business of the country with activity and foresight. They are obliged to render an account of their actions, but they have a right to act. They must not attempt to hold in tutelage the country and the legislature, but they none the less hold an authority which must not be weakened.

Sir, I will refer but briefly to those other extremists to be found chiefly outside the province of Quebec. Extremes meet. They also believe that we are still at that period of our history when the Canadian colony existed only by the tolerance of England and when Canada was a mere toy in the hands of the metropolis to be dealt with according to each passing caprice. For them, Great Britain is still, with respect to Canada, the sovereign master to whom everything is due and before whose will alone all must incline. From their point of view we should give up all we have, because their views are so narrow that they believe that nothing belongs to us.

On the other hand (and this opinion appears to me to be the result of the sound common sense of the great mass of the people of this country) there are those who believe that Canada has become a nation within the British empire and that when we lose no occasion to proclaim our loyalty our action should not belie our words. Some of us believe that we live in the best country of the world, under the best possible system of government, that the protection of Britain is our safeguard and the buttress of our progress and development. Many of us consider that for the present at all events and even from a business point of view alone, we are directly interested in the maintenance of British supremacy on the ocean, and that were that supremacy to be lost the result would be the most complete disturbance of our trade, without mentioning the uncertainty of our own national existence. Many of us believe that our dignity as a nation within the empire requires that we should begin to organize our own defence, the protection of our coasts and rivers, our fisheries and trade in order to secure by our own efforts our national existence. Some of us also aspire to a still greater future and consider the establishment of an exclusively Canadian navy as a guarantee of the coming greatness of the Dominion of Canada and as the last step towards nationhood of a great people. I belong to the latter class and I am prepared to vote in favour as the Bill brought down by the government, believing as I do that I am thereby doing my duty as a Canadian citizen and as a British subject.

On motion of Mr. Lewis, the debate was adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the naval debate go on to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 1, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 150) respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to 'The Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Company.'—Mr. Reid (Restigouche).

CLAIMS AGAINST GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 151) to provide for the adjudication of small claims arising in respect of the operation of the government railways. He said: The provisions of this Bill are, in short, to create of the Board of Railway Management a body that can be sued for small claims for damages, as they could be sued if they were a company, and that no fiat or petition shall be necessary before making such claims. There is a provision that under certain circumstances a case may be removed to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the limit of the claim?

Mr. GRAHAM. $200.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does it include actions for negligence, as well as under contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. Damages for negligence, but not under contract.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he expects to make any announcement before the end of the session with regard to the Waterways treaty?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All I can say is that I hope to be able to do so.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the Naval Service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, I believe we are face to face with a question which will have a greater bearing on the future prosperity, comfort, health, and wealth of the people of Canada than any other question that has been before this House, I was going to say, since confederation, but during the last decade. And, Sir, it is very gratifying to me, and it must be gratifying to every one, to know that both parties in this House are of one mind in regard to the great principle embodied in the Bill which is now before the House. As an evidence of that, I may cite the words of the hon. the Prime Minister, when he said that in case the supremacy of Great Britain on the high seas was endangered, it would be the duty of all the daughter nations to form a rampart around the motherland and protect her from attack; and in winding up his remarks, he said that the life of Canada depended on the safety of Great Britain, or words to that effect. And, Sir, those words were endorsed with stronger language by my own leader, the leader of the opposition.

What more significant event could there be than that which took place when, in one of the daughter nations, 3,000 miles removed from the motherland, 200 men, themselves descended from other lands, English, French, Irish, Scotch, German, and no doubt others, but citizens of the daughter nation, elected as the representatives of the people in parliament, rose, not by concerted action, but as one unanimous whole, and sang together that national anthem of the motherland in honour of him who is every inch a king and every inch a man. But, Sir, how absurd it must have seemed to some of the neighbouring nations when they saw afterwards that some of the rabid partisans of both sides and some of the newspapers, probably looking for news, were crawling over each other in the effort to establish the claim that the national anthem belonged to them, that they were the only true, loyal party, that they were the only party that belonged to the motherland. This country is downtrodden, or will be, if we keep on in the way we are going. And the people will be over-ridden and depressed by combines and trusts, and I call upon the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King) at this juncture to add to the Bill which he has laid before the House this session a provision that there shall be no combine or trust in reference to the national anthem, the national flag or the loyalty of this country. That pernicious, avaricious, unpatriotic idea should be stamped out. Why cannot we all be of one mind with respect to that matter? In reference to the question of loyalty, my grandfather, when a young man, in 1776, left the state of Connecticut and came to Canada to follow the flag. In 1812 he was one of the yeoman guards of the St. Lawrence river, repelling the American invasion, anl I take second place to no man with reference to my loyalty to the flag. Probably I know more than any one, excepting two hon. gentlemen in this House, when I say that there are no more loyal people than the sturdy yeomanry and mechanics of the riding from which I come. Who were more distressed, felt bluer or looked more so on the black days during the South African trouble than the men of Huron? Sir, it is easy enough in the large cities for young men to get together and enthuse and froth at the mouth in reference to loyalty, but when the scattered yeoman of the county from which I come came together and enthused in a patriotic way, as they did after the relief of Ladysmith and upon other notable occasions during the South African war, no one can require better evidence of their loyalty, and no overt act is needed. Outside the relatives of the men of the 42nd regiment, which was cut to pieces in South Africa, I do not believe there was a man in England who felt that event as keenly as did the people whose representative I am. I have been elected by the voters of West Huron to represent them in this parliament. This country is run by the larger of two parties, and it is impossible for all men of the different parties to think alike individual-

ly. Some have to give way to the others. It has been stated repeatedly in the Liberal press that the loyal opposition was divided on this question. I speak with knowledge when I say that there is no more division in the ranks of the opposition than there is in the ranks of the government. There are men on this side who will vote against their ideas and there are men on the other side who will vote against their ideas. There are Liberals who have been elected to follow the Liberal policy and to follow the Liberal party, and while they do not see eye to eye they will vote for their leader as we will vote for our leader. They would not be doing their duty if they did not do so. I wish to note that I have been told by hon. members on both sides of the House, personal friends of mine, that if I publicly took the stand which I have taken privately I will not return to this House the next general election. If so I shall be sorry, but I trust my people will believe I acted in their interest as I believe I do.

Mr. CONMEE. Tell us what it is.

Mr. LEWIS. The hon. gentleman is asking me for information. There are two bad habits becoming prevalent in this parliament which tend to warp the dignity of parliament and interefere with the continuity of debate. One is asking questions which generally, like boomerangs, recoil on the persons who ask them. I have been very sorry at times to hear questions from this side of the House, because I felt that the person who asked them sometimes got the worst of it and vice versa. I am only going to speak for ten minutes, and if any person wants information I will be glad to give it to him, if I can, when I get through, but until then I do not want to be interrupted. One of the important features of the question before the House is what is the great pressing danger threatening the British empire. There is no doubt that the supremacy and life of the mother country rest entirely upon the $400,000,000 of toll which she receives for the carrying of the commerce of the world, and without which she could not stand for a moment. The main question is: How can we, as we have all agreed to do, help the mother country if she is in trouble? I do not think, from the documents which I have read and some of which I will hand into the House, that there is any pressing danger as far as Germany is concerned. Lord Beresford and Lord Roberts come out here and say there is. They have earned the right to say what they like, but they are men of war and they come out here and talk of war. The great canal man would come here and talk of canals, the great medical man would come and talk about tuberculosis or similar matters, but it rests with us to give consideration to all these views and help the country in the best way we can. I believe, Sir, that what Germany is preparing for is intervention by the United States in South America.

In support of this contention I give not my own opinion, but that of Captain Mahan, the greatest living naval expert who has declared that the German fleet is not unlikely to be used to establish a new state of things in Brazil or to dispute the control of the Panama canal. I also cite as an authority the Ottawa 'Citizen,' in which it was stated that the Germans are looking for a large tract of country in the Argentine republic, and Professor Schmoiller, a German, has declared that he looks forward to the day when there will be a second Germany of 30,000,000 people in southern Brazil. And, Sir, in this connection I would point out that the emigration to Brazil and to South America is of an entirely different class from that which comes to the shores of the northern part of this hemisphere. The German who comes to the land of the beaver or the land of the screaming eagle is rapidly assimilated into the population and becomes a supporter of the established institutions of these countries, but the German immigrant to South America is German, first, last, and always. But, Sir, notwithstanding the fact that there are experts who assure us there is no danger to England from the German menace, it is nevertheless the part of prudence to be prepared for war. As a recent editorial in the Toronto 'Telegram' pointed out the unity of the British nations during the South African war prevented the terrible consequences of intervention by other nations, and the strength of the British fleet during the Spanish American war prevented intervention by Germany. The maxim is as true to-day as ever it was, that in time of peace we should prepare for war, and, Sir, the life blood of the British nation depends on the British fleet. The question then remains: How can we as Canadians discharge our duty to the motherland. I say, Sir, that the solution is not to be found in the creation of a Canadian navy. Canada as a country is not ready for militarism, and God forbid that militarism should ever thrive in this peaceful land. I stand here taking my political ife in my hands to say, that I am unqualifiedly, unreservedly, and unconditionally opposed to regular militarism in Canada whether it is to be found in an army or in a navy. Of course, I do not include in that our militia system, but, I should be horrified to think that there would be imported into this country that militarism which is the curse of some European countries and which can only end in officialism, red tape, circumlocution, poverty, and socialism. We have the evi-

dence at hand that our young Canadians will not join voluntarily—and they cannot be forced to join under our present happy conditions—the regular military service whether in the navy or in the army. I might point to the regular regiment at Halifax, which I believe is now only three-quarter strength, and I am told that 90 per cent of the men are British army pensioners. In a prosperous and growing country like Canada the young citizens of the country cannot be induced to give up their prospects and to tie themselves down to a life of idleness in the barrack room. For my part, I do not want to see in this country one-half the people working, slaving like the people in the old lands, keeping their noses to the grindstone, in order to support the other half in idleness preparing for a war which may never come. Then, I may be asked how do you expect to help the motherland? In a work entitled 'The A B C of the British navy,' prepared by Admiral Henderson and Mr. Russell, it is pointed out that the great need of the British fleet is men. Lord Beresford has intimated to the British House of Commons that four-fifths of the British fleet is undermanned, that one-half of it had only the nucleus of crews, that one-fifth of the fleet only had its full compliment, and in a document which I shall lay on the table of the House for publication in 'Hansard.'

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must read anything which he wishes to appear in 'Hansard.' The custom of the House is that anything that is to be published in 'Hansard' must be spoken or read.

Mr. LEWIS. Then, Sir, I will have to take up more time than I intended, and I regret having to do so, but I am in hopes that these citations may have some bearing on the question before the House. The literary digest, as quoted in the London 'Standard,' and the Hamburgher 'Nachrichten,' referring to the report of a German naval expert on the British navy says:

England's Half-manned Ships.

England at present, to judge from her parliamentary reports, is in a terrible condition of alarm over Germany's naval expansion. Each party blamed the other because ships with less than half crews had been ordered to sea. 'We have the ships, we have the men, we have the money too,' rang the old music-hall song. It is now admitted that England has the money, and can make as many ships as she chooses, but the men are wanting. The present state of things we thus summarize from the London 'Standard':—

The grave position of the home fleet is made plain in the details of its units as it assembles to-day off the mouth of the Thames for a cruise. Although it is composed of four squadrons, consisting in all of eleven battleships and fourteen cruisers, the startling fact is disclosed that of these twenty-five vessels, fourteen are dangerously undermanned.

Of the undermanned vessels, six battleships have only half-crews; two of the cruisers have half-crews, while the remaining cruisers have only two-fifths crews.

Fourteen of the twenty-five ships, therefore, can not manœuvre with the remaining eleven, can not fight, and can not run away. It is officially announced that this British war fleet is to exercise in the North Sea—where it will be subject to the keenest foreign criticism.

Commenting editorially on this avowal, the 'Standard' observes:—

Such is the fleet which Mr. McKenna has sent to manœuvre in the North Sea in winter. The useless hardship unnecessarily inflicted upon officers and men, the gratuitous waste of money, need no comment. But there are wider aspects of this incredible action to be considered. These are two. The first may be briefly indicated. At a time of somewhat critical international relations, the first lord sends to sea a fleet of twenty-five ships which an efficient squadron of half its size could sink or destroy, and the pitiable state of disorganization and weakness to which the British fleet has been reduced is advertised in the face of the whole world.

Of the keen foreign criticism which this London organ anticipates we may perhaps find a sample in the following remarks of the 'Hamburger Nachrichten':—

'It is not the ships but the men that do the fighting,' still remains the truest of dictums. And yet one often hears the question of a navy's strength or weakness decided merely by the number of its vessels—cruisers, battleships, torpedo boats, and submarines. As to the question of the number of her sailors, the recently formed reserve fleet is both undermanned and undertrained, but probably this will not be recognized until the moment of mobilization, which will result in its incorporation in the regular fleet. But what is very apparent is that in case of war Great Britain will suffer most from the insufficient manning of her own vessels.—Translation made for the 'Literary Digest,' March 27, 1909.

I cite the following from the Ottawa 'Citizen':

Men wanted in Navy—Ships are wasted for lack of Hands—Some have two-fifths of the Complement—Where will Crews be found for New Ships?

London, Oct. 25.—It has been stated officially that the battleships of the Albion class, which are to be stationed at the Nore as a reserve for the home fleet, are to be manned with reduced nucleus crews—that is to say, with about two-fifths of their full complements.

The ships of the Albion class—the Albion, Canopus, Glory, Goliath, Ocean, and Vengeance—though not large vessels, are very useful. They are of 12,950 tons, and carry four 12-inch and twelve 6-inch guns, and are still capable of making eighteen knots when pushed. They have all been completed since 1900.

The Albions will join a number of ships

which are already laid up in reserve, manned with a fraction of their nominal complements.

The obstacle in the way of sending them to sea, however, is shortage of men.

Among the battleships which are laid up at the home ports in the third and fourth divisions of the home fleet are eight ships of the Majestic class—ships of 14,900 tons, armed with four 12-inch and twelve 6-inch guns and completed in 1895-8. These ships have—or are supposed to have— about three-fifths of their full complement on board, a large proportion of the short service men, who spend their years in the navy, principally in the ships, and are then passed into the reserve without any adequate training in the work of a sea-going fleet.

The 'Prince George,' of this class, is kept 'in dockyard hands,' for no other reason, apparently, than to save the cost of a crew.

Now, Sir, we have been told by the First Lord of the Admiralty in England that the preponderance of Great Britain in ships is so great that he absolutely refuses—I quote his own words to take over ships which are being built in England for foreign countries:

No Cause for Alarm—Britain is quite Safe—First Lord of the Admiralty says the present supply of Dreadnoughts is Ample.

London, March 25, 1909.—Reginald McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, stated in the House of Commons that he declined to consider the advisability of purchasing one or other of the three Brazilian battleships now under construction in this country. He added:—

If we require more ships I think it would be better to build them ourselves, but we don't require any more ships at present. As regards the future, we will have ample time to build them.

I have some short citations here which I would like to have published in 'Hansard' without taking up the time of the House to read them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I regret that I cannot grant permission to the hon. gentleman because it has led to abuses in the past. The 'Hansard' must be a report of what is said or read in the House.

Mr. LEWIS. Then, Sir, I trust that when the Prime Minister is revising the rules of the House he will make provision under which such citations as these may be printed without being read. Were such a rule in force it would in my opinion lead to a great saving of time. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that England is not wanting in ships at the present time. England is building a $40,000,000 navy for Spain, she is building three battleships for Brazil, she is building two for Chili, two ships for Italy, and other ships for other foreign countries, and under agreement with the builder the British government has the right to take these ships at any time they are needed. We have, as I have read, the refusal of the First Lord of the Admiralty to take these ships because he says they are not needed, and this would seem to establish good ground for my saying that England is not in need of ships. Now, Mr. Speaker, while I agree with the naval policy of the government—(and in this I am speaking for mysel alone) with regard to building dry docks which are needed in this country, I absolutely disagree with them as to the building of a Canadian navy. As was said to me by a gentleman from the west, a man who knows the feeling of the people in the west as well as any other man in the House: Canada needs a navy just about as much as a man needs a fur overcoat in that land to which a good many of us are going hereafter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, Sir, a word with regard to battle ships. If we looked at the history of the three last wars, the Chinese-Japanese war, the Russo-Japanese war, and the Spanish-American war, it will be seen that the naval strength of a nation depends on her battleships. In the A. B. C. of the British navy by Admiral Henderson and Mr. Russell, the dictum is laid down that the great final issue will be decided by the battleships alone; it was so at Trafalgar in days of hemp and wood; it is still so in the day of steam and steel. Therefore, Sir, if ships we are to have, it would seem that the best thing to provide are battleships, and together on the firing line. I cite that great family paper the Montreal 'Star':

The mobilization of a great British fleet of three hundred and fifty warships is a magnificent object lesson of the naval power of the empire. No such object lesson would appear if we were told that six British fleets were being mobilized—one in the home waters, another off Halifax, a third off Vancouver, a fourth near Australia, a fifth near New Zealand, and, possibly, a sixth under Table Mountain. Yet this division of the fleet and wide scattering of its power would be the logical outcome of the proposal to establish colonial navies.

The 'Free Press' of Ottawa, on March 24, 1909, in an editorial headed 'Has Canada gone Batty also?' said:

We believe that the great body of public opinion in this country is against the idea of Canada being drawn into the vortex of European militarism.

The Huron 'Expositor,' Seaforth, Friday October 15, 1909:

The announcement is officially made that the imperial government of Germany will ask for a loan of $125,000,000, this enormous amount being required to cover deficits. This is one of the first fruits of intense militarism.

The common people are being ground to death to maintain an army and navy to gratify the vanity of the ruling elements and to provide positions for the sons of the aristocracy where they can have an affluent living at the expense of the toiling masses.

Now, Sir, how can we help the mother country? There is one way in which we can help her, and if the English experts knew it, they would at once grasp the idea. We have in this country 84,323 fishermen, the finest men that sail the waters, in the maritime provinces and on the great lakes, the descendants of those men who sailed the cutters of England and the luggers of France; and we have 11,490 sailors on the great lakes. I am sorry that we have not more sailors on the ocean, because we have hardly an ocean-going steamship or vessel under the Canadian flag. These men are busy in their vocation for six months in the year; and if you came with vessels of the type of the 'Charybdis,' and asked them to volunteer for a navy, you could not get one of them to leave his big pay and his prospects. But after their return on the first of December, and after they had their holiday of one month at home, this government on the second of January of each year could get 40,000 or 50,000 of these men—and I guarantee that I could get 5,000 from the shores of my own lake and 200 from my own town—sailors, stokers and engineers, to volunteer to go to Halifax or Vancouver and take three months' training at the big guns; and I would suggest that this government do not buy any expensive warships, which will be scrap in a few years, but make an arrangement with the motherland under which she will send out a dozen or more men-of-war on which these young men can be trained. Canada to pay them. I will guarantee that after three years' training 40,000 young Canadians would be likely to give as good an account of themselves as the several thousand Canadians, Australians and New Zealanders who went to South Africa during the Boer war and there gave evidence of their loyalty. Why, Sir, the people of my county were tumbling over each other to get to the recruiting office in their desire to be taken to South Africa. We could have sent 10,000 from western Ontario in case the motherland got into trouble, to say nothing of the two or three hundred we did send. I also quote the words of the Earl of Clan William, in an interview with the Toronto 'News' last July:

> Canada would do a great service to the empire if it built up a reserve of seamen, who would be invaluable in case of war breaking out.

If the Admiralty were asked if they would prefer forty thousand sailors trained to big guns they would say yes. I say it advisedly, from investigations made by myself and by members on both sides of the House who have spoken to me on the matter, that I believe that four out of every five men in Ontario—and I have heard the same from other provinces—do not believe in a navy for Canada, and I believe there are more who are against a contribution to the motherland. Some people go wild on the subject of imperialism; but, Sir, there are threads of love and affection and friendship and sentiment uniting us to the motherland which, though fine as silk, are stronger than steel. But, Sir, if you are going to try to put handcuffs of iron on the hands of the free Canadian citizen, and try to put him in an iron cage, those handcuffs will snap like thread. There is no overt act of loyalty required from a Canadian. We are always ready when the time comes. There is a definition of ingenuity which applies to the Canadian people—to do the right thing at the right time without being asked to do it. But, Sir, when you ask us to repay those bonds of love and friendship and kinship with money or with paid help, you are making a mistake. There is nothing like personal service in matters of this kind. In reference to the British men of war and the Canadian seaman, I cite the case of a present editor of the Toronto 'Globe,' Mr. Ewan, who was sent by his paper in 1899 down to the island of Newfoundland, to go round that island with the British fleet, which was trying the expedient of ascertaining what Newfoundland sailors were made of. They went from port to port and called the fishermen and sailors together and spoke to them. At first the men were averse to any questioning. Finally a large number, probably 2,000 or 3,000, volunteered for a voyage to the West Indies and back. They went and returned, and the British admiral was very much pleased with them, and they were pleased with their experience in handling the big guns. What was the result? The British admiralty sent out the 'Charybdis' and tried to get men to volunteer for the whole year, but they found that it was an absolute impossibility. We are not ready for regular militarism in this country. Now, Sir, as to war: It is not a question of ships altogether—and I probably know more about it than most other members of this House, from my youthful training on vessels, though I have never been on a man-of-war—it is not a question of ships or of the number of men, but it is a question of the quality of the men. It is the man behind the gun. Drake's ships would not have roared so loudly or so strongly had they been manned by others than the seamen who did man them. Why cannot these two parties meet together on this great question and do what is best under the circumstances? Both parties are asking Canada, which knows all about rail-

ways, to build battleships. We do not know anything about battleships, but we do know that we have the best class of men to man them that can be found anywhere, and they are all from the same common stock Frenchmen and Englishmen, they all come from the same stock. I have it on the authority of a high personage in this House that when the Welsh sailors and fishermen, from which stock I am descended, and the French mariners from St. Malo, and other ports in the province of Normandy and Britany—St. Malo, famous as the point from which Jacques Cartier came originally—when these two nationalities meet in the channel on their fishing voyages, they speak to each other in the one mother tongue although parted for centuries. That shows conclusively that we are all descended from the one stock, and there should not be any division among us in this matter as regards loyalty. We ought all to be one in that sentiment.

I repeat that I am absolutely opposed to spending $25,000,000 for a Canadian navy or $25,000,000 for two Dreadnoughts. There are one million people who pay the taxes of this country, and that means a tax of $25 on every man of them. There is not one of them who will stand for it. It is not a question of going to the country. There are enough people in the country who would vote for men and not for measures, but if a plebiscite were taken, both the policy of the government, and the opposition would be defeated by an overwhelming majority.

His Majesty, King Edward, our sovereign, has by his wisdom, policy, and tact, earned the title of Edward the Peacemaker, yet still his battleships are being launched with increasing rapidity, each new one stronger than its predecessor in every thing that goes to making a fighting machine. And that supremacy on the high seas, which England gained 300 years ago from Spain, has continued until this day, and has ever been the greatest safeguard to the peace of the world. I look to see the day when England and Celtic peoples shall be bound together in one harmonious whole—Gael and Gaul alike—for the peace of the world.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN (South Huron). Under ordinary circumstances, I should feel almost like apologizing to the House for taking part in a discussion which has been so prolonged. But since I have the honour of a seat in this House, and while I have been endeavouring to attend to the discharge of the duties pertaining to that position to the best of my ability, I do not think I have trespassed upon the time of the House by over much, or over long speaking; and I might be permitted to say, without desiring to give offence to any one, that if some hon. gentlemen were to follow my example in this respect, there would not be such necessity for revising the rules of the House. In this matter, however, I feel that I would not be doing justice to myself or those I represent were I to give a silent vote. The question we are discussing is probably the most important that has come before parliament since confederation. It involves an entirely new departure. It means the inauguration of an entirely new policy, rendered necessary by the increased prosperity and influence of this country, and its increased attachment to the empire.

I have no very great objection to many of the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend and good neighbour from West Huron (Mr. Lewis) who has just spoken, and consequently I do not intend attempting to make any particular answer to any particular point he has raised; but there are some things on which he has dwelt to which perhaps I shall refer as I proceed. But at the outset, let me say that I do not intend to treat this question from a technical, scientific, or even constitutional standpoint. Technically I know very little about it, but I shall endeavour to deal with it from a plain, practical, common sense point of view. In my opinion, having regard to the very great importance of this subject, it is necessary that the people in every constituency should be seized of all the conditions, and the only way which they can get that information is through the discussion in this parliament. Consequently I feel that any discussion on this matter is not by any means time wasted. As I have said I intend to deal with it from a plain, practical, common sense standpoint, and the question before the House, stripped of all superfluity, may be reduced to a very plain, practical, easily understood proposition. In the first place, the opposition propose that a large sum of money be donated to Great Britain for the purpose of enabling her to improve and extend her navy, Great Britain to continue the expense and the responsibility of the naval protection of Canada, and the money which we give to Great Britain to be expended in that country for the benefit of British ship builders and artisans. On the other hand the proposition of the government is that a lesser amount of money be devoted towards the establishment or erection of the nucleus of a Canadian navy for the protection of our own shores, thus relieving Great Britain of the expense and responsibility of the naval protection of this country, and this money to be expended in our own country for the benefit of Canadian ship builders and artisans and also for the purpose of building up a larger shipbuilding industry in Canada which will give

employment to thousands of our working people and enlarge the home market for our farmers and manufacturers. It is quite proper that I should say that our love for and devotion to the mother country is only right and proper. Filial affection, I am sure, is one of the noblest traits of human nature; but filial affection divorced from self-preservation does not amount to a very great deal. It is the boy, the young man, which makes the best use of his opportunities and the gifts with which he has been endowed, and who shows a disposition to carve out his own future and to paddle his own canoe who is always dearest to the mother's heart. And, Sir, if Canada shows a disposition to take advantage of the great privileges which have been placed in her way, of the great natural advantages with which she has been endowed, and if she shows a disposition to take care of herself and do what is right and necessary in her own interest, she will, I contend, do that which is most likely to win the esteem and confidence and trust of the people of Great Britain and of every other country.

Sir, I was sorry to notice, whether consciously or unconsciously, running through nearly every speech of hon. gentlemen opposite, a vein deprecatory of Canada and of Canadians.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Yes; we had it stated here, over and over again, that Canadians have not the ability nor the skill to construct their own ships. We have had Australians held up to us as a bright and shining example because she has sent her money to Great Britain and looks to Great Britain to construct her ships. We have heard, in almost every speech from the opposite side of the House, attempts made to detract from the honour and credit which is due to the right hon. the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Attempts have been made, time and time again, to show that he is disloyal to his country, that he has betrayed the trust which was reposed in him by the people, and that he is not acting in good faith with the people, and so on and so on; and, lastly, that he is introducing a policy which is simply the thin end of the wedge of disruption of the empire. One hon. member—I think it was the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan)—spoke for two mortal hours here the other night, and at least one-third of his speech was devoted to that sort of thing. Sir, the name and memory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier will remain bright and green in the minds and hearts and affections of the people of Canada long after the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) and I are forgotten. We have also had a brilliant word-picture placed before us showing Great Britain at war with Germany; her immense fleets were assembled upon the high seas; the word went forth to Australia and she came forward courageously and promptly with her fleet unit: the word went forth to little New Zealand and she came forth, with equal promptitude, with her Dreadnoughts: the word went forth to Canada, and she came up at the heel of the hunt with her 'tin pot navy.' And when the great British admiral cast his eye over his assembled fleet as they rode the sea ready for action, he looked upon Australia and beamed upon her with pleasure and pride; he looked upon New Zealand and she equally met with his approval; he looked upon Canada, he frowned upon Canada, and ordered her to the rear and instructed her to sail for her own shores as fast as her ships could carry her: and poor Canada had neither part nor lot in the bloodless conflict of that picture. When I heard all this, it seemed to me that the author of it should have been a novelist instead of a politician. I ask: When has Canada undertaken any great national enterprise and has not carried it out successfully? Have not Canada's sons, in almost every department of life and in every country of the world, signalized their ability and proven their integrity and uprightness and every characteristic which goes to make a good, a worthy, a proper man? Wherever the sons of Canada have come into competition with the people of other countries, have they not almost invariably come to the front? If there is one thing more than another for which I am truly thankful it is that I am a Canadian. I am proud of Canada, and proud of Canada's sons; and I have not the least hesitation in saying that, should Canada undertake to construct a navy, she will have a navy that will be a credit to her at home and abroad. And should this country, unfortunately, be dragged into a war either at home or abroad, I for one do not doubt that Canada's sons will acquit themselves with the same prowess, the same bravery that has distinguished them and given them a name in every country of the world. In view of the facts, I say that it is not fair, it is not manly, for hon. members opposite to endeavour to cover their veiled insinuations against Canada by loud protestations of loyalty to the mother country.

But there is something else that should be said. I believe it is the duty of every true Canadian to preach, and, in so far as he can, to practise the doctrine of peace and not the doctrine of war. For the future of this great and growing and grand country depends upon the farm and the factory and not upon the sword or the battleship.

I notice that in nearly every speech hon. gentlemen opposite profess disappointment with the provisions of the Bill now before the House on the ground that it is not

comprehensive enough, that it does not go far enough. I, too, am disappointed, but I am agreeably disappointed; for, I am free to confess, I did have a lingering fear, if I might so express it, that the government would ask this House to commit the country to an elaborate scheme requiring an immediate expenditure of millions of money which, I think, could be more profitably devoted to developing the latent resources of the country. I therefore say that it is a fortunate thing for Canada that we have in power at this time a government, and more particularly a prime minister, with the stamina and courage to resist this wave of jingoism which seems to be passing over the country, and to refuse to do unwise and foolish things which afterwards the people might regret for many years to come. No person dreads war, or is more opposed to militarism, than I am. And I think it does not say much for the Christian civilization of the twentieth century when the civilized nations of the world cannot come together and agree on some more rational and sensible means of settling their disputes than in wasting their money in armaments and their efforts in killing one another. But we must take conditions as we find them. And we find that the nations of the world have not yet reached what we might call the ideal point, when they can settle their disputes upon a rational and sensible basis and in a manner which would be a credit to the integrity and character and intelligence of the country. Until such is the case, we must meet conditions as we find them. And I am free to confess that, in my judgment, the time has come in the history of Canada when it is necessary that we should make some fitting preparation to meet the requirements of the country in this direction.

Such a time does come I think in the history of almost every country and every nation, and it comes to a lesser extent even to municipalities. For example, for a village or a town one policeman is ample for the purpose of maintaining peace and order within that municipality; but when that town grows to become a large, populous and influential city. a whole regiment of policemen are required. So it is with Canada. If I may be allowed to use the expression, Canada has emerged from the town stage to the large, prosperous and influential city stage, and consequently it is necessary that some provision should be made such as is now proposed. I would not have been disappointed, in fact possibly I would have been rather pleased, if the government had seen fit to adopt a smaller plan than that which is proposed. But there is not sufficient difference between them to justify a difference of opinion, as both are practically the same in principle. But I believe in making this provision, we should commence on a modest scale such as the government proposes, and that we should allow the enterprise to grow in strength as the country grows in strength, power, wealth and influence. Also, I think that what we do should be done under the direction of Canada, and should remain entirely under the control of Canada. And we should take very great care indeed not to allow this country to become in any way entangled or mixed up with old world troubles or difficulties. What I mean is that we should keep Canada in this position, that if even Great Britain should engage in a war of which we did not approve, the justice and righteousness of which we were not convinced of, this country should stand aloof, as we have done on other occasions, and act the part of a looker-on. But if, on the other hand, Great Britain became engaged in a war of self defence, or for any interest of humanity, or for purposes which appealed to our sympathies and our sense of right, then we should join in and help Great Britain even to the extent of our last dollar and our last man.

I also believe that whatever we do should be done entirely in the interest and for the benefit of Canada, and not in payment of any supposed debt which we owe the mother country. Now the idea has pervaded the speeches of many hon. members opposite, and especially the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto, that Canada is in some way materially and morally indebted, even immensely indebted, to Great Britain, and that this proposed donation is in payment of that supposed debt. Now, Sir, I am not in the habit of proclaiming my loyalty from the house-tops, but I take no second place to any man in my loyalty to Great Britain, the birth-place and home of my forefathers. But, Sir, I am a Canadian, I am loyal to Canada first, last and all the time; and I think that at the present time perhaps a little plain speaking on this subject might not do any harm. I say this claim of our hon. friends opposite that we are greatly indebted to Great Britain is a fallacy which cannot be supported by fact. As a Canadian, I wish to say that in a material sense we are not indebted to Great Britain for anything, and in no sense is Canada indebted to her for more than good will and filial affection. If I desired to establish that point, I think I could do so by a few words which fell from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in the concluding part of his address in this House. I understand that that hon. gentleman is the leader of the Conservative party of the great province of Quebec; I know he is a deputy leader of hon. gentlemen oppo-

site. So long as he is their leader, they are responsible for his utterances until they repudiate his leadership. I have not heard that they have endeavoured in any sense so far to repudiate his leadership, and I think they dare not do it; consequently they are responsible for his expressions in this House and elsewhere as their political leader.

Now, Sir, I would like to bring the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite down from the realm of pure sentiment in which some of them so much delight to dwell, to plain facts, every day facts. If I can do this, they will find that Canada has never received one dollar from Great Britain for which she has not given a good big dollar's worth in return. It may be said, and it has been said in this House, that Great Britain furnishes us our best market for our surplus products. That is quite true, but it is equally true that this is a mutual obligation, because Great Britain requires our products just as much as we require her market. And she has never given us the fraction of a cent more for our products, for our apples, our cheese, our butter, our bacon, our bullocks, our cereals, than she could get them for elsewhere, or because they were Canadian. On the contrary, she has persistently, for years, maintained against this country a barrier to our live stock going into her markets. Now remember I do not blame her for this. If she considers such a policy in the interest of her own people she has a perfect right to pursue that policy, and we have no right to complain. But what I want to point out is this, that Great Britain adopts the policy which she considers in the interest of her own people, irrespective of the results which it may have upon Canada; and so I say in that respect as well as in other respects we should follow her example. It has always been said in this House and throughout the press of this country that most of our great national enterprises are carried on by means of British capital. That is quite true, but it is equally true that we have never borrowed one dollar from Great Britain for which we have not given her the highest current rate of interest and the very best security. It is equally true that she has never loaned us a dollar upon better or more favourable terms than she has loaned to other countries.

But, Sir, the most silly contention I think I have ever heard made in this House is that she has protected our shores from invasion by foreign foes. Now I ask when, in the memory of living man, have our shores been even threatened by a foreign foe? The only occasion I remember is what was known as the Fenian Raid, and that was not inspired by any dislike for Canada but by a dislike for Great Britain, because she denied to a certain portion of her subjects the rights and privileges which they thought, and which I think, they were justly entitled to. The last contention along that line that I shall refer to is that she has protected our commerce on the high seas. That is also quite true, but it is equally true that any protection she has afforded to Canada in that way has been purely incidental. She has protected her own breadstuffs and she has afforded to Canada in that respect the same protection that she has afforded to other countries and nations from which she has drawn these breadstuffs. I do not give these illustrations in the way of complaining that we have not received just and proper treatment from Great Britain. On the contrary, I give them to show, in the interest and in defence of Canada, that Canada has done her whole duty to the mother country, that she has not played the part of a sponge absorbing everything and giving out nothing.

Let me refer for a moment or two to the amendment which has been placed before this House by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I think we can divide it into three parts very properly and justly. In the first place, it is proposed that Canada should bestow on the mother country a gift of from $22,000,000 to $25,000,000; secondly, that a real emergency exists by reason of the danger of war between Great Britain and Germany, and thirdly, that Canada should provide a navy of her own, but that before she does so she should take a plebiscite of the people. Now let me consider each one of these proposals, made by our friends opposite, separately. The first is that Canada should bestow on the mother country a gift of from $22,000,000 to $25,000,000. Why, in all that is sensible, should Canada give to the mother country any such sum? If the mother country were in need of this money, if she were in stress, then I say that it would be quite right and proper for Canada to give her that money, and it would be the duty of Canada to do so. But, is the mother country in need of money? No, as the boys say, she has money to burn. From the money standpoint she could buy out Canada twenty times over and that being the case why should we in this House vote the hard earned money of the labourer, the artisan, the farmer, the merchant and the manufacturer of this country to fill the already over-flowing coffers of Great Britain? I do not think we would be justified in doing anything of the kind, because there is no necessity for it. Now, let us come to the second proposition that an emergency exists. In order to prove their case hon. gen-

tlemen opposite must, of necessity, prove that an emergency does exist, and if they fail to do so, in my humble judgment, their whole case falls to the ground. How have they gone about proving an emergency exists? They have quoted from the speeches delivered by British statesmen over a year ago, speeches that were delivered for an election and for political purposes and also for the purpose of bringing the British people to a realization that they had not been keeping up their navy to the standard which it formerly had been kept up to, and that it was necessary to provide funds for that purpose. That, Sir, was the object, and in these respects it has been realized. The emergency has passed over, the scare is no more, and now only exists in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, Mr. Speaker, who is it that they have sought to show that Great Britain has really to be afraid of? Afraid of Germany. Why should she be afraid of Germany? Are not the ties of kinship as well as of commerce, against any such proposition? Is not Great Britain one of Germany's very best customers? Is not Germany one of Great Britain's very best customers? Why then should Germany desire to destroy her best customer? It is said that Germany is rapidly increasing her navy. That is quite true, but it is necessary that she should increase her navy just the same as it is necessary for France, or Austria, or Japan, or other surrounding countries to do so. She was obliged by that necessity to do it, and it was not for the purpose of going to war with Great Britain. Let me tell you that the Germans are not a foolish people, the Germans are not a people who are foolish enough to bite off their noses to spite their faces. They are an intelligent, hard-headed, frugal, enterprising, law-abiding people and they know too well upon which side their bread is buttered to instigate a war with Great Britain or with any other country that they are so dependent upon as they are dependent upon Great Britain at the present time. There is a word that I would like to say here if the House will pardon me for a short digression. I was very much pleased and delighted at the intimation which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) gave to the House the other day, that the little commercial war which had been in existence between Canada and Germany for a few years had been closed up and that a truce had been proclaimed. I was not pleased so much on account of the improvement in the commercial relations that that would accomplish, or the commercial advantages that might accrue to Canada from that, although I have no doubt they will be very considerable, but I think it will have a strong tendency to encourage immigration from Germany to Canada, and we cannot get a better class of immigrants from any country in the world than we can from Germany. It has been proved in this country time and time again, and any of us who have German settlers in our constituencies know how valuable these settlers are in the cities, towns, villages and communities, in which they live throughout this province without any other evidence. They are an industrious, well-doing, enterprising, law-abiding people and we cannot get Canada populated with a better class than the German people. Now let me come to the third part of the amendment, that Canada should provide a navy of her own, but before she does so should take a plebiscite of the people. I do like consistency, but I am sure there is no consistency in the position taken by the leader of the opposition in this amendment. He is quite willing that $25,000,000 of the money of the people of this country should be given to Great Britain right off the reel, without a word, for the benefit and advancement of the people of that country. But, Sir, when it comes to devoting a smaller sum of money to the development of the manufacturing industries of this country for the purpose of constructing a navy for our own protection, for the protection of our own shores, the whole of which money will be expended in this country, then forsooth, we must go to the country and ask for the consent of the people. As far as I can judge the amendment of my hon. friend was moved simply for the purpose of gathering in the stray lambs of the flock and herding them into one fold on the division. An hon. friend remarks that there are no lambs in that flock. Perhaps they are all grown sheep. If we really desire to aid Great Britain, and if we could aid her I think it is right and proper that we should do so. I think that we could do this much more effectively by helping ourselves, by devoting every dollar that we can raise to the development of the great natural resources of this country, by extending, improving and increasing our traffic highways to the sea-board and from the sea-board across the Atlantic, so that we can lay down our products in the British markets, and her products in our markets in the least possible time, in the best possible condition, and at least possible cost. We should provide profitable investments for the immense horde of surplus capital in Great Britain, and we should provide comfortable homes for the teeming millions of her population. These are the ways in which I think we could aid Great Britain much more effectively, much more to her interests as well as to our own interest, than by presenting her with Dreadnoughts, which, by the time they are constructed, will, in all probability, be fit for the scrap heap,

and for which there is no necessity. In this way, I think we should work and build up on this continent a great nation which will be at least the equal, if it does not surpass, the greatest of the great nations of the civilized world. A nation that will work in harmony and consonance with the old mother who will look with pride and pleasure justly upon her brightest and best sons. This, Mr. Speaker, is an ambition worthy of young Canada. This, Sir, is an ambition which is worthy of our best energy, and our best intellect, and we have the men to accomplish it. Let us set ourselves to this work, and do it to the very best of our ability, and let us place this country of ours in the position which nature has destined her to occupy. And, Sir, if we do this, if each one of us does his duty, we need not trouble ourselves very much about difficulties between Germany and Great Britain. Why, thirty-five years ago, or possibly a little more, we had a similar scare to this. We had then precisely the same arguments which are to-day being used by hon. gentlemen opposite and notwithstanding all that, no trouble and no war between Germany and Great Britain has supervened in all these years. On the contrary, these two great countries have worked hand in hand together, and in trading with each other peacefully, they both have made profit, while advancing their own interests. Under such circumstances is it not a craven and cowardly thing for hon. gentlemen opposite, to be going up and down this country whining that Great Britain is afraid of being swallowed up by Germany. This is a species of loyalty which we on this side of the House, at all events, do not profess.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I have listened to most of the speeches which have been delivered on the question before the House, and I cannot but feel that this parliament is now dealing with a measure of unparalleled importance in the history of Canada. There are three things which present themselves for our consideration as Canadians; the first is: the consolidation of the British empire; the second is: the maintenance of that empire, the greatest the world has known; and the third is the question as to what best we can do to bring about peace among the nations of the world. It is well, Sir, that we should consider this question free from personal or party bitterness and controversy I could not help but think this afternoon, in listening to the speech of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) that his language did not express the sentiments of the people of his riding. He has talked a great deal about autonomy, as most hon. gentleman on his side have done, and in this connection I would like him to explain the relation between paragraph 4 of this Bill and paragraph 18. It would be a great comfort to members on this side of the House if hon. gentlemen opposite would reconcile these features of the Bill, the one with the other. Section 4 of the Bill distinctly states, as does clause 15 of the British North America Act, that the Canadian navy shall be placed under the control of the King, but section 18 of the Bill just as distinctly states that the government of Canada shall have control of the navy and that they need not send it to war unless they wish to do so. This seems a contradiction. Then again, gentlemen opposite have been telling us that they are greatly in favour of peace throughout the world. The Minister of Labour, speaking in Harvard University hoped to see the day when the government of Canada and the government of the United States would join in building a monument on the border line to celebrate 100 years of peace. On the 8th of July last, the Prime Minister endorsed that suggestion of his Minister of Labour, and on the same day, speaking in Plattsburg, New York, the Postmaster General used this language:

> Sir, is this not the fittest occasion to proclaim our determination that now on and forever the American Commonwealth and the Dominion of Canada shall always promote and advance the cause of peace, harmony and civilization on this vast continent.
>
> There are heroes of peace as there are heroes of war, under different flags we are pressing towards a single goal—freedom, righteousness and duty.

But, where is that hero of peace to-day? Did we not find him a few weeks ago urging his compatriots to furnish the money to build a Canadian navy, which by the way I may say would be of no use to Canada for her own defence and of no service to Great Britain in time of war. I quote the words of the Postmaster General from 'Hansard':

> Why should we not have a navy as we have an army? The Canadian militia began fifty years ago; it is now a fighting force. May I not prophesy the same happy results for the Canadian navy.

Are we to understand from the Postmaster General that fifty years hence we will have a fighting force, in our navy? Well, it is quite possible that half a century in the future the Canadian navy, as proposed in this Bill, may be of some consequence. Then again, the Postmaster General says:

> We must exhibit our fighting qualities and take care of ourselves against the United States.

And the member for Huron (Mr. McLean) gives his hearty approval to such language. Are we to say to the people of the United States: Wait a little longer until

Canada has built a fleet, wait until we have abrogated the Rushe-Bagot treaty and built our cruisers on the great lakes? Is that what hon. gentlemen opposite would wish as the outcome of this navy? I can tell the Prime Minister that the United States ship builders would only be too glad to see the abrogation of the Rushe-Bagot treaty so that they might build on the great lakes war ships and naval armament. And, Sir, does the protection of our shores only mean the Atlantic and Pacific coast line, are we not to take into consideration all of the 7,600 miles of shore line which we have in this Dominion? On the eastern coast we have 3,000 miles of shore line between the United States boundary and Hudson straits; on the west we have 1,000 miles of coast line between the United States boundary and Alaska, and in addition we have 3,600 miles of boundary line between the United States and Canada. When you take into consideration that most of our wars have come from the United States, one can readily understand that in preparing for coast defence it is necessary also to take into consideration preparation for the defence of the boundary line between Canada and the republic to the south. It must be remembered that were England to be engaged in a war with Germany, there are 16,000,000 Germans in the United States who would not sympathize with the Monroe doctrine being enforced on the northern half of this continent. Then, have we not some duty to protect our mercantile marine? When we realize that 70,000,000 tons of water-borne freight passes through the Clair river every year, and that a large portion of it is carried by Canadian merchant marine, we must also realize that that merchant marine demands protection.

When we realize that we own half of this continent, with seven millions of people scattered over its length and breadth, we must see that with our limited resources it would be perfect folly on our part to attempt to protect all our boundary line. Have not the people of Sarnia, Goderich, Sault Ste. Marie, Port Arthur and many other prominent cities on our great lakes just as good a right to expect shipyards and dockyards to be built in them as many of the cities on our eastern and western coasts? If we enter upon a career of navy building, as proposed by this government, we will have no end of competing cities on our coasts all wanting to build ships of war. If we pass this Bill we enter on a mad race for naval construction, and commit our people to an indefinite, perpetual and ever-draining policy. The Canadian people are a patriotic people, proud of their homes, their lands and their progress. They do not shrink from assisting the motherland; but I do not believe that they are anxious to undertake the expenditure which this government is proposing for the purpose of building a navy, especially one that will not be of any definite help to Great Britain. The defence of the empire is not the defence of the British islands alone, but includes the defence of Great Britain's colonies and dependencies. The Prime Minister may well say that when Great Britain is at war, Canada is at war, because the only hope of Canada remaining a part of the British empire depends upon Great Britain having the command of the sea. If Great Britain were defeated in a war, of what good would be all this talk about autonomy and having the rights of the people of Canada protected? I am absolutely opposed to militarism in every sense of the word; but I realize that there is only one court of appeal to which nations can go at present, and that court is war. However, I sincerely hope and believe that the day is not far distant when the nations of the world will come together in a bond of peace and submit their differences to a court of arbitration similar to the Hague tribunal, and war will be no more. Only a few weeks ago I received a letter from a Mr. Marburg, in the city of Baltimore, at whose home a conference was held a few nights previous at which a large number of prominent citizens of the United States were present. At the conference a plan of campaign was mapped out for this continent and the different nations of Europe to educate the people up to a sense of their duty on this question of peace. The President of the United States, Senator Root and many other prominent men have given their hearty approval to the project. Within the next few months we may expect to see a propaganda started for the holding of public meetings in the United States and in Canada to urge the people to assist in bringing about a cessation of the mad rush for armaments on the part of the nations of the world. I sincerely trust that whatever can be done in the way of assisting this movement will be done by the men of Canada. Until we are able to build a navy worthy of the name, or until international peace is consummated, it would be folly for us to undertake to build such a navy as is proposed by this government. The proper position for us is to stand by the British navy. On this occasion there is a distinct line of cleavage between the two great political parties of this country. The opposition say: submit the question to the people and give two Dreadnoughts to tide over the present emergency. If you look into the records of Great Britain, Germany or the United States you will find that it takes years to build Dreadnoughts, and if we placed at the disposal of Great Britain the money proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition in his resolution, it would probably take two years or more before the battleships would be ready to go into service. The present government propose

to build a little navy that dared not go to war, would be of little service if it did, as it is to be built apparently to run away and not to fight. Let the government give the people of Canada an opportunity to vote on this question. Do not attempt to dragoon them into the building of a navy if they do not want it. Trust the people. This is an entirely new question which should be submitted to them for consideration. The last speaker said that he did not consider this subject of sufficient importance to submit to the Canadian people; but you may depend upon it that if we enter upon this expenditure it will increase as the years go by. Inside of ten years we will have expended at least $100,000,000, and even then we will not have a navy worthy of the name, or one that will be of any great assistance to Great Britain in time of war. Whereas if $20,000,000 were placed at the disposal of Great Britain for the building of two battleships, these would be in the front line of the fleet and would be doing a service not only for this country, but for the whole British empire. The government have proposed a plan which they themselves knew little about. They have not stated the cost of the dockyards or of the ships or how long it would take to build them. The only figures that have been placed before us are those which the Minister of Militia gave us a few days ago; and if you investigate those figures you will come to no other conclusion than that they are most misleading and are entirely too small to be considered seriously. For instance, the estimated cost of a dockyard is given as $100,000. What perfect folly to think that we can build a dockyard capable of holding a ship for that sum of money. Why, the Postmaster General only a few days ago had an appropriation of $300,000 passed through this House for the construction of a dock in his own riding. If you will investigate the records you will find that in the dockyards of the mother country and in the States, millions of dollars are being expended instead of a paltry $100,000. Take the dockyards at Portsmouth. Great Britain has expended over $16,000,000 on it already; and for the building of one dock for the purpose of holding a Dreadnought, she has spent $5,000,000. Take the naval base at Rosuth where Great Britain is building now. I find by the Navy League Annual for the year 1909 that the estimated cost of the work for the establishment of this base, which is on the Frith of Forth, is £3,000,000, exclusive of the cost of machinery. That includes basin, entrance lock, straight river wharf, an emergency exit from basin, space for stacking coal, a dry-dock, a boat slip, a basin for submarine boats and electric light and power. And since the completion of this work is not expected for ten years, it is understood that the admiralty have under consideration the provision of two or three huge floating docks capable of berthing a Dreadnought or Invincible, one of which, they say, might well be stationed in Cromarty.

I merely call attention to these facts to show that instead of $100,000 being a reasonable estimate for the erection of a dry dock and ship yard, it will not cover the cost of the necessary plant and machinery. Let us consider for a few moments what will be necessary in order that we may build ships in Canada. Member after member on the government benches has emphatically and distinctly said that the one great reason why we should build these ships here is that they will give employment to a lot of men and be of very great benefit in other ways to this Dominion. Well, what would we have to do? We would have first to provide a naval board, with an admiral at its head, pay and pensions to officers and thousands of men on the ships and in the shops, dock yards, dry docks, ships, factories for the manufacture of different parts of ships, engines, machinery for bending and shaping steel plates, iron and brass foundries, machine shops, boiler and copper smith shops, blacksmith shops, containing immense steam hammers, pattern shops, drawing rooms, ordinance repairs, rope houses, block and boat making houses, store houses for torpedoes, general mountings, chains, cables, ammunition, arms, armouries stores, uniform, clothing and equipment, targets and buoys for rifle practice, rifle ranges for use of naval service, also material for construction, maintenance and repairs for naval establishments and other vessels. We have also ships to supply navy with coal cranes for lifting, shears and docks, naval colleges and academies for training ships. Work without end, without including the gun factories, which would be necessary to supply the guns.

When we take into consideration this enormous amount of plant, we must conclude that it is folly for this government to pretend that its estimate of $750,000 would cover all the items I have named, including a naval college. The government estimates the cost of the naval college to be $150,000. Why, our military college at Kingston has cost us upwards of $300,000. Therefore, I am warranted in saying that if this estimate is taken as a sample, we may expect a very large increase with regard to them all.

British sentiment in Canada is strong. There are but few who would cut the cable and let Great Britain go. You can depend upon it that when the people realize that, if we are to have a navy worthy of the name, the expenditure will increase with

such rapidity, their present sentiments are apt to undergo a change, and this expenditure will do more towards cutting the cable and letting Great Britain go than anything else possibly could. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Northwest Grain Grower's Association, public gatherings in different parts of Canada, Boards of Trade and many prominent men of all shades of opinion, including the premiers of three provinces, have all most emphatically urged on the government to send an emergency contribution to Britain at present, and submit the question of navy defence in Canada to the people. There can be no question that the mother country is facing a crisis. This year she is spending over $175,000,000 on her navy, which means over $4 for every man, woman and child in that country. That is a large increase over last year, and in addition His Majesty the King, in his speech from the Throne the other day, emphatically stated that they would have to make a material addition to their naval estimates. We have always had the protection of the greatest sea power on the earth. England has loaned us, in addition to that protection, hundreds of millions of pounds sterling for the development of our waterways and railways and public institutions in general, so that when the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) made the statement that Great Britain had done little for us, that statement was not based on fact. Between 1852 and 1902, Great Britain spent $85,000,000 on military expenditure in this country. Go back 100 years and you will find that she spent $170,000,000 in addition, making a total of $255,000,000 in 150 years. In addition she spent $35,000,000 on the citadel and public works in the city of Quebec and $81,000,000 on our canals before we took them over. Again she spent $56,000,000 on all kinds of public works in this country before confederation. And I want you to remember that I am not taking into consideration the war of 1775 or the public works on which enormous sums of money were expended in 1778, when these were built at Levis, Kingston, Montreal, Halifax, Toronto, St. John and many other places. I am not taking into consideration the war of 1812, which lasted, so far as the British taxpayer is concerned, from 1811 to 1815, and I could go on and show you what she expended on roads and bridges which she made in this country. The expenditure taken out of the treasury of Britain on our railways and public works including canals and defence would reach over $1,000,000,000. In addition to this England loans us $200,000,000 annually and has invested in our securities over $1,000,000,000. Therefore, when I hear the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) say that we do not owe Great Britain anything, that she got dollar for every dollar she gave us, I cannot understand how he can make such a statement, so utterly unfounded on facts. Is it not a humiliating spectacle to see the right hon. the Prime Minister and his government forcing through this House a measure that cannot possibly be of any service to Great Britain? The Canadian people are willing to assist Great Britain, they consider it their duty to give her their valuable assistance, but to bring in a measure that cannot possibly protect our merchant marine or be of any service in the wars of Great Britain, is nothing but sheer folly. There is not a bit of danger that Great Britain would ever ask this government to send the navy proposed in this Bill to help her in time of war.

It would be of no use to her, and nobody knows better than the Prime Minister himself that he is placing us in a false position in regard to this very important question. Great Britain is increasing her public debt and adding to the burdens of her people in order to build Dreadnoughts for the protection of her colonies and dependencies. Why should we not relieve her of some of this responsibiilty? Japan, Germany, the United States, France, Italy and Austria are all discarding their old ships and building Dreadnoughts. What does a Dreadnought mean? A Dreadnought, Sir, is a death dealing monster with 22,000 tons displacement, with 12 inches of steel covering her deck, with ten 12-inch guns that can all be fired at once, throwing over four tons of death-dealing missiles. Each one of these guns can discharge a shell containing 750 pounds of missiles, and back of it 200 pounds of cordite, capable of sending that shell 10 or 12 miles. Compare that with the puny cruisers which this government are trying to make the people believe will be any protection to this country or any assistance to Great Britain in time of war. Compare their little cruiser of 3,000 to 5,000 tons with a 22,000 tons Dreadnought, a little cruiser with four and 6-inch guns capable of carrying a shell only two or three miles. If the shell struck the deck of a Dreadnought it would either go off as a fire-cracker, or have as little effect upon it as a pea fired at a barn door. It is humiliating to see this government trying to make the people believe that this navy can be of any service in protecting our shores, or in assisting Great Britain in her wars. We must remember that in years gone by Great Britain has sent her best men and has spent her blood and treasure in protecting this country in order to bring it up to the splendid position of a nation we now occupy. It would be most humiliating to see a measure like this going through, wasting money that could otherwise be usefully employed in building battleships that would be of some assistance to Great Britain in

time of need, wasting money in building a useless navy that can be of no service to Canada or Great Britain. England's nvay is closely associated with her greatness, with the mighty deeds which have extended her empire and made her mistress of the seas. The British fleet to-day, centred as it is around Great Britain, is within striking distance of Canada. We must remember the fact that within five days of our shores is the British fleet, practically as near to Canada as the eastern portion of Canada is to British Columbia. Wireless telegraphy and cables render the protection of our shores by the British fleet more effective than they would be by a separate squadron. Australia and New Zealand, lying as they do at a greater distance, require an entirely different system of defence. We have no enemies excepting the enemies of Great Britain. And we must remember this fact, that our people are not only self-reliant and confident, a people full of energy and hope, but they are a people willing and ready to contribute of their means towards assisting Great Britain in time of crisis. We may make mistakes in the legislation that comes before this parliament, mistakes which we can remedy, but, in forcing this Bill through parliament, we shall make a mistake in imperial policy which will be irretrievable. The colonies have been the cause of most of Britain's wars, and while Britain owns one-fifth of the land area of the globe, and controls a quarter of the world's population, it will be necessary for her to have a large army and a large navy.

We cannot but admire the justice with which Great Britain has governed her overseas dominions. She has displayed unflinching confidence and absolute justice in dealing with Canada, not only with the French Canadians of Canada, but with every other nationality, since she has put them all on the same footing. She extends the same square dealing to all her colonies and dependencies; justice in administration is always the uppermost aim in England's administration. Then England is the greatest importer in the world. She imports food and raw material for her population, and she exports manufactured goods. Seven-eighths of her imports are food and raw material, and seven-eighths of her exports are manufactured articles. To keep the British empire together, we must first protect her commerce, and this is done by helping her to keep command of the sea. We hear much said about the necessity of protecting our commerce on the high seas. In that connection I would like to read an extract from a report of the Royal Commission on Food Supply in Time of War. This commission was appointed in 1905, and we find that many of the most prominent men of England were on that commission. At the head of it was His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and among the members were the Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, His Grace the Duke of Sutherland, the Rt. Hon. Lord Berkeley, the Rt. Hon. John Henry Chapman, and many others. Now let us see what this commission has to say with regard to Great Britain's food supply in time of war, and the protection of that food supply. Here is what they say in the course of their report:

The imports of wheat and flour in 1904, given in millions of quarters, were as follows: United States of America, 4·40; Russia, 5·53; Roumania, ·35; Argentina, 5·10; British India, 5·95; Canada, 2·13; Australia, 2·65; minor exporting countries, 1·59.

So when we hear hon. gentlemen opposite talking about sending to Great Britain the whole of her food supply, they must take into consideration the fact that India sent to Great Britain in 1904 double the amount of wheat that Canada did. The report gives the various sources of Britain's food supply as follows:

The supplies from the principle sources begin to arrive as follows: January, wheat from the Pacific coast of America; February and March, Argentine wheat; April, Australian wheat; May, June and July, Calcutta and Bombay, Delhi and Karachi Indian wheats; July and August, American winter wheat; September and October, American spring and Russian wheat; November, Canadian wheat.

This goes to show that Great Britain has practically a supply from various sources all the year round, one source or another every month, as I have just shown. On page 28 of this report we have some very important facts:

In their communications to us the admiralty admit that the policy of attacking the floating trade of a country has always played an important part in maritime warfare. But in a summary of the events of the various maritime wars of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries they point out that naval history demonstrates the truth of these two general principles.

I would ask your consideration to this, Mr. Speaker:

1. That the command of the sea is essential for the successful attack or defence of commerce and should therefore be the primary aim.

2. That the attack or defence of commerce is best effected by concentration of force, and that a dispersion of strength for either of those objects is the strategy of the weak, and cannot materially influence the ultimate result of the war.

And, surely, Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman who leads this House would consider the statements of these men, made in 1905, when there was no general election on in Great Britain, and

would apply their suggestions to the case of the Canadian navy, he would see that the policy he is undertaking is named by them, 'the stategy of the weak', and they say that it 'cannot materially influence the ultimate result of a war'. They emphasize this further on page 30 of the report:

We were specially anxious on this point, on account of the evidence warning us that we must expect captures, and we asked the following questions:—

(1) Assuming the country to be at war with any two of the great maritime powers, are the admiralty of opinion that our supplies of wheat and flour would arrive in practically the same volume as they come at present?

. . . Practically, the reply is yes, as the admiralty believe that there would be no material diminution in the supplies of wheat and flour reaching the United Kingdom.

The question and answer in this report proceed:

(4) Supposing popular pressure took the form of demand for more direct defence of our food supplies, and special protection of ships carrying foodstuffs to this country than the naval authorities would otherwise contemplate, and was successful, do the board consider the probable result would prejudice arrangements for the general conduct of our offensive operations of war against the hostile fleets?

The answer to that is as follows:

If a portion of the naval forces at the disposal of the admiralty were deflected from the main operations of the war for other purposes of whatever kind, the general conduct of these operations must of necessity suffer, and the entire course of the war might be injuriously affected.

Just the very thing the present government are doing is the thing which the British admiralty and this commission most emphatically state should not be done. Another statement is as follows—page 32:

The number of British merchant steamers which would be taken up by the government in war time is so small compared to the total number available that it is not believed the British carrying trade could be seriously interfered with. The admiralty have already been in consultation on the subject with some of the leading shipowners.

Sir Cyprian Bridge also thought that if proper naval arrangements were made, the losses by capture, or by ships being driven on shore, of vessels bringing imports into the United Kingdom, would not exceed a very small percentage of the total, and he suggested that the proportion lost would probably amount to about 5 per cent.

So, if this government are building their navy for the purpose of protecting our merchant marine, it is easy to see what folly it is. And what do these gentlemen say as regards torpedo craft?

It should be added that torpedo-craft (i.e., destroyers and torpedo boats) can neither spare prize crews nor accommodate any one above their complement numbers. If, therefore, employed against commerce, for which they were never intended, such craft could only compel merchant ships to follow them into port under threat of being torpedoed. Moreover these crafts can only operate within a comparatively short distance of their shore bases.

I think that is sufficient at least to call your attention to the fact that, so far as the navy proposed by this government is concerned, it is utterly inadequate and can be of no service for the protection of our merchant marine. The government talk about protecting our commerce. Let us, for a moment, take the United States as an example. Out of the port of Baltimore went 50,000,000 bushels of grain last year of which only 10,000 bushels were carried in American bottoms. Out of the port of New York last year went 1,200 ships, and of these only seven carried the American flag. If you investigate the commerce of the United States you are forced to the conclusion that they are not building their navy for the protection in particular of their own commerce. They are in an altogether better position as concerns population and consumption than we are. It seems utter nonsense, therefore, for us at the present time, with our small population and small income, to attempt to build a navy such as would adequately protect our commerce.

War is organized force. When peace is broken the nation best organized and prepared for war has the best chance of defeating its opponent. Only men make war, and it is a well-reasoned affair and conducted on business principles. Germany, when she defeated France, demanded from France a thousand million of dollars of indemnity. What would be the indemnity Germany would demand of the British empire if she defeated that empire on the high seas? Instead of a thousand millions, the indemnity demanded would be five thousand millions. And, would not we feel the burden if we had to pay our share of that into the coffers of Germany? Then the people would say of the men now in charge of our affairs that they did not consider the best interests of the Dominion, or of the empire, or they would have sent to the motherland without delay sufficient money to show, at least, that they were ready and willing to assist her in time of emergency.

Increased knowledge and practice, with a liberal expenditure of money, are perfecting day by day the navies of the world. Well may we say: When will this conflict cease? The nations are vieing with one another to see which will build the best boats and build them in the shortest space of time. The fighting, so far as England is concerned, will be done in the

North Sea. If you follow up what England has been doing with her battleships during the past few months, you will see that she is gradually gathering around her shores in the North sea the best battleships she has. In addition to that, she is protecting her shores to the utmost extent and making all preparation for the war that is likely to take place.

The admiralty made a definite and distinct demand on the people who were represented at this colonial conference, that the best way to assist Great Britain was to keep her navy a unit instead of in separate squadrons as suggested by this Bill. And though the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) may think that he did a noble and a good thing in bringing in this measure, yet, if he will take into consideration the contributions of Australia, New Zealand, and other colonies which have been giving to Great Britain in large proportions to their population, and if he will compare the Dreadnoughts of New Zealand, and the fleet unit of Australia, with the navy that he proposes by this Bill to build in this country, he cannot but see that his navy is not to be compared with the splendid fighting fleet that these other governments are ready and willing to give.

There is no question about it, when you consider the means of protecting the British merchant marine, the only way at present, as the members of the admiralty will tell you, is to send a battleship alongside a number of merchantmen to carefully guard them and protect them. So far as our little ships are concerned, they would be no manner of use whatever. On reading the reports of these various conferences, we cannot but feel that the men who represented us were not ready or willing to do even a reasonable amount for the assistance of Great Britain in time of war. Here is the one outstanding fact; the aim in naval warfare is to attain command of the sea; the power that attains this control can attack its enemy where and when it pleases. England has had command of the sea for generations. Fifty years ago her commerce went into every port. At that time, Britain had command of the commerce of the world. To-day, France, Germany, the United States and Russia are vieing with one another to take away that commerce from Great Britain—as they have a perfect right to do. But, we must recognize this fact that it is our duty, as far as British commerce is concerned to assist and protect it to best of our ability. How is command of the sea to be won? Not with such a fleet as is proposed by the government, but simply by the possession of a navy stronger than your opponents. Courage is necessary, and a careful study of the enemy's resources, their naval methods and intentions. An opposing navy could not commit a more serious mistake than to detach a squadron with the object of reducing some outlying fleet. She would spoil her concentration, and you would spoil yours if you attempted to follow.

The government say that we must give money and men for the building of a Canadian navy. What have they been doing during the past few years?—spending over a million dollars per annum for the purpose of bringing people to our shores to develop our resources. Would it not be wise to continue this instead of taking money to bring men here for the purpose of assisting in building a navy. The men engaged in the development of these resources, who would otherwise be engaged in the useless defence of our country, would earn sufficient to give a large annual grant to Great Britain, if that were thought advisable. But, I do not believe in an annual grant to Great Britain, and I do not believe we will be called upon to duplicate the two battleships that have been proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in his splendid resolution. Let us leave the naval question for the present to the powers which have to keep up their navies. Great Britain has the men and we have the money to help her to increase her navy. If we have a navy we have to consider that it means an ever-increasing annual expenditure until that expenditure reaches the sum of $50,000,000 per year. Great Britain will spend on her navy in 1910 $175,000,000. That is $480,000 for every single day of the 365 days in the year. In adition to that she is maintaining her great army at a cost of $430,000 per day. There are $900,000 taken out of the treasury of Great Britain and spent every day for keeping up her army and navy in order that she may protect herself, her colonies and dependencies to which Canada is not contributing one dollar. In addition to that she spends $3,000,000 per annum for her consular service to which we do not contribute a dollar. The South African war cost England $1,000,000,000. That, at interest, represents a payment by the British people of $30,000,000 per annum. It is true that Germany, ten years ago, brought in a measure whereby she set aside $1,000,000,000 for the purpose of building her navy. Since that time she has appropriated $500,000,000 for the same purpose. During this present year she has set aside $105,000,000 for the purpose of building ships, and if you will investigate the German reports, and the German books which tell you of the position of Germany at the present time you cannot but feel that as far as Great Britain is concerned she is not in the position to build these large battleships of the Dreadnought class with the rapidity with which Germany is building them at the present time.

Germany made her plans years ago to construct her dockyards sufficiently large to hold the Dreadnoughts that she is turning out at such a rapid rate. In England's Navy League Annual you will find such facts as these: By the year 1914 Germany, at the present rate of speed will have one ship of the Dreadnought class more than Great Britain will have. You will also see the different firms in Germany which are manufacturing ships of the Dreadnought class and the rapidity with which they are manufacturing these ships. You cannot come to any other conclusion than that which I have indicated with the enormous amount of money that she is expending. Fifty years ago Germany only had $18,000,000 of a debt while to-day she has a debt of $1,000,000,000. Last year she expended $83,000,000 on her navy, and this year she is expending $105,000,000. From year to year, the expenditure has grown until on her army and navy she is expending $224,000,000 this year, or double what the expenditure was in 1900. We know it to be a fact that she has one million men in line, and that she can call upon 4,000,000 more who are fully prepared to fight upon land. We know that she has spent enormous amounts of money in addition to those I have mentioned in preparing her canals and rivers for just such large ships as those of the Dreadnought class. Not only that, but Germany's population is increasing at about the rate of 1,000,000 souls per annum, and her total population to-day is 65,000,000 on a land area less than that of the province of Ontario. There is no place for these people to go unless to some of the colonies owned and controlled by other nations. I do not wish to say one word against the German people as a people. I believe they are a thrifty progressive people, and I sincerely hope that the government, may take steps to bring about better trade relations with Germany, and that they will put a sufficient amount in the estimates to provide for trade representatives who will try and increase our trade with that land. Our government have taken a step in the right direction in the late treaty arrangements, but we are not in as favourable a position in the German markets as we were in 1896. Great Britain's population, in the British Isles, only amounts to 43,000,000 people, and with her limited resources she is spending at the present time $222,000,000 on her army and navy. I have just been handed a copy of to-day's Toronto 'Globe,' in which the following statement appears:

Gathering her Soldiers—Germany ordering her scattered Sons Home—All Unnaturalized Germans in United States receiving Instructions to report for Military Physical examination—An Order never before issued.

(Special despatch to the 'Globe.')

Dallas, Texas, Feb. 28.—Whether or not she is preparing for war with Great Britain, Germany is serving notice on all her available citizens in the United States to report for military physical examination, to decide if they are still fit for military duty. In view of the fact that this order has never before been issued, and considering the loud talk of war between the countries, this development is full of significance, and shows that Germany is getting all her forces lined up in case a conflict comes. Nearly two hundred Germans of Dallas and Fort Worth who failed to serve their allotted time in the German army have been called upon to submit to physical examinations. Unnaturalized Germans in Texas have been ordered to report to the German Consul at Galveston, where transportation to the fatherland will be supplied.

That is an article which appears in the Toronto 'Globe' and one which is worthy of consideration. It bears out to some extent the position that the opposition are taking on this important question. If we are going to assist Great Britain in her wars, now is the time to act. Do not let us wait until we have expended tens of millions of dollars on a useless tin-pot navy, but let us place at once at the disposal of Great Britain a sum sufficient for two Dreadnoughts, and we will be doing something worthy of our country and worthy of the name of patriotic sons of England. We were told by the Minister of Militia, and by other hon. gentlemen opposite, that a contribution of two Dreadnoughts would mean $25,000,000, but the fact is that the official returns disclose that the largest battleship built in the United States has not cost them $8,000,000 (this estimate did not include guns), and of all the Dreadnoughts turned out of the British dockyards not a single one has exceeded a cost of $8,800,000. Last year the United States spent $219,000,000 on its army and navy, and this year they have given a proof of their anxiety for international peace in reducing that expenditure by $60,000,000. Look at what the countries of the world are doing in naval construction to-day, and you will find that not a single one of them is building cruisers of the type which this Bill proposes for their protection. In 1904 Great Britain put out of service 155 ships, and I have no doubt that if we continue to purchase second-hand vessels we will have among our fleet a number of those discarded from the British navy. The control and management of the British navy is under the direction of the Lords of Admiralty, and surely the sea lords should know whether it would be better that we should have a unit of the British fleet or a separate squadron. Practically the first word of the British admiralty to the gentlemen attending the British conference

was that they would prefer a naval unit I submit, Sir, that the proposition of the leader of the opposition now before the House renders the most effective aid to the motherland at the least cost to our people. When war is declared is not the time for the colonies to help Britain; help must come in advance to be of any use. The Prime Minister has told us that if Great Britain were at war, he would go up and down this country to arouse the people to a sense of their duty, but, Sir, when the smoke of battle is seen and death-dealing missiles are hurtling through the air and Britain calls us to her aid, are we to say Please give us time to think, we have not yet decided whether the war is just or not? Can any one imagine a more humiliating position for a nation such as Canada to be placed in? We are told by the Prime Minister that when the beacon fires are lighted on the hills, Canada would come to the aid of the empire. Yes, but when the beacon fires are lighted on the hills, the war will be on and there will be no time for the right hon. gentleman to go up and down the country urging assistance. It is our duty to declare that we shall stand by Great Britain always for the sake of the empire, and not when the Governor in Council thinks it fitting that we should do so. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McLean) tells us that he would investigate whether a war was just or not before sending the fleet, but I can tell him that if the British fleet is defeated on the high seas, Canada will be defeated that same hour. The first few hours of a naval battle decide who shall have command of the seas. The decisive part of the war between Japan and Russia lasted forty minutes, and the taking of Santiago harbour by the United States in the war with Spain took less time than that. Dreadnoughts, and Dreadnoughts alone, will count in the wars of the future. What inducement is there for a young man to enter the Canadian naval service, when he knows that the height of his ambition is limited to command a cruiser that dare not go to war, and which if she went to war would be of no service. It is an insult to the intelligence of our people for the government to declare that this navy would only cost $3,000,000 a year, when every one knows that even for such a navy as they propose, it will cost at least eight or ten million dollars per annum. Does not everything done by the government in this connection, lead us to the inquiry as to whether this is another Grand Trunk Pacific humbug, or another Public Works Department job, or an example of how this business government conducts public affairs? I have tried to place before the government what would be necessary should we attempt to build a navy in the Dominion. I have pointed out that we need a new Welland canal, a new Soo canal, a new Georgian Bay canal, the Hudson Bay railway, the Hudson straits lighted, and numerous railways and public works in different parts of our country. Last year the government told us that they had to cut down the estimates to the extent of eight or nine million dollars for the want of money, but to-day, just a year after, they appear to have money to burn on a useless navy. Let me point out also that the English navy is a long service navy. Boys enter at Greenwich between 13 years of age and 15, the marines enter between 17 and 23 years of age, and they serve for 12 years. Where are the Canadian boys who are going to train for 12 years in the hope of some day attaining the command of such cruisers as we propose to build? It has been my privilege to have gone through the Greenwich Naval School, and while I have every confidence in the patriotism of the young men of Canada, I do not believe that they are ready to undergo such a training as the boys undergo there, when their only ambition can possibly be such promotion as this proposed navy can afford. Great Britain does not build battleships for coast defence; for that purpose she uses the ships which cannot accompany the fleet, and the pay and salaries in Great Britain are only about one-half of what they would be in Canada. Suppose, for example, such a navy as that which the government proposes were present at the demonstration in the North sea last year, or suppose our little navy should be invited to American waters, how humiliating it would be for the people of Canada to have to admit that they own them. Last year Great Britain sent to the scrap heap 155 vessels of all descriptions. Her age limit for battleships is 25 years, for cruisers 20 years, for destroyers 12 years, so you can readily see that if we build a navy we must continue to build, and pay, pay, pay. This government admits that the construction of the ships will cost us 35 per cent more in Canada than if they were built in England. If the two Dreadnoughts will cost $25,000,000, as the Minister of War says they are likely to, a saving of 35 per cent on that amount would mean $8,750,000 to the people of Canada. If the total cost of two Dreadnoughts would not exceed $20,000,000, which is the proper estimate, then we would save $7,000,000 by having them built in Great Britain, because the 35 per cent is the difference between $20,000,000 and $27,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about giving a preference to Great Britain in our markets and about contributing to her maintenance in so doing. Why not give her a preference by having two battleships built in Great Britain, as proposed by the leader of the opposition, when they can be built there so much better and at so much less cost? Australia and New Zealand are having their ships built in Great Britain.

Great Britain is the greatest colonizing nation the world has ever known. Germany has tried it, France has tried it, Russia has tried it, Italy has tried it, the United States has tried it, and they have made a complete failure of it. Everybody knows the constitutional principles that govern this country. The King is Commander-in-Chief, here as well as in England, and here this parliament exercises the prerogative as parliament exercises it in England. The King can dissolve this parliament; he is practically the only man who can. Canada is either a part of the British empire or it is not; but this government are driving a wedge between Canada and the motherland by proposing to build an independent navy.

All Canadians have hoped that war was a thing of the past, and that as the years went by war would cease. We look at the militarism in force to-day in the nations of Europe, where men in uniform parade the streets and ships of war are constantly in evidence. These nations are burdened with debts and responsibilities that should warn us against undertaking any such burdens. The nations of the world deplore the state they are in and are seeking means to get away from it. Witness the various naval conferences that have taken place and the means that have been used to maintain peace in different parts of the world. These recognize the futility and needlessness of the barbarous spirit that forces them on. We should be glad that we are privileged to live in a land of peace, and we should welcome some universal congress of the nations to put a stop to this insane competition for armaments. Why should we, in the light of the twentieth century, when all are talking of the days when war shall be no more, deliberately and voluntarily assume that which other nations are trying to get away from? We like to believe, and there are many signs which show, that mere might is not the only way to conquer. Nations formerly carried on their wars with swords and spears. Now the weapons that are being used, and that should be used, are brains, tariffs and treaties. Building a navy is the first step in the opposite direction. The old-world powers are compelled to keep up their present armies and navies. Why should we attempt to imitate them? The only true position for us to take is to assist in keeping one central navy, and not to build a separate and independent navy, as proposed by this government. If we follow the government's plan we will add to our expenditures without subtracting from Great Britain's expenditures. Thus far Great Britain has carried us, and in this undertaking we would not be helping her or yet be helping ourselves. It is recognized that the central imperial navy must be maintained at adequate strength. The question therefore, is, who is going to pay for maintaining it up to the proper standard? The people of Great Britain must do it if we do not assist them. New Zealand says: 'We will give a Dreadnought, and thereby deduct $10,000,000 from the amount of money which the taxpayers of Great Britain will have to expend'. Australia and the other colonies and dependencies of Great Britain have been saying the same thing. Every dollar they give in the form of a direct grant means a dollar less from the pockets of the English taxpayers, while this government's proposition will not add to the strength of Britain's navy nor deduct a penny from the burden of the British taxpayer. The government of Canada says: 'We will build a little navy of our own. That little navy will be under the control of parliament, and we will not send it to assist Great Britain unless we choose. We will add $17,000,000 to the expenditure and debt of Canada, and place an everlasting burden of annual expenditure on the people of this country.' But the government are unable to show that this expenditure will mean a dollar less of necessary expenditure on the part of the British taxpayer to keep up the imperial navy. What one navy introduces to-day other navies strive to get. Never in the history of the world did false prophets or quacks have better opportunities than they have in this age, and this government can furnish more false prophets and quacks to the square inch, particularly in regard to this question, than any that ever existed before. We can count up an enemy's ships, and calculate the number she will put into line, but we cannot forecast the ability of her commanders. Who expected Russia to produce a Suvoroff, or Corsica a Napoleon Bonaparte, or Austria a Tegetthoff or Japan a Togo? If we study history, we will thank God that we have never had a navy to send to sea, and be more than glad if we never will. You may paint a tiger's face on a shield as the Chinese do, but you will need more than the craft if you propose to accomplish anything in war. We cannot mimic or deceive the nations in regard to our naval strength. The world to-day is alive to our military and naval strength, and it is impossible to disguise it. Sea-borne commerce must be defended, and Great Britain's statesmen say that the best way to defend it is by a united navy. There is the convoy method where groups of merchant ships can be escorted by a man-of war, and it is the proper method. What kind of an escort would we give with our puny cruisers and torpedo boats? The ob-

ject of cruisers is to observe an enemy's force and strength, and return and communicate whatever information they have obtained to the officers waiting. Fighting would be quite outside of their duties. In a cruiser high speed and fuel endurance are necessary, more necessary than ability to fight. We must remain masters of our destinies and not slaves. If we become slaves to war tactics, our energies will become divided. We need all the force and energy we have to develop our resources. Local defence of its very nature must be repeated at many points to be of any service. The enemy will choose the point of attack and the time of attack.

Before we decide on a navy for Canada, let us ask the military class and the working class, the farmer and the artisan, the capitalist and the miner, those who live inland and those who live on our coasts, whether they want for ever to pay, pay, pay. The government has no mandate from the people to force this measure through the House. The only hope for Canada if she embarks on navy building is to set her teeth, build and maintain, and pay, pay, pay. If we are to build and maintain a navy, all parts of our country and all sections of our people must cling together in a manly, patriotic spirit and stand true to our country and to our flag. Let one flag, one fleet, one throne be our motto.

Look at the humiliating spectacle that we are presenting to the world. Canada ready to assert her independence. She will not go to war without the consent of parliament. Are we not drifting towards independence at a rapid rate?

Picture, if you will, Great Britain, with its back to the wall, fighting the foe, sending over a request for Canada to come to her assistance, and the Prime Minister of Canada and his cabinet discussing the merits of the British case and calling parliament together to hear all sides of the question before determining whether we should go to the assistance of the mother country or not.

There is no danger of European nations sending their battleships to Canada until they have defeated the British fleet at home. They would weaken their unit and serve no end. While Great Britain holds command of the sea there is no fear of a foreign foe attacking Canada. Where they would strike would be at the heart and not at the extremities. Canada's ships, as proposed, will never be called to battle, and after the battle, should Britain's power be supreme, they will not be needed. Should, on the other hand, Britain's power be lost, they will either be sunk or captured.

In closing, let me say to this government: do to England as you would wish England to do to you. If she is in need of help to-day, and I believe she is, you are denying her that help by introducing this Bill. She has asked you for bread, you are offering a stone. You are taking money that you ought to expend to assist Great Britain in building ships to go to the fighting line, like the ships of New Zealand and Australia, and you are instead squandering that money on a useless navy which will be no protection to either Canada or the empire.

If she has displayed ignorance in making her request in the manner that she has, you must remember that had she exposed her whole wish in this matter it would be the public property of her enemies to-day. Stand by the good old flag and answer England's call, and depend upon it you will never regret it.

An independent navy, as suggested by this government, involves years of delay. The construction and armament of which means enormous capital expenditure, added to which, it will necessarily follow, the up-keep and renewals of our fleet, in addition to the maintenance of schools and academies.

I have unbounded faith in my king and country, and undieing belief in the empire to which I belong. Let the British navy continue to be the floating bulwark of our land and her parliament our guiding star. The most effective contribution we could make, and one which may never need to be repeated, would be to give to England's navy two Dreadnoughts. Then if you must build a navy, submit the whole question to the Canadian people. I am prepared to assist in maintaining the splendid inheritance received from our forefathers. I love my country, I believe in her, I honour her, I am prepared to work for her, to live for her, and, if needs be, die for her.' In order that her territory may remain intact and her name untarnished.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. VICTOR GEOFFRION (Chambly and Verchères). Mr. Speaker, this already long debate of the very important question of the creation of the Canadian navy has, in my opinion, elicited two facts—the wisdom of the measure now before the Chair and the illogical position of the hon. gentlemen who oppose it. The opponents of this measure are divided into two classes—those who are in favour of giving tribute—or, perhaps, I should not use that expression, but let us say, making a contribution—to the British admiralty, and those who

are in favour of doing nothing at all. The most illogical feature of those who oppose this measure lies, of course, in the fact that, having voted and spoken in favour of the policy expressed in the resolution of the 29th of March last, they now oppose it. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), when this resolution was before the House, took a certain position; to-day, he adopts a different policy altogether. I shall have to quote some parts of the speeches of hon. members opposite, but I shall endeavour to make my quotations as brief as possible, as many of them have been used by other hon. members. Still, in order to make my own argument complete, I think I should be allowed to make a few brief quotations. Here is what the leader of the opposition said when he was addressing the House on the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as reported at page 3517 of 'Hansard':

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the lines of naval defence of this country I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that. The other experiment has been tried as between Australia and the mother country and it has not worked satisfactorily in any respect. In Great Britain the contribution has perhaps been regarded as rather unsatisfactory.

Then, at page 3518:

So, I am at one with the Prime Minister as far as this is concerned. I am at one with him in this respect also that I think that an expenditure of money designed for that purpose ought, in the main at least, to be under the control of our own parliament and that by making an appropriation of that kind and attending to the defence of our own coasts, by co-operation and co-ordination with the imperial naval forces, we would be rendering a real service in defence of the empire and we would be doing our duty not only to Canada but to the empire as a whole.

The leader of the opposition, since that day, has seen fit to change his policy three times. The first policy was on March 29, 1909—rapid construction of a Canadian naval service according to the recommendation of the admiralty; no contribution in money. The second policy appeared on January 12, 1910: Rapid and prudent construction of a Canadian navy, plus a contribution in money to the value of one Dreadnought. Third policy, February 3, 1910: No Canadian navy; immediate contribution in money to the value of two Dreadnoughts.

Now, Sir, what is the reason of these changes? Everybody knows that the leader of the opposition is a statesman, a very eminent lawyer, able to grasp every question which comes before him, able to analyse a question from all sides. Who can comprehend the reason why he has seen fit, within one year, to change his policy three times?—unless it be that the thumbsrew and the rack so much spoken of by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) have been applied to the leader of the opposition by his own followers. I cannot see any other reason for it. The leader of the opposition has seen fit to increase the tribute he wants this country to pay to the mother country in proportion to the decrease of the German scare. On the 29th of March last, when we discussed the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto, the German peril cry was launched in England and soon reached this country. Some of us who had not studied the question naturally felt obliged to pause, fearing there might be something in it. At that time, the leader of the opposition was in favour simply of a Canadian navy. But after the thing had been discussed, and when it was found out in England, during the elections, that this was simply an election cry, when the people who govern England, the Prime Minister and some other statesmen said it was simply raised for election purposes, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) wanted to contribute immediately one Dreadnought. But after the elections were over, when the German scare was found out to amount to nothing, the leader of the opposition declared that he did not want a Canadian navy, but that he did want this country to contribute $25,000,000 to the treasury of the admiralty. Well, Sir, I desire to address particularly those gentlemen on the other side of the House who think that a direct contribution is the policy that should be adopted by this country. I wish to quote the admirable argument of the hon. member for North Toronto when he discussed his resolution of the 29th of March last. This quotation, like my others, will be very brief, but I am sure every hon. member of the House will enjoy it. It is couched in most admirable terms, and is a most logical argument. Everybody knows that, at that time, the hon. member for North Toronto made a most powerful speech. For my part, I was so much impressed with that argument that I think we cannot quote it too often. The hon. gentleman was discussing the different modes by which we might help England, and was dealing particularly with the mode of a direct contribution. I quote from page 3494 of last year's 'Hansard':

While these objections have some force, though as I think not a force that is irresistible, there are some reasons which appear to me to have deeper force with reference to that method of taking our part in defence. I do not know whether I can make myself

understood to the members of this House on this point, but I shall briefly try to do so.

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to this form of aid. It goes still further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year. After ten, or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years, you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime; but in Canada itself there will be no roots struck, there will be no residue left, there will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product of defence. Yet some time or other, no one can doubt that with resources and with a population constantly increasing, we must and will have in this country a naval force of our own for our coast and home defence.

The interest that we take in a contribution spent by another is not the interest that I desire for Canada. I want to see something grafted on the soil of Canada's nationhood, which takes root and grows and develops until it incites the spirit of defence in this country, leads to a participation in the defence, leads to that quick interest in it, its glories, its duties and its accomplished work, which is after all the one great thing that compensates a people for great expenditures either on land or on sea in the way of defence and of the maintenance of the rights of the country.

Sir, I am entirely of the opinion of the hon. member for North Toronto in that regard. I think he made a most logical argument. But now, to cover his changed base, the hon. member has invented the emergency cry; and he pretends that his policy on this question at the present time is quite consistent with the speech which he made on the resolution of the 29th of March last. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. The emergency cry which he has invented is based, according to his own admission and the admission of his friends who take the same stand, on the assumption that Germany, who is now arming rapidly, will in a few years, probably in four or five years, have caught up with the naval power of England. Well, Sir, if this apprehension of the hon. member is correct, that emergency will be still more pressing next year, and when that fatal day apprehended by him does come, the emergency will be still more pressing than ever. Therefore the hon. gentleman, in order to be consistent with himself, must ask next year for the gift of another twenty-five millions to England, to be followed by still other gifts as the emergency increases.

Now we know that the hon. member for North Toronto is a very talented actor, and instead of going from town to town, and from village to village to preach temperance, as he did in the past, he should have adopted the profession of actor. He gave us sentiment and pathos in his speech when he spoke of the position of England. He represented the mother country, with her daughters assembled around her, and saying to them: Will you do something for me? Look at me, I am exhausted, I can stand the strain no longer. Do something for me; but if you do not, I will love you just the same. He represented the old British lion limping along exhausted, surrounded by his cubs, and saying to them: Boys, look at me, I cannot stand it any longer, you must help me. Sir, how flattering such a picture must be for the proud and justly proud, British nation! Just think of it! England with her glorious history, with her long series of victories, England surrounded by powerful allies, surrounded by colonies ready to rush to her help in the hour of need, England with her world-wide, famous corps of diplomats, with her enormous wealth, a nation of landlords, and of lords, half of whose wealth would be enough to meet the emergency imagined by the hon. gentleman. Think, Mr. Speaker, the effect such words would produce when read in Germany. What must the Germans think when they read of a British statesman representing the great British nation in such a deplorable condition? Sir, we would have heard a different tale from the hon. gentleman if the Prime Minister had committed the error of adopting the policy which he and his friends now advocate. Then we would have heard the hon. gentleman telling us of the poor settlers of this country, how hard they had toiled, themselves, their fathers and their grandfathers, to settle up this country and preserve it for England; he would have pictured them to us as burdened with taxation in order to send this twenty-five million dollars to England, when she did not need it, and when she had all the money she wanted. He would have told us that the best policy for Canada to adopt was to develop this country and make Canada strong and powerful. Sir, that would have been a manly speech, and it would have been true.

Now, what about the policy of those who are opposed to the government Bill for creating a navy, those who pretend that we owe nothing to England, and that we should do nothing at all for England? That is the policy advocated by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and by some of his friends from the province of Quebec. Now, I believe that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is not really responsible for this policy; I think he has been led astray and deceived by the leader of the

nationalist group in the province of Quebec. Sir, there is a rumour current in Montreal and in the province of Quebec that the leader of the nationalist group in Quebec took the hon. member for Jacques Cartier upon the top of Mount Royal and showing him the great and beautiful province of Quebec, with its mountains, and lakes, and fertile plains, and vast resources, and its happy and prosperous population, and said to him: All these things will I give you if you will follow me and adopt my policy. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier answered the great tempter of the province of Quebec, that he had voted for the resolution of 29th March last. But said the great tempter: You can always say that you did not read it, or if you did read it, that you did not understand it. But, replied the member for Jacques Cartier: My leader has another policy, he wants to make a contribution to Great Britain. Then said the tempter: There is always the double game policy; you can always say that Laurier does not want to do anything, that he is a traitor to his province, that he is sacrificing the interests of his own province to England, while in the other provinces your own leader can say that Laurier is a traitor to England, that he wants to keep everything for the province of Quebec. Thus was the hon. member for Jacques Cartier tempted, and thus he yielded to the temptation. He started for Lachine, followed by the sardonic laugh of the great tempter in the province of Quebec. At Lachine he made that famous speech in which he said that we did not owe anything to England, that the best policy for Canada was to develop our own resources, that we owed nothing to England, but if anything, England was indebted to us.

He made a long and elaborate speech, full of arguments, but when he came back to this House there was a little different story. He made another speech, but he was not so enthusiastic about his policy as he was at Lachine. He quoted parts of reports, editorials of newspapers, and he read some letters, but he could not muster courage enough to make the eloquent plea that he made in Lachine, because he saw in front of him the stern and evil eye of his master right in the press gallery here. One moment he seemed to have courage to make one of those pronouncements that Canada did not owe anything to England at all, but it was too much for him, his legs failed him, and he rolled under his desk. The great tempter left the gallery in disgust and we have not seen him since. But the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was also led astray by other influences in the province of Quebec. We have some newspapers in Quebec that contend that we should not do anything at all in the way of helping England under any circumstances. We have, for instance, a great daily newspaper called 'L'Action Sociale' which puts as the headline of its first page 'Instaunare omnia in Christo'—Restore everything in Christ. That paper is deceiving the population of the province of Quebec, when it pretends as it does, that it is speaking in the name of the Catholic clergy of Quebec. It is impossible for it to speak in the name of the Catholic clergy of Quebec, knowing as we Catholics do what the Catholic clergy owe to England and knowing that we have the most perfect liberty and the most complete protection under the British flag to exercise our religion and maintain our institutions. The editors of that paper deceive the people of Quebec, when they say that the clergy of Quebec are against the policy of my right hon. friend who leads the House. We know that when Sir George Etienne Cartier presented his Militia Bill which provided that a navy should be created at the same time the clergy of the province of Quebec, rightly, we hope, were in favour of Cartier to a man and approved of his policy. Then the country had a revenue of only $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 a year and to-day we have a revenue of $100,000,000. Then we had a commerce of about $150,000,000 while now we have a commerce of about $800,000,000. It is impossible that the clergy of Quebec would inspire that paper as they pretend that they are inspired. It is my privilege to have for friends some of the most eminent of the clergy of Montreal and the province of Quebec, and they have deplored the attitude of this paper when they pretend to speak for the clergy. What would happen if the policy advocated by that paper and by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) should prevail? What if England should say: I cannot get anything from you; you absolutely refuse to do anything for me; what interest have I to keep you; what interest have I to help you? Where would the Catholics of Quebec turn for better protection? Would it be towards the United States? Sir, everybody knows that that would not be the wish of the clergy or of the Catholic people of Quebec. Would they turn their eyes to Germany? Sir, asking the question is to answer it. Would it be to France when we know that the clergy and the Catholic people of Quebec deplore the policy of the French government against certain of the Catholic institutions of France, and when we know that the members of those Catholic institutions are flocking to Canada where they are able to obtain a secure and peaceful home under the protection of the British flag. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier misunderstood the loyalty of the population of Quebec. It is strange that we, the Liberal members in this House, should have to fight for it

against those parties in the other provinces whose speeches we have heard in this House, and even against some of our own friends in Quebec. The French and the Catholic people of Quebec are loyal and their's is a true loyalty. It has been manifested so often that it looks almost absurd that we should have to defend it. Not many years ago, when the news reached us of the death of that most illustrious, kind and admirable woman, Queen Victoria, there was true sorrow manifested in the province of Quebec. To-day, it is not only loyalty that the people of Quebec feel for our great and kind King, but it is a sentiment of friendship. Not long ago, again, there was joy all over the province of Quebec when the news reached us of the establishment of the great entente cordiale between France and England, and if there came a war in which England would have to meet her enemies on the seas it would be a happy day in the province of Quebec, if, through that entente cordiale, France should launch her powerful fleet side by side with that of England.

Now, I desire to say a word about that referendum that has been proposed by different members on the other side of the House. I think it is the policy of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. How would it be possible, I would ask my hon. friends opposite, to go before the people with such a referendum. How many questions would we ask? Should we ask as many questions as there are policies in the House? There is the leader of the opposition with one policy favouring an immediate contribution, there is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier with his policy of doing nothing, there is the policy of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) favouring the giving of five or six Dreadnoughts at a time, and the policy of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty). It was very hard to follow him, and find out what the policy was which he did favour, but after he had spoken three hours, in the last five minutes of his speech, he managed to say, if I understood him properly, that he would be in favour of an immediate contribution provided we would have a word to say as to the expenditure of the money.

There would be four policies and consequently there would be four questions to put to the electors, and even if we should put these questions it would still be very difficult to get at the true meaning of the electorate. For example, some enterprising newspapers in Montreal have endeavoured to ascertain the opinions of their readers all over the country as to this naval policy and the result of their replies received was an evidence of very divergent views. Thousands of answers came in; some said: I am in favour of the statu quo provided we should promise that if England calls us we should rush to her aid; some said: We would be in favour of building a Canadian navy on the condition that we should not engage in foreign wars of the empire; and some said: We would be in favour of a fixed contribution on the condition that we should have some say in the foreign diplomacy of Britain. Now, how would you proceed, what were you to do if the result of your referendum was anything like the result of this newspaper vote. Is it not after all more logical, that having a responsible government elected every four years to conduct the affairs of this country, this question which in fact is a sequence of the military policy of this government should be left to the government and the parliament of Canada to settle. I submit, Sir, that the best way to prove we are true Canadians is to follow the course I have outlined. We must not forget that the paramount reason for the building of the Canadian navy is the protection of our trade. Putting aside for the moment the sentiment of loyalty which actuates every man in every part of Canada, and looking at the question in a business way only, is it not a fact that the development of the ship-building industry would be a most important thing for this country? Is it not a fact that the ship-building industry in England has been a great source of wealth, and is it not a fact that in Canada we have all the things necessary to construct ships of war as well as merchant vessels? As was pointed out very eloquently by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) we have in Canada the iron, the steel, the coal, the timber, and we have to back it all up, an energetic and intelligent people. Every civilized country in the world to-day is making great sacrifices to open up avenues of trade within themselves, and why should Canada be lacking in this respect. Putting aside, as I have said the question of sentiment, we have the opportunity to create an industry which will probably mean millions of dollars of wealth to this country and which will give employment to thousands of our citizens. Shall we lose the opportunity? Shall we prefer to take $25,000,000 and send it to England, or shall we be content to rest on our oars when at the same time we gladly vote millions of dollars for the betterment of our canals and for the equipment of our ports, and, for our militia? Well, Sir, I think we ought to be more Canadian than that. And, Sir, if we build a Canadian navy as outlined in the Bill which we are now discussing, then, when the real crisis comes to England, in the province of Quebec as in the other provinces of this Dominion, England may rest assured that every man will do his duty.

Mr. P. E. BLONDIN (Champlain). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I shall take the liberty of congratulating the hon. member from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion in his magnificent piece of oratory, but I de not deem it incumbent upon me to follow him in the more or less obscure intricacies of his reasoning. He did not even try to prove that he had authority from his supreme ruler, the people, to solve the important question which is now before the House, or that he had a mandate to that effect.

Much as I regret it, I feel that I am bound to protest loudly both against the policy of the government and against that of my own party as regards the question of creating a Canadian-imperial war fleet or of making a cash contribution.

In rising to concur in the amendment moved by the hon. member from Jacques Cartier asking that the question be submitted to the people before the government solve this matter, I am fully confident that I am merely ruled by my regard for the people and the institutions of this country, as the hon. member himself was.

I do not intend to cast the least doubt upon the sincereness of the hon. members who preceded me nor to inquire as to what extent rhetorics stand for logics and sometimes for truth, but I may be permitted, Sir, to state that the reasoning of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier still stands untouched in spite of all these attacks more dazzling and cunning than grave and convincing.

His speech still sheds upon this discussion rather obscured all the glowing light of the principle which inspired it and as already stated it shall remain upon our parliamentary records as 'a page of true history and a monument of logics and common sense.'

Much has been said up to this date about dangers from all sources which, according to me, threatened more the far distant shores of imagination than those of our country; but very little has been said of the danger, the sole danger evident and really imminent which threatens our most cherished and sacred rights: the government of this country by the people and not by autocratic ministers, the government of this country by the people and not by one hundred and forty members without mandate and authorization. For it is without any mandate from the people, without their knowledge and their consent that these hon. gentlemen propose and sanction this extraordinary measure which, as every one agrees, exceeds in importance and in formidable consequences the most serious and perplexing problem which has ever been before this country. And I ask these gentlemen when have the people, who after all are the sole masters, the only sovereign of this country, because in this British country the King himself is only the supreme representative of the national will, I ask these hon. gentlemen opposite when have the people given them a mandate to propound and execute such policy?

What is the use of invoking the resolution adopted on the 29th of March, 1909, a resolution which does not bind the members of this House any more than a thousand other resolutions unanimously adopted in the same way. This one has been laid away and will remain forever in the wide cemetery of the government, where it will never hear the trumpet of the resurrection? And even if this resolution could bind us, by what magical logic can it be claimed that it binds the people who have taken no part in it, who have not given consent to it nor authorized it? And is this report of the different imperial conferences, whose long publicity is pleaded a more serious and more justifiable reason than the first to refuse a plebiscite?

But even if this report, which may contain, but in a far less measure than it has been contended, a few imperceptible germs of the present policy, has been partly communicated to the electorate, to the mass of the people, it has been interpreted as containing the absolute refusal of Canada to take any part in the imperial policy, and nothing else; that is all what the people of this country have ever understood—that is all what they have learned. And who can contradict me when I assert that never has this government, nor the hon. Prime Minister, nor any of his followers ever done anything up to the present in order to modify or efface this popular belief.

Nowhere have thep explained to the people the policy now before us.

Some hon. ministers came to my constituency at the last general elections and they kept a most complete silence upon this question.

And I am still within the truth and moderation when I say that on the contrary they have expounded the very opposite during the last election; and since this question was started, and I will quote just one evidence amongst a thousand others. Here is what is said in 'Le Canada' of the 5th October, 1903, in an article entitled 'Participation Militaire:—

It would only be necessary that a few enthusiasts would pass a resolution and ask intervention to authorize England to take Canada at her word and say: 'all right, send your soldiers and your ships.' And our brave Canadians would be obliged to go and fight for the sake of Macedonia and at the greatest glory of Bachibouzouczs. While if we remain as we are, no one can ask us to go to the front. Let those who have adopted this resolution go if they like, but the Canadians won't go. Oh, yes, let us keep for a long time

to come the statu quo, where is our safe guard. Let us keep firmly into power Sir Wilfrid Laurier who has given to the Canadian people the assurance that he will not let our country run into the vortex of militarism nor meddle in the disputes of other nations. We are well, let us stay as we are.

But in order to avoid this reproach which is impossible, the hon. gentlemen have adopted their ordinary tactics; they keep silent in their weaknesses and their sins, and never uttered a word in defence. But in order to escape the strict consequences of this evident fact, they have undertaken to belittle before the public the immensity of the undertaking in which they will engage the country and they consider as a mere bagatelle the enormous sums which we will be obliged to spend.

They have been obliged, nevertheless, to admit that the first expense will amount to fifteen million dollars, and if we keep in mind this important admission of the First Minister 'that it might be the same with those estimates that it has been with the estimates of the Transcontinental, and that a great deal larger ones might follow,' if we put together the new information which comes to light every day, and which go to make the expense greater and greater, as for instance the estimate of admiral Kingsmill, which the hon. Minister of Militia seemed the other day, so afraid to communicate to the House, we must, without any great effort of imagination calculate this first cost at twenty-five millions of dollars and not fifteen millions.

And this is only part of the truth, because these hon. gentlemen take great care to keep before the public eye the veil which still hides our future obligations, this vortex of militarism upon which the hon. premier was speaking so eloquently in the days gone by, and which the experience of the old nations show in a way so clear, so precise, and so alarming. Neither have they said to their constituents that once entered in the game of armaments, a nation must increase and always increase her armies, multiply and always multiply her men of war. But the example of our own militia of which the budget has increased by the sum of $6,000,000 in a few years, is enough to make us suspicious about the silence of these gentlemen and the cautious of their optimism. But they go further than that when they try to benumb public opinion, and since the beginning of this debate, their aim has been to explain that this new unprecedented law is a natural sequence of our statutes and that it is only the development of our Militia Act.

Clause 69 of this Act expressly says that the Governor in Council can put our militia in active service on the frontiers or farther, only for the defence of Canada. Nothwithstanding allegations to the contrary, I claim that this clause does not justify the argument of these hon. gentlemen, 'that Canada is obliged to share in all the wars of the empire,' but that it means that 'Canada is only obliged to take part in his own wars, and that he is at war only when being attacked.'

The people of this country have always interpreted the law in that way, and the law which is proposed to-day is one which they ignore, which is contrary to their political ideas, and upon which they have never been consulted.

But the people, in the eyes of the hon. gentlemen opposite, have repeated it long enough, they have given it sufficiently to understand, the people, for them, is a great child in guardianship who never must be consulted on the grave questions, for fear of fanatism and juvenile passions. This belief holds so firmly in the mind of the hon. gentlemen that it overflows in all their speeches, it escapes by all the numerous breaks of their arguments. Mr. Speaker, I must sincerely admit that I cannot understand what good it would be to call parliament after our navy would be gone, in order to express our approbation or disapprobation when the thing is done. And I cannot see in this clause anything other than a last subterfuge to hide unmannerly to the people the fatal blow given to his absolute right to control public expenses and take obligations for the future and without his consent as we do presently; a last subterfuge to hide in a very feeble manner and contemptious manner the humiliating attitude which will be an everlasting blow to the conscience of the country, in imposing to a whole people a war which he will not have declared nor desired, and which he will probably disprove. After all, Mr. Speaker, the people have a right to know and to appreciate all these new facts before being bound to them for ever.

These are new considerations which amply justify the amendment of the honourable member for Jacques Cartier, and which will make this Bill, if parliament adopt it, not only an abuse of our mandate, but an infringement on the liberty and institutions of this country.

But I do not wish to take my seat before saying to this government that I am ready to suffer the extreme consequences of my convictions and in order to release my responsibility of the claim which is about to be perpetrated and if the hon. gentlemen refuse the appeal to the people which we ask and which is asked by the thousands of people who signed the petitions which we have presented, I am ready, Mr. Speaker, to put immediately my resignation into your hands, if the honourable Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) who has made himself a champion of this policy in my province, will do the same and run with me the risks

of an election in the county of Champlain, where he will find, I can assure him, a population above the spirit of fanatism and party which he and his honourable friends seem so much to fear in our people.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily join with the honourable member of Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty) in the congratulations which he offered to the right hon. Prime Minister upon his happy return to health. I was most happy about it, but I am assured that the hon. member has not spoken all his mind and omitted the best of his wishes. He would have liked to see the hon. premier younger. We would also, all of us, see him in the prime of his bright youthful years, so that he would find also his past convictions, and instead of defending this Bill in the House, he would fight it on our side.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval). Mr. Speaker, before the trumpets of the last judgment of our parliamentary institution, blown by the hon. member of Jacques Cartier, and echoed by the hon. member of Champlain (Mr. Blondin) have ceased to be heard——

Mr. BLONDIN. At the resurrection.

Mr. WILSON. I ask permission to raise my feeble voice before the government, the Liberal party, and the whole people has entered into that eternity, happy or unhappy, of which the honourable member has spoken. I will speak in a language which is not my own, but which every one here understands.

Mr. Speaker, I will support Bill (No. 95), and I desire, in a few words to state to this House my reasons for doing so. The main reason, rather I would say the sole reason, for it includes all the others, is because Canada occupies now the position of a nation, and as such has a status, a rank, amongst the other nations of the world, and more so amongst the dominions, colonies, possessions forming part of the British empire, an empire on which the sun never sets.

As a nation Canada has: (1) a dignity to uphold; (2) a territory to defend; (3) a trade to protect; (4) various obligations to herself, to the mother country, and to the empire; which obligations and duties I will, with your kind indulgence, the full measure of which I claim, submit to this House for consideration.

The building of a national navy is a duty of the hour which this government cannot escape without being unfaithful to the mandate entrusted to it by the people of this country, a duty which it could not ignore without impairing the most sacred rights, the welfare and the interests of the people.

The advantages of the construction of a Canadian navy from an industrial point of view, namely, the creation of a new industry, ship-building; the construction of dockyards; the construction of the ships on Canadian soil by the people of Canada; the various trades that will benefit by it; the creation of a naval school; the defence of our sea-boards; the defence of the country in co-operation with our militia; the protection of trade on the coasts, on inland waters and on the high seas—are also questions of vital importance to the people of Canada.

I will also try to meet a few of the objections formulated against this legislation My conclusions are to be found in the various clauses of the Bill laid the other day on the table of the House and which constitute the subject of the present debate.

But, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, is Canada a nation? Above and before all the essential and distinctive characteristics of a nation, the qualifications sine qua non of its existence, are: the community of the law, the body of legislation, the participation in governing power, the rights to express freely the will of the whole and to affirm it in Acts, the constitutional organs which it possesses, and in a word, the personality, public and judicial. The power in the hands of the people and the full exercise of the faculty of self-government in all matters of legislative and municipal administration, are the principal attributes of nationhood. Has the Canadian people, according to the above classical and complete definition, a life organic, political, social, judicial, common and international? Does it fulfil the conditions above enumerated? It is for you, Sir, to pronounce. For my part, I will not go as far as to say that 'poser la question c'est la résoudre,' but my mind, my conscience and my patriotism are satisfied and crave no further definitions. It is true that this title of a nationhood has been denied to Canada. Some people say: 'We sometimes call ourselves a nation, but we are only a colony. Our constitution is as liberal as it possibly could be in view of the fact that Canada is a colony and therefore a dependency.' In reply, I much prefer the assertion of the learned Professor Wrong of the University of Toronto, who in presence of no less a prominent man than Hon. James Bryce, the British ambassador at Washington, emphatically affirmed that Canada was in reality a free country; that the British ambassador at Washington had one of the most difficult positions to fill, a more embarrassing task, to perform than had the other diplomats, because he had to serve and represent two nations instead of one, to wit: England and Canada. And he also said:

> In theory the King reigns, but in reality he has no political powers, it is the Prime Minister who governs. In theory, Canada is a colony, but in reality she is an independent nation.

After all, Sir, it is not a question of mere play on words. As a learned German professor, M. Bluntschli stated:

The international law established no human tribunal to decree whether a body of men are qualified or not for nationhood; the tribunal of God alone may pronounce and its decrees are recorded in the history of the world.

Sir, I have uttered a most terrible word, the word 'independent.' I presume I will have to account for that most heinous crime to my hon. friends from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), who the other day charged the Prime Minister with being a very bad man, who, from 1866 to the present day, went and is still going up and down the country, preaching independence, belittling and deriding 'the diplomacy of the British empire, instilling insidious poisons into the minds of young and growing citizens.' And he goes on to say:

But he has done more than that. He has never given up an opportunity, during the last ten or fifteen years, of representing Canada as engaged in deadly peril, wrenching from the British government, tyrannical government, rights and privileges, and he has stretched to the very verge of a very vivid imagination the rights and privileges which we to-day enjoy by virtue of the concession of the British prerogative. And so his Minister of Marine afterwards comes back from the conference of 1909 and says: We have wrenched from Great Britain our political autonomy, we have wrenched from Great Britain our treaty-making autonomy, we have wrenched from Great Britain our fiscal autonomy, and now I come back with our naval autonomy. All these things my right hon. friend speaks; lesser men echo what he says. These are but the results of teaching.

And he plays that tune for many more lines. He also quotes a few detached phrases from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at various dates, to wit, from 1888 to 1890, the following:

In 1888 in the House of Commons he says:

The time is coming when the present relations between Great Britain and Canada must either become closer or be severed altogether.

At the Club National, on the 2nd of July, 1890, he made another profession of faith:

I do not mean to say that we should always remain a colony; on the contrary, the day is coming when this country will have to take its place among the nations of the earth. But I do not want to see my country's independence attained through the hostility of one race to another.

Oh, in the opinion of my hon. friends from North Toronto, Frontenac and others that Quebec French Laurier is a most disloyal and monstrous man because he spoke such a language. There is no man in the whole British empire who would not repudiate such assertions. Certainly, at least, nobody would entertain such a proposition in the good city of Toronto or in loyal Ontario.

Far from me the intention of irritating the nerves of my hon. friends nor offending their pure and disinterested imperialism, but for their own edification I will ask them permission to read the following:

But it is no longer possible for any Canadian to deny to his country the status and dignity of a nation. British ideals and practice assure to us continuance and growth of the powers of self-government with which we have been so long entrusted. Our connection with the British Crown, though formed by the deepest and most strenuous loyalty, is a connection which involves no economic fetters, and which is rapidly tending in all foreign relations towards freedom of contract and full powers of management, in respect of Canadian affairs. We make our own laws. No attempt is made at imperial control. It seems no longer possible to withhold from us the right to make our own treaties, even in cases which may indirectly affect imperial interests. British garrisons have been withdrawn, and Canada manages, without review or appeal, her military affairs. The great fortified harbours of Canada, which Britain deemed an essential part of that great maritime system by which she maintained her naval supremacy and effectively policed the world, have been assumed by Canada. In her outlook towards Britain, Canada, while loyal is independent. She faces the rest of the world, in every essential sense, a free, autonomous and imperial power.

And this is an extract from a valuable essay entitled, 'Shall Canada have a navy of her own?' by Mrs. W. Hewes-Oliphant, Toronto, and Toronto was so proud of her that a prize of $400 was awarded to the author! And in Toronto!

But perhaps, Sir, this authority would leave my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) indifferent and his conscience will still rest at peace.

Far from me the idea of converting him to that doctrine, but let me bring forth in support, in a different order of things, it is true, but on the same lines, the parole of a prominent man formerly from Toronto and now occupying a very high position in that more or less loyal city of Montreal. I refer to His Grace Archbishop Farthing. I am quoting from a newspaper report:

A most outspoken address was that delivered by Bishop Farthing before a representative gathering of churchmen at the first annual dinner of the Federation of Churchmen's Associations, held last night at the Canada Club.

Speaking on behalf of the Anglican church in Canada, he made a striking declaration of absolute independence from the mother church in England. Then he proceeded to castigate the city council of Montreal for its inaction in regard to the outbreak of typhoid, and to call on all churchmen to work for a higher ideal of citizenship.

Owe Allegiance only to Primate of Canada.

We need to remember said Bishop Farthing, that we are a national church. There is a tendency across the water to think that we must not legislate or move a step forward unless the mother church tells us we may.

No one has more respect for the mother church than I. No man here owes more to the mother church than I. Everything I possess, morally and spiritually I have from her.

But here we are a daughter setting up housekeeping for ourselves. We are not always to be under the dictation of the mother whose home we have left, and for whom we have the deepest respect, and love, and veneration. We are here as an independent national church.

We realize to-day, more than ever, the prophecies of all the great statesmen, the far foreseeing political geniuses, who have adorned the political summits of the empire, more specially during the last half century, and at the head of whom sparkles with a most brilliant eclat, the late Lord Russell. If you will allow me I will quote just a few words of the famous speech which he delivered in Westminster on the 8th February, 1850, when addressing the House on the question of colonial policy. I am sorry the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is not in his seat, because I think he would be much scandalized at what Lord John Russell said. I shall only read a brief quotation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Read it all.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I shall be happy to do so. He said:

The next point, I think, is that in conformity with the policy on which you have governed your British North America colonies, you should as far as possible, proceed upon the principle of introducing and maintaining political freedom in all your colonies. I think whenever you say political freedom cannot be introduced, your are bound to show the reasons for the exemption, and to show that the people are a race among whom it is impossible to carry out free institutions—that you must show the colony is not formed of the British people or even that there is no such admixture of the British population as to make it safe to introduce representative institutions. Unless you can show that, I think the general rule would be that you should send to the different parts of the world, and maintain in your different colonies men of the British race, and capable of governing themselves; men whom you shall tell will have full liberty of governing themselves, and that while you are their representative with respect to all foreign concerns, you wish to interfere no further in their domestic concerns than may be clearly and decidedly necessary to prevent a conflict in the colony itself.

But what I say is this, we should not be considering whether we should part with those colonies—whether we should make the connection looser—or whether we should even leave them with less means of defence against foreign aggregation.

I believe not only that you may proceed on those principles without any danger for the present, but there may be questions arising hereafter which you may solve without any danger of such an unhappy conflict as that which took place with what are now the United States of America. On looking back at the origin of that unhappy contest, I cannot but think that it was not a single error or a single blunder which got us into that contest, but a series of repeated errors and repeated blunders. . . . I anticipated indeed with others that some of the colonies may so grow in population and wealth that they may say—Our strength is sufficient to enable us to be independent of England. The link is now become onerous to us—the time is come when we think we can, in amity and alliance with England, maintain our independence. I do not think that that time is yet approaching. But let us make them as far as possible, fit to govern themselves—let us give them, as far as we can, the capacity of ruling their own affairs—let them increase in wealth and population, and whatever may happen, we of this great empire shall have the consolation of saying that we have contributed to the happiness of the world.

And to think that Lord John Russell was the Prime Minister of England!

Without endorsing all the above remarks, without sharing in all these opinions expressed by such pre-eminent men, I thought it proper to repeat them in this House for the benefit of all, who may, in my humble judgment, draw from them useful lessons of tolerance, of liberty, of speech, in British parliaments at home and abroad. Nobody would have thought then, nor would think to-day of accusing Lord Russell of treason or disloyalty because of such utterances and predictions? But, here, to a certain class of men, it seems almost a crime to dissertate on the future of our country, on the possibilities of the future, on the preparations for the coming times.

Sir, I don't want to be misunderstood or misconstrued on this question. I am not in favour of the independence of Canada, in the sense that some people attach to the expression. I am not advocating that doctrine. Whatever may be the term employed, whether it be independence, or autonomy, nation or colony—it is of little moment to me so long as we remain what we are, as we are and where we are. Nothing more but nothing less. We need the protection of the mother country and at all and every point of view either national, political, commercial, and even sentimental, Canada has nothing but to gain and benefit by that protection. No disconnection, no severance, but good amity and alliance between the mother country and her autonomous daughter nation is my motto.

But, Sir, we do not know what the future has in store for us; what natural evolution will bring about. We may be left alone and this is one of the reasons why we should prepare, and, amongst other preparations, I believe that the building of a navy is the one most to the fore and of pressing necessity. Is it reasonable to have a navy of our own? What would

happen to us in case of a conflict between England and Germany, for instance, or any of the great powers of Europe? For one, Sir, I am in doubt on the question whether there is or there is not a German menace, and a reasonable cause for it; whether those who apprehend the conflict, are right or wrong. The only thing we may assert is that this agitation has caused the question of naval defence to spring up to more life again. And the people of this country, and the majority of the members of this parliament, are convinced that it is time for us to fortify and protect our young nationhood.

It would be useless to give too much importance to the stirring articles of a Robert Blachford, or of the legion of journalists of his type, who wrote thousands and thousands of columns on the German question in the German press, in the English press, in the European and American press, not to say in the universal press. Without giving too much consideration and importance to the more or less terroristic speeches delivered by stumpers and lecturers on this subject, I feel justified, in saying that, with all due respect for those who think otherwise, one may draw the following conclusions: Germany is increasing her war material—her navy; she is trying to follow England as close as possible in that line. Is it in view of capturing the supremacy of the sea? England, if not scared, took notice of it any way, and she is now increasing her own navy. It is not war yet, but a serious Dreadnoughts' competition to say the least. It was one of the favourite themes of the politicians during the last campaign in England, and statesmen of no small importance firmly believed in the German peril.

Lord Beresford, speaking at a banquet tendered to him in New York during last summer, went as far as to say:

Personally, I am not at all easy about the immediate future. I see red sky ahead, and I do not like it. Prominent statesmen have made speeches full of anxiety for the possibilities of the situation.

Thousands of people have thought and have spoken that way. A Canadian imperialist writes:

Germany has been for the last few years, ever since the success and power of the first British Dreadnoughts became known, concentrating her national energies in the construction of a fleet of Dreadnoughts and of suitable docks in which to refit and repair them. Neither argument, persuasion nor threat prevails to turn her a hair's breadth from her policy in this respect. Thinking and reflecting men know that in building her fleet at such tremendous national sacrifices as her people are compelled to submit to, Germany can only be doing it for the purpose of wresting from Great Britain her naval supremacy.

After all, Sir, can a sensible man reasonably ask himself the following questions: Why all those peace conferences without practically any results, during the sessions of which every delegate is keeping, with a sentiment of suspicion, his eyes wide opened on his neighbours around the table ronde of the deliberations? What messages do the delegates bring to their respective governments, we know not. We cannot tell. But the evident result is armaments, armaments and more and more armaments?

What is the significance of that steeplechase for Dreadnoughts? It may not be war at once, but assuredly Sir, it cannot be peace! If it is peace, it is a terribly armed peace.

But I do not believe its reign will soon commence. War has ravaged the world since the early days of creation, and will ravage it, I am afraid, as long as there shall be human beings under the skies. That is my honest belief, and I cannot but feel convinced that all these tremendous preparations for war will only result in war. We all applaud the appeal of the pacifists, and allow me to quote the following from Lord Beresford, who, on the same occasion, said:

The English-speaking nations, the United States and the five nations of the British empire, are the great trading nations of the world. Why should they not join and say that there shall be no war? That again, could be no threat; it would mean only that we mean to maintain the peace that at present reigns.

But was that appeal echoed by anybody? Will that long sighed for peace ever come? Will its reign ever begin? And after all, supposing the English speaking races were to join together to prevent war, what would be the result? This alliance of the English speaking peoples would provoke a counter alliance, and the situation would be practically the same. The nations of the world are far from being prepared to accept such a condition. They are not homogeneous enough, and their relations have not the necessary uniformity. The result may perhaps be attained some day in the distant future, when these relations and the essential character of humanity will be better understood, and the nations may then be ready to hear and understand the language that will appeal to them. In case of war between England and Germany or England and any other nation, in what position would we find ourselves? We all admit that we have a seafaring traffic to protect, and sea-boards to defend. The Prime Minister has clearly defined the position when he said: 'When the mother country is at war, Canada is at war . It would be wasting time for me to repeat the explanation, any unbiased man will

understand it. In case of war breaking out to-morrow, or for many years to come, England needs all her navy for her own defence, England cannot put a single gun at our disposal. England being attacked cannot defend herself and all her dominions at the same time, one hundred Dreadnoughts would not suffice. Supposing England lost all her possessions and colonies, that would not relieve her from the expense of building a single ship. England needs all her fleet. Why, Sir, her fleet is not strong enough, apparently, because every day she is expending more and more money to augment it, and to modify it to meet new inventions, and more modern devices. How can we reasonably expect help and protection from her in case of a clash between her and Germany, or any other country? England would be pleased, no doubt, to receive money contributions from us, or to receive Dreadnoughts; she needs them, but that is not the question as I understand it. The question is: What can we do to assist her, and what should be the form of this assistance to make it the most effective both for Canada, and England, if we take into account, as we are in duty bound, our status as a nation, the provisions of our constitutional Act, our geographical situation generally, and more especially the strategical point of view, our resources, our revenue and our wealth? These are questions which our representatives at the various colonial conferences have well considered and understood, and upon which they have taken their stand. The result was the present legislation, which I think wisely and reasonably enacts that we should equip a navy of our own. In case of emergency we may put our naval force at the disposal of His Majesty to form part of the royal navy. This bring up clauses 17, 18 and 19 of the Bill against which there has been levelled so many criticisms by the group of members headed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and by Mr. Bourassa, who both wrongly pretend to represent in this House the sentiment of the majority of the people of Quebec. Mr. Bourassa says frankly, in an editorial in his paper 'Le Devoir' of the 11th of February, and in another on the 14th of February, that he is in favour of a Canadian navy:

(Translation). Had the question been the building of Canadian navy, for the defence of Canada, under the control of the Canadian government, I would have nothing to say against clauses 17 and 19, nor in fact against the Act as a whole Had the government committed us to an expenditure, and even a large expenditure, for the organization of the naval defence of Canada, the protection of her harbours and her coasting trade—a trade which, after all constitutes our whole maritime trade—the Nationalists would perhaps pointed out more urgent works to be undertaken, even from the viewpoint of the security of our territory; but they would not have urged any objection against the measure itself.

What seems to us foolish and at variance with national interests, even from the mere financial standpoint, is the fact of throwing Canada into the 'vortex of European militarism' for the exclusive benefit of England.

That is the main objection of these gentlemen to the Bill. These three clauses have been so fully discussed that nothing new can be said with regard to them. However, for the sake of argument, let us wipe out these three clauses, then the Bill would be satisfactory to my hon. friends. The law being so amended, let us suppose a clash occurred between England and Germany, or any other power, and in case of war the prestige, the honour of the empire would be at stake. Would my hon. friends be prepared to say that Canada should do nothing in these circumstances? Are they prepared to say that while England's fate were in the balance, or in great danger, that our fleet should remain inactive, at anchor, at Quebec, Halifax, St. John and Esquimalt, unconcerned and disinterested? Are they prepared to say that it would not be the duty of Canada to do something for England, because these three clauses did not appeal to them? I know too well my hon. friends, even my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Blondin) who has just spoken. I am satisfied that he would approve of the action that is contemplated in these three clauses. My contention is that the Governor in Council, under those three clauses, should place the Canadian navy at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the royal navy. This patriotic action would be endorsed by parliament, by the people at large, and by every patriotic French Canadian in the province of Quebec.

Now, Sir, let us not confine our views and our actions to the limited horizon of the moment. Let us think about the future, the near and the far future. As the old proverb has it: 'An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure.' Let us face the future with the calm of men who feel the responsibility of their office, of men who will not sacrifice the interest of their country, the welfare of the people for petty party purposes, of men who realize, who know that their action of to-day will be echoed for years and years to come, for centuries to come of men engaged in the solemn and sacred operation of moulding the destines of a nation.

Mr. Speaker, the British empire is vast, immense and powerful, but it cannot assert, it cannot claim eternity as her privilege. What is a century in the life of an empire? What is a century in the evolution of a nation? To pretend and assert that the British empire will not

dissolve some day, would be to ignore, to deny history.

The British empire is not the first one that was founded. Many empires have spread over the world their alternatively beneficent, and malevolent power and majesty. What has become of the empire of Alexander, of Caesar, of Charlemagne, of Frederick, of Charles V, of Napoleon? The empire we are so proud of, we are so happy to form part of, long may it live for the happiness of Canada, and the whole world! But war has often unexpected and unforeseen results. War means victory, it means also defeat. What would become of us, if, for the empire, it was defeat? Nobody can give a definite and positive answer. Some far seeing minds may only predict, may suppose, may conjecture. Now, Sir, I firmly believe that this is not the time nor the occasion when one may say: 'Dans le doute, abstiens-toi'—in doubt, abstain,' but: 'In doubt, prepare.' So vis pacem para bellum. I believe in legislating and preparing for the future. Let us not consider only the cares and views of the moment; let us look farther ahead. England has always protected Canada. From 1760 to 1906, from the capitulation of Quebec to the abandonment of Halifax and Esquimalt, England has maintained a body of troops in Canada, maintained here an army and a navy for about a century and a half. Now the last of the English soldiers has embarked for the mother country. Why has England withdrawn all her troops and squadrons? It is because she believed it was time for us to have a militia of our own. It is because she intimated that our wealth was large enough to maintain and enlarge our military force and to build a navy of our own. It is because she had faith in our loyalty to such an extent as to give us the command of our army and navy. England surrendered to us the fortified places of the land. What does England expect us to do now that we have been left entirely to our own selves? Does England expect us to give her money or build ships for ourselves? Does England expect from us imperial gifts of Dreadnoughts when we have not even a rowboat? No, Sir, the only conclusion to draw is that when England recalled her troops from this land, she believed that we were capable of providing for ourselves to a certain extent, and so we do and so we shall do.

Now, Sir, you will remark: In case we should be abandoned to ourselves, to our own resources, have we not the Munroe doctrine to protect us. The hon. Postmaster General has so eloquently given a masterly answer to that question, and in so able a manner, that for me to repeat it would be to minimize it. I will simply say this: Perhaps our neighbours would protect us, but would this protection be for our advantage or for their own? No doubt they would, at least, ask for a contribution. We would have to foot the bill in proportion to our population, territory, borders and what else and what not. In what proportion would it be—one-tenth or one-fifth? For my part I prefer to help the mother of our liberties, as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) so truly described her the other day, the mother who, for more than a century and a half has accustomed us to concessions of freedom, of government, of liberty, the result of which is what we are to-day, a prosperous, a free nation. And the best manner to help her, and prevent bad results, is by building a Canadian navy. We owe that to Canada; we owe that to England and the empire. England does not impose any contribution of money on her dominions. She has always been satisfied to let each of them provide for itself, remembering, however, that they form part of the greatest empire of the world and that they have obligations of honour, of solidarity, and confraternity.

The building of a navy in Canada will be, in my opinion, a most beneficial innovation. Industry and labour, at large, will derive the greatest advantage therefrom.

On this subject I cannot do better than quote the following from a valuable magazine called the 'Iron Age':

The Army and Navy as Industrial Schools.

That military discipline is an excellent preparation for work in factories, is asserted by a writer in the 'Iron Age' (New York, July 29, 1909). In his opinion the enforced military service of the continental nations of Europe is of use to them in this regard, and he suggests that our own navy may perform the same function for us. He writes:—

An American who has spent considerable time in German shops comments upon the excellent discipline which prevails everywhere as the direct result of the military or naval service which all Germans are compelled to perform. The years of absolute obedience to superior officers have a lasting influence upon a large majority of men, as shown by them in the industrial works where they are employed in after life. Quick compliance with orders need not mean servility. It is the same obedience which the men from whom workmen take orders extend to their own superiors. It does not of necessity curtail suggestion, because the trend of discipline is of a different sort. We have heard American employers say that they like to get young men who have been trained in the navy under conditions as they have existed in recent years, because they have been well grounded in their work, are resourceful and above the average in their ability and willingness to make suggestions, and at the same time obey quickly, without sullenness and seldom with resentment. The author of a communication to one of the metropolitan dailies, answering a criticism of the navy as a national extravagance, takes up the question from the employee's view-point, saying:—

As for 15,000 young men 'turned from productive industry'—well, the navy requires electricians, telegraphers, carpenters, plumbers, machinists, engineers, coppersmiths, boilermakers, clerks, 59 trades in all, and it educates boys to fulfil these duties. I know whereof I speak. I learned my trade in the navy, was honourably discharged two years ago, having saved $800 in my four years, and I am now on a salary of $3,200 per annum. The navy taught me all I know of 'productive industry.'

The American navy seems to be an industrial school worth taking into consideration. The industries of the country need well-trained men. Schools are being established in many centres in order that the supply may be increased. The suggestion of the benefit of the modern naval training is a good one. The warship of to-day is not unlike a great industrial plant. The immense complexity of machinery which performs the various functions of the vessel, combined with the equipment which looks after maintenance and repairs, affords the opportunity for a practical training which should be of great value to a young man after his term of enlistment has ended, especially if he follows the trade in which he has been specialized. Moreover, the fact that he has lived under strict discipline is a consideration not to be lightly discredited.

I shall quote now from a French Canadian who seems to be a gentleman of experience and an able writer, Mr. Fred. E. Gauthier, who in a letter to the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' dated September 15, 1909, says:

As for the raw material, our St. Lawrence river and gulf, the Atlantic and Pacific coasts can furnish a magnificent and intelligent class of men; all we require is to encourage young men to enter and remain in a naval service belonging to Canada, whether government or merchant, in the same manner as has been done for our permanent militia corps.

The officers and crews of all Dominion vessels, whether employed as cruisers, survey vessels, in the fishery service or lighthouse service, should be drilled by competent instructors at sea, during the summer; this would not interfere with their regular routine of duties; in winter all these men, or at least those who are willing, could be attached to the permanent militia units in Halifax, Quebec, or Esquimalt, where further instructions could be imparted, and greater discipline infused. Canada would have, before long, a very fair nucleus of trained officers and men, who would feel proud of their service, in the same manner as do the officers and men of our permanent militia corps.

Schools of navigation could be attached to the depot points such as Halifax, Quebec and Esquimalt, where the men could be taught navigation, qualify under the rules of the board of trade, and obtain certificates as masters and mates. Later on, as the government through experience, perfects this system, the men instead of remaining in barracks in the winter could be put on board a regular training ship and sent on foreign cruise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to protect our whole trade and not only a portion of it, we have to protect not only Canadian goods on Canadian ships, but also Canadian and foreign goods as well, on British ships. It is true that the six large steamship companies, plying from Canada to British countries and elsewhere, are English, but they carry away our own goods and carry in the foreign goods we consume. We need those ships for our exports as well as for our imports.

I have a few statistics on our trade with the various countries of the world which to save time, I shall hand to the reporters.

TRADE AND COMMERCE.

Aggregate Trade of Canada by Countries during the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1908, Includes Coin and Bullion.

Countries.	Total exports.	Total imports.	Total trade.
	$	$	$
British Empire—			
Great Britain	134,484,156	95,855,887	230,340,043
Australia	2,873,461	536,935	3,410,396
British Africa	2,011,382	32,193	2,043,575
British East Indies	30,105	4,036,867	4,066,972
British West Indies	2,483,118	7,211,801	9,694,919
British Guiana	607,350	2,082,003	2,689,353
Fiji Islands	137,625	1,641,319	1,178,944
Hong Kong	267,533	275,417	542,950
Newfoundland	3,408,518	1,777,659	5,186,177
New Zealand	993,442	257,044	1,250,486
Other British Possessions	451,395	2,937	454,332
Total British Empire	147,748,085	113,110,062	260,858,147

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Concluded.*

Aggregate Trade of Canada by Countries during the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1908, Includes Coin and Bullion.

Countries.	Total exports.	Total imports.	Total trade.
	$	$	$
Foreign Countries—			
Argentina	2,266,945	872,026	3,138,971
Austria-Hungary	11,577	1,365,933	1,377,510
Belgium	3,377,479	2,405,971	5,783,450
Brazil	969,001	350,620	1,319,621
Central American States	85,457	84,916	170,373
Chile	274,008	117,375	391,373
China	964,793	724,926	1,689,719
Cuba	1,366,319	515,163	1,881,482
Denmark	222,676	42,498	265,174
Dutch East Indies	1,000	316,563	317,563
Egypt	41,095	40,061	81,156
France	1,806,732	10,251,717	12,058,449
Germany	2,374,607	8,250,745	10,625,352
Greece	304	409,691	409,995
Hawaii	65,006	12,093	77,099
Holland	855,085	1,512,145	2,367,230
Italy	349,839	806,481	1,156,320
Japan	741,108	2,197,159	2,938,267
Mexico	477,119	919,826	1,396,945
Norway	195,465	103,103	298,568
Panama	92,318	.....	92,318
Peru	118,505	20	118,525
Philippines	180,614	11,391	192,005
Porto Rico	543,714	6,732	550,446
Portugal	46,865	154,234	201,099
Russia	425,068	315,889	740,957
St. Pierre	134,678	38,155	172,833
Spain	106,594	1,148,575	1,255,169
Sweden	98,805	192,122	290,927
Switzerland	17,664	2,759,762	2,777,426
Turkey	5,151	535,444	540,565
Uruguay	111,196	277,040	388,236
United States	113,520,500	220,791,209	334,311,709
Other countries	411,234	146,918	558,152
Total foreign countries	132,258,521	257,676,463	389,934,984
Total imports and exports	280,006,606	370,786,525	650,793,131

These figures show the immense trade of Canada, half of which, at least, is maritime, which we should protect.

I shall now, Mr. Speaker, deal briefly with the question of the plebiscite which is the great cry of some of our hon. friends opposite. To those who demand a plebiscite, let me say, this: When the people of Canada returned this government into power, it was a renewal of confidence. In 1896, 1900, 1904 and 1908, the country by a large majority expressed its faith in Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party. The people do not expect from us that on each and every Act of legislation and administration we will spend a quarter or a half a million dollars for a consultation with them. The defence of our territory, the defence of our sea-boards, of our ports and our harbours, the protection of our trade, the protection of our commerce on the sea, are all primordial questions and so much within the scope of the constitution that this parliament, by the very fact of its existence, has as its sacred mission and duty to take all the necessary steps to protect and defend the people and the territory. The defence of our territory is an elementary duty of a governing power; a sine qua non condition and reason of its existence. The people will ask: Why a plebiscite? We have sent you to parliament to perform your duties and this is one of them. Was there any plebiscite in England or in Germany, to approve or disapprove of the construction of Dreadnoughts and the increase of the naval forces at large? No. Nor was there a plebiscite here in 1899, and the people ratified in 1900 the action of the Governor General in Council. In 1907, on the 12th of July, a law was

passed by the French parliament reducing the time of military service from three to two years, and the effect of that amendment to the law, was the licensement of nearly of 50,000 men, and there was no plebiscite. There was no plebiscite in 1862 or in 1868 for the Militia Act, there was no plebiscite even for confederation.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Was there not a plebiscite on the prohibition question.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. Certainly, and I am glad my hon. friend has asked that question. That was a plebiscite on a question of internal economy, while this is a question international in its scope, and one which affects the defence of our territory, and there is a great difference between the two. My hon. friend knows what was the result of the plebiscite on prohibition? Does he think that that plebiscite advanced the question of prohibition in any degree? No, Sir, I believe that the good will of the people, the work of the temperance associations, and the preaching of our ministers of different creeds do more for temperance than any plebiscite could do. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier urges that this is a question of too large an expense, and one which involves too heavy obligations for the future. He does not want to spend on our protection $15,000,000, but he proposes a heavier expenditure of $100,000,000 or more for the Georgian Bay canal, and for that he does not propose a plebiscite. Supposing a plebiscite would be ordered, what would my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and his supporters say to the electors? Would they say that we must not protect ourselves now that England has withdrawn her Pacific squadron, and her North Atlantic squadron from our waters, and now that the last of the English troops has departed from Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and Esquimalt, for the mother country. Will they tell them that what was decided at the various conferences was unwise, derisoire, disloyal and unconstitutional? Will they go against the statement made to the House of Commons by Mr. Asquith on the 29th August, 1909, which is resumed as follows as far as Canada is concerned:

> As regards Canada, it was considered that her double sea-boards rendered the provision of the fleet unit of the same kind unsuitable for the present. It was prepared, according to the amount of money, that might be available, that Canada should make a start with cruisers of the 'Bristol' type and destroyers of the improved river class—a part to be stationed on the Atlantic sea-board and a part on the Pacific.

Will they say that we will not help England in case of danger? Will they say that we don't need the protection of England? Will they say that we must not vote a penny for the defence of Canada? Will they say to the other dominions and colonies: Do what it pleases you to do, we will not contribute in any shape or form? Will they say our trade with Great Britain and ten or fifteen other British countries, our trade with more than forty or fifty foreign countries need no protection? No, Sir, we know them too well; we all know they would not dare speak such a language. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has pretended that on this side of the House there were some grinding of the teeth; the hon. member for North Toronto has discovered a composing room, a rack, a thumb-screw and other forms and instruments of torture. These gentlemen must have had terrible nightmares, and it is no wonder. They are fighting so much between themselves that they have lost their heads and all control over their nerves and imagination. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier must be deaf and insensible if he does not hear the grinding of teeth his policy has aroused in his party against the province of Quebec and himself whose sentiments, fortunately, the hon. gentleman does not reflect on that question. He must be insensible if he does not feel the ferocious bites of his warm friends of yesterday and of the last elections; his leaders, the hon. member for North Toronto, the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, and last but not least, the hon. member for Frontenac. I am sorry that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has belittled that national and patriotic question to a paltry party question. Have you heard him accuse his leader of lack of courtesy towards him, and the member for North Toronto, of having failed to keep his word towards him? But, Sir, is it a real fight between the members at your left or a sham battle? It looks as if it is a case where they all agree to disagree —for party purposes. They are preparing, sharpening their favourite weapon, the double-faced policy. But the people have not been fooled in the past and will not be this time either. The people of Quebec will never consent to play that isolation game. What the people of this country expect from us and want us to do is that: Having been chosen and elected as members of this parliament for its legal term, we shall govern and legislate for the people; having taken the oath, that oath we shall keep; we shall faithfully do our duty to the full measure, without feebleness or faltering; we shall be faithful to the King and to the constitution of our country; that constitution we shall not disobey, but shall preserve intact and sacred; we shall not sacrifice the slightest parcel of our autonomy to jingoism or partisanship; whatever may be the expenditure for the naval defence, we shall spend the money, and the whole of the money in Canada for Canada. Some people pretend that by building a Canadian navy we are helping to break the

bond that ties us so closely to the mother country. This proposition I cannot entertain for one moment. We shall uphold, and very highly, the dignity of our nation. We shall enjoy to the limit the full liberty of self-government, and we will not allow any one to interfere in our domestic affairs.

Let Canada build her own navy with her own money; let Canada train her own men on her own ships. In 1775, in 1812, in 1854, in 1865, in 1899, during the African war, and elsewhere, it was our trained men who added lustre to the Canadian name and advanced our progressive march toward nationhood. Canada in making a start with a navy does not intend to enter into any naval competition, but to bear her share in the great work of maintaining the prestige of the Canadian and British names. By making safer her commercial routes, Canada is thus adding to her commercial renown. Canada with a navy, commands more respect as a nation in international relations. Canada's name has become great and respected because of our ties with the British empire, whose grandeur and prestige we are in duty bound to uphold and increase if possible. Let Canada not break those ties, but let her be more and more worthy and proud of her position within the empire.

Mr. S. SHARPE (North Ontario). Mr. Speaker, I desire to trespass for a short time on the attention of the House while I offer a few observations on this important question, in order that there may be no uncertainty in the minds of my constituents as to the position I desire to take on this question, and no uncertainty as to the motives which impel me to take that position. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat that few questions have occupied the attention of the House which have been fraught with graver results to Canada and her future and which have created greater diversity of opinion than this naval question. I congratulate the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Wilson) upon his very fair presentation of the government's position. He made a patriotic speech, recognizing the plain and manifest duty of Canada to the empire under existing circumstances, and I think it would be well if some of his colleagues from the province of Quebec would follow in his footsteps.

In the discussion of this question it is quite natural that the future of Canada should be canvassed by those who take part in it. What is to be that future? Is Canada to remain an integral part of the British empire or is it destined to become independent and possibly annexed to the United States? If Canada is to remain an integral part of the empire, what is the only reasonable logical position for her to take, and what is her plain manifest duty at the present juncture? Whatever sentiment there might have been in favour of independence with possible annexation to the United States prior to 1891, was wiped out in that memorable campaign in which that distinguished and respected Conservative leader, the late Sir John Macdonald, sacrificed his life for the maintenance of British connection and institutions, and his rallying cry, 'a British subject I was born and a British subject I will die,' will go down reverberating through the ages of Canadian history, to steady any waverers in in their allegiance to Great Britain and to strengthen the bonds of Canada and the mother country. And the Hon. Edward Blake, in his famous letter to his electors of West Durham, drove the last nail into the coffin of that traitorous sentiment that then existed. As we are aware, Mr. Blake wrote his constituency prior to 1891, informing them that he was unable to accept the nomination for that constituency because he believed the policy advocated by the leaders of the reform party would ultimately lead to union with the United States, and he further expressed his opinion that the destiny of Canada was irretrievably wrapt up in that of the empire. If Canada is to remain an integral part of the empire what is our duty? There are only two courses for us to adopt. One is to do nothing, and thus remain inactive and 'unresponsive to all the demands of duty and gratitude to the mother country. The other is to do something and thus acknowledge that while we remain a part of the British empire and share in the benefits we must assume some of the duties, burdens and responsibilities of that relationship.

I have sufficient confidence in the patriotism and sense of justice of the Canadian people to believe that an overwhelming majority are in favour of this House making substantial sacrifices for the benefit of the empire, and the only question on which there should be any possible difference is as to the extent and character of that assistance.

I wrote to a great many of my constituents of both political parties to ascertain their views upon this question, and after a careful perusal of the replies I received, I am at a loss to know what a majority really do want. A very small number desire no expense whatever incurred. A very important and influential body of public opinion desire a cash contribution or a contribution of Dreadnoughts. And a very important and influential body of public opinion desire the construction and organization of a Canadian navy.

This shows that public opinion is still in

a fluid condition, that it has not yet become crystallized; and before any definite permanent policy be entered upon, before this House should lay out a permanent policy, time should be given to the people to canvass the situation more fully.

For reasons some of which have been advanced in this House already, I am unalterably opposed to a cash contribution or even a contribution of Dreadnoughts as a permanent policy of this country. A cash contribution looks too much like paying some one else to do our fighting, and also savours a little of tribute. Canadians are not serfs prepared to contribute their taxes to some sovereign powers beyond our borders, even though it be Great Britain herself. Besides a cash contribution as a permanent policy involves the principle of taxation without representation. which is foreign to our democratic notions of government and is thus an impossible solution..

That there is necessity for making some provision is admitted. The very fact of our making any appropriation at all for this purpose is at once an acknowledgment of the necessity for some provision, and hence, the principle being admitted, the policy being adopted, the extent of our help should be in proportion to the necessity of the case.

If the British navy is being challenged, if the empire is in danger, our assistance must be commensurate with the peril.

Then, the question naturally follows, is there a real emergency in the affairs of the empire?

Is the sword of Damocles suspended over the British navy?

Every student of imperial affairs must acknowledge the gravity of the situation. Germany and England are at present engaged in a strenuous struggle. A war of construction is now being waged; a war of destruction may follow. Germany by reason of her geographical position is essentially a military, and not a naval, power. Her inland position without much coast line and without colonial possessions naturally make her an inland power. She possesses the most perfect fighting machine in the world. By intense organization, by her technical education, and by her highly specialized methods of training, she has become on land without a peer among the nations of the world. There is no army comparable with hers in efficiency, in numbers and in effective fighting force. It is estimated that she could put in the field upwards of 4,000,000 fighting men.

England on the other hand is essentially a maritime power. Her insular position with vast colonial possessions has peculiarly fitted her for the premier naval position among the nations of the world.

As England at present is supreme on the water, so is Germany supreme on land.

Why are these two great powers not content to allow this equilibrium to be maintained? Why is Germany not content to allow matters to remain in statu quo?

England is content that Germany should maintain her supremacy on land because this is essential to her very existence surrounded as she is with aggressive, watchful and resentful neighbours.

Germany, however, is not content that England should maintain her supremacy on the high seas, although this is essential to the empire's very existence. Germany, with her vaulting ambition, is apparently desirous of being supreme on water as she is now on land. She strives for naval as well as for military supremacy.

If the British fleet demolished the German fleet, Germany would still be immune from successful attack by England's forces by reason of her military strength and power.

But if the German fleet once defeated the British fleet, England's supremacy would be lost—the army of Germany could overrun the country—the British empire would be dismembered, and the rich self-governing dominions beyond the seas would in all probability, be the prizes of war—and eventually Canadians would pay dearly for the indifference they have displayed to the empire's interests.

Why then is Germany challenging England's naval supremacy? What is the object and purpose of the great activity? At whom is her great naval programme aimed, if not at England? Her fleet to-day is stronger than the combined fleets of France and Russia. She has nothing to fear from these two powers. What then is her purpose? Germany has a population of 60,000,000 people and is increasing at the rate of 1,000,000 each year. She must secure colonial outposts for her surplus population to which her subjects may emigrate and continue to live under the German flag and suzerainty. Canada, New Zealand, Australia and South Africa would make rich prizes for any nation to contend for.

Max O'Rell, the famous French lecturer says that France fights for glory; Germany fights for a living, but England fights for trade and peace.

I have heard a number of hon. gentlemen opposite on the floor of this House declare on several occasions that the Monroe doctrine would protect Canada in the last analysis. I say that such a declaration is unworthy of any Canadian. I was pleased to hear the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean) resent the imputation that was cast upon Canadian character by some of their colleagues. To entertain the idea that we could look with complacency to a foreign country for protection is revolting to any true British subject, and to rely upon the indefinite and

uncertain policy of a foreign country known as the Monroe doctrine is to lean upon a broken, at any rate an untried reed, and to pace us at the mercy of and under obligation to a foreign country. Such a prospect does not commend itself to the patriotism of any true Canadian. Sir, to state such a proposition is to dismiss it from our minds. The question, I think, must be answered, and the course of this parliament must be determined by the answer to that question: Is there a real emergency in the affairs of the empire? If there is, the insignificant contribution offered by this government is of no assistance in the time of need. Long before the general elections in the old country, British statesmen speaking upon the status of the British navy as compared with foreign navies, raised distress signals. They sounded cries of alarm at Germany's naval activity. During the elections, they attempted to neutralize the effect of their previous statements; but it was too late, the people took them at their word, as that word had been uttered prior to the election excitement. Hon. members opposite offer many authorities to prove that there is no menace at the present time from Germany, no emergency in the affairs of the empire. But of all the authorities that were quoted, the most peculiar and extraordinary was that quoted by the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). That hon. gentleman quoted from a speech of the German ambassador who, he said, was speaking in England—I presume making an after-dinner speech—to show the pacific intentions of Germany towards Great Britain. That is the proof the hon. gentleman relied upon—that the German ambassador, speaking in England, told the English people, in an after-dinner speech that Germany's intentions were not hostile and that Germany was not intending to attack England, because of these preparations. As has been stated here, the German people are not the people to hunt ducks with a brass band.

Now, the wisest men in both political parties have conceded the absolute necessity of maintaining Great Britain's naval supremacy. Mr. Gladstone, in 1878, used these words:

> The strength of England is not to be found in alliances with great military powers but is to be found henceforth in the efficiency and supremacy of her navy—a navy as powerful as the navies of all Europe.

And Sir Edward Grey, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in June, 1909, said:

> The navy is the common security of the whole empire. If it ever fails to be that it will be of no use to discuss any other subjects, and the maintenance of the navy in that position must therefore be the care, not only of us at home, but of the self-governing dominions beyond the seas.

At the imperial press conference, one of the colonial press men interviewed Sir Edward Grey, and the result was published in the Evening 'Journal' of Thursday, January 27, 1910. Sir Edward Grey, upon that occasion, said:

> I cannot think that there is a likelihood of war. I cannot bring myself to believe that a great and intelligent and christian nation like Germany could attack us without provocation—without grave fault on our own side. But I am compelled to admit that the historical fact is that in the course of her imperial expansion, Germany has in our time gone more than half way to meet war with Denmark, with Austria and with France, and has within a few weeks practically presented an ultimatum to Russia giving the option of war or silence regarding the annexation by Austria of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We must face the possibility that our turn might come. It is possible, though I cannot think it probable, that if Germany were strong enough on the sea to risk an encounter with our navy the encounter might ensue in spite of ourselves.
>
> If war were to come, and our navy were worsted, it would spell the ruin of the British empire. Germany would not need to land a soldier in England. Our food comes across the seas. We could be starved into absolute submission in a month.
>
> No other great power has to face such a consequence of defeat.
>
> We have two courses open. One, to allow Germany to easily catch up with us in sea power, and take the chance of a quarrel. The other, to try to keep so far ahead of her naval force that no quarrel will occur.
>
> The latter course seems the necessary one. The possibilities of the other are too grave to risk so long as our resources enable us to keep ahead.
>
> I would hardly contradict any one who would say that it is a hundred-to-one chance against our having war with Germany even when Germany has arrived in a position to risk it. And yet I am compelled to feel that even though it be a hundred-to-one shot against war, we must not, if we can help it, take even a single chance when that single chance includes the possibility of the ruin of England—the possibility of the end of our thousand years of English story.

And Sir Edward Grey spoke on March 29 in the House of Commons, and is reported in volume 3 of 'Hansard' of 1909, page 54, as follows:

> First of all the House and the country are perfectly right in the view that the situation is grave. A new situation in this country is created by the German programme. Whether that programme is carried out quickly or slowly the fact of its existence makes a new situation. When that programme is completed, Germany, a great country close to our shore will have a fleet of 33 Dreadnoughts. That fleet would be the most powerful which the world has ever yet seen. It is true that there is not one of them in commission yet; but it is equally true that the whole programme comprises what I have said, and when completed the new fleet will be the most powerful fleet which the world

has yet seen. That imposes upon us the necessity, of which we are now at the beginning—except so far as we have Dreadnoughts already—of rebuilding the whole of our fleet. That is what the situation is. What we do not know is the time in which we shall have to do it.

We must be prepared to defend our national existence under the conditions which are imposed upon us in our own generation. I am glad that it is not to us alone that this feeling is confined. I am glad that the colonies, such as New Zealand recognize that their national existence is one with us in this matter.

The friends of the government, including the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in their speeches have quoted Lord Charles Beresford as being in favour of local navies for the component parts of the empire. They do not, however, accept his statement that there is a real peril, and that the true policy is one of preparedness on the part of the British navy. I submit that if they accept him as the highest authority on one point, they are bound to accept him on the other. Lord Charles Beresford on January 1, 1910, spoke as follows:

Germans have said that if they intended to attack England it would be without warning. I suggest that Germany would send out her tramps with six-pounders and attack the trade routes--and even a tramp could sink a Mauretania. The pretext is easy—a little difficulty about Holland or Belgium, the Congo, or the Persian gulf, a diplomatic letter would follow, and what is to stop Germany from striking a blow at night and getting hold of the trade routes? Great Britain has left her arteries undefended.

I say seriously that Germany is deliberately challenging us to make all preparations.

Then Right Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, leader of the Conservative opposition, speaking on January 4, 1910, said:

He hoped and believed that Germany and Britain may not come into conflict, but said the diplomats of the lesser powers did not share this view. He insisted that Britain was now in a position as regards her navy which she had not been in within the memory of living men. Indeed, her naval superiority on her own seas would be threatened within the near future.

'I don't believe there is going to be war between this country and any great foreign power,' he exclaimed. 'Heaven knows I don't desire it. I don't believe it. But please remember that absolutely the only way in which you can secure the peace which you all desire is that you shall be sure of victory if war takes place.'

The empire existed only on sufferance if the navy were not supreme, and he was not content to exist on sufferance.

Now, I purpose quoting a gentleman who has been somewhat assailed in this House, Mr. Robert Blatchford. Mr. Blatchford is a talented and educated socialist who wrote for the 'Daily Mail' in London in connection with the German peril. His principles are opposed to a military and naval programme, but in this crisis he subordinates his principles to the welfare and salvation of the empire. In this crisis he was a British subject first and a socialist afterwards. He wrote as follows:

The strongest evidence of Germany's designs against Britain is the German navy. There can be no stronger evidence of any nation's intention to make war than that afforded by wholesale, feverish, and systematic preparations for war.

Now the German preparations are naval preparations. Against whom can these preparations be directed if they are not directed against us? Manifestly they are not meant for Russia, nor for France, nor for America. The magnitude of the preparations points to a prospective struggle with a fleet more powerful than that of Russia or France.

The construction of the German ships prohibits their use in distant seas, against Japan for instance, or the United States. And whereas we have been told in a hundred books and newspapers and pamphlets and speeches that the German navy is meant to wrest from Britain her command of the sea, it would be difficult to find a single German suggestion that the German navy is meant to try conclusions with any power other than Britain. Germany can reach France or Russia by land. Her fleet is already more than a match for France or Russia combined.

Her fleet is built for the North sea, it is exercised in the North sea, it remains in the North Sea.

Her ships were built against our ships, the object of the German builders being always to go one better than the British in each type. . . . If we do not want to war with Germany, we must be strong enough to want Germany to cause peace.

Though Germany is a brave, resolute, and mighty enemy, she is not omnipotent, nor is she invulnerable. But she means business—blood and iron business—and all conciliation, subterfuge, and compromise provoke her to contempt and scorn.

Germany puts her destinies into the hands of warriors; we leave ours in the hands of politicians. Germany acts; we talk. Words count for nothing in the game of blood and iron.

Arm or surrender; fight for the empire or loose it. We can choose our alternative; no middle course is open to us.

Now, I submit that when prominent British statesmen on both sides of politics agree in pointing out the gravity of the situation, we as Canadians cannot longer remain indifferent. British statesmen are not extremists, they are not jingoes, they are not alarmists, their language is not violent or exaggerated; their utterances are usually characterized by discretion and moderation, and consequently we should give due weight to their deliberate judgment upon this supreme issue. I think that on the evidence

adduced it must be conceded that the British navy is menaced at the present time by the German naval programme, and the question naturally suggests itself: Is the Naval Bill introduced by the government commensurate with Canada's duty to the empire? Does it discharge our plain and full duty to the empire under existing circumstances? In my humble opinion the government has lamentably failed to meet the situation. It is a matter of universal regret that the government has refused to comply with the wishes and plans of the British admiralty as outlined at the recent conference of 1909. The British admiralty are peculiarly fitted and specially adapted to know the wants and needs of the British navy, and they expressed their preferences for certain lines of action, but the Canadian government refused to meet their wishes. In the first place, the British admiralty suggested as an ideal method of assisting the navy, a money contribution, but this was refused. Then they suggested a complete fleet unit which would include a Dreadnought, but this was refused. Then they suggested that this fleet unit should be stationed on the Pacific coast in order to relieve the British men-of-war stationed there, and this was refused. Then they expressed the opinion that the local naval forces, in the event of war, should come under the immediate command of the British admiralty, but this was refused, and made subject to the consent of the Governor in Conucil. The ideal of the British admiralty was that the five component parts of the British empire should each furnish a fleet unit which would, in time of war, come under the control and command of the British admiralty in case of emergency. Canada's danger lies in the defeat of the British navy. Once it is defeated, Canada's contribution of her insignificant defensive force would be of no avail whatever. Canada, in my opinion, should have organized a fleet unit as suggested by the British admiralty, and when the summons to arms was issued, that each fleet unit from the colonies should proceed to array itself with the British navy and forming a component part thereof dovetail into that great fighting machine. When you compare the fleet units as suggested by the British admiralty with that contemplated by the government's Bill, there is not much difference in the number of ships, nor in the actual maintenance charges. The fleet unit as suggested by the British admiralty consisted of 13 ships, being one armoured cruiser of the 'Indomitable' class and of the Dreadnought type, three protected cruisers, six destroyers and three submarines, costing $18,500,000, and the maintenance charges amounting to $3,000,000. The proposed Canadian unit consists of 11 ships, being 4 Bristols, 1 Boadecea and 6 destroyers, costing $11,000,000, and the annual maintenance charges being $2,500,000. In the matter of initial expense there was only a difference of $7,500,000, and for annual upkeep, a difference of $500,000. But there is a great difference in the effective fighting force of the two units. But the government programme makes no provision for a Dreadnought, and a Dreadnought is the effective fighting machine in modern naval warfare. Superiority in Dreadnoughts will decide the naval supremacy of the future. The British admiralty asked for a complete fleet unit, a living vital fighting force. This government is merely presenting a skeleton without any effective striking power. Hence, I submit there are two fatal defects in the programme of the government which make it impossible for me to support the measure. Although I have in the past expressed myself in favour of the principle of a Canadian navy as a permanent policy, there are two fatal defects in the government programme. One is the absence of a Dreadnought, which would have formed part of the fleet had the government organized a fleet unit; and the other is the presence of a condition that the navy will assist the empire only with the consent of the Governor in Council. Paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of the Bill are fatal paragraphs, in connection with this measure. Paragraphs 17 and 18 read:

> 17. The Governor in Council may place the naval forces or any part thereof, on active service at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of an emergency.
>
> 18. In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the royal navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

And section 19 provides that parliament shall be called for a meeting within fifteen days after the Governor in Council has placed the naval service on active service. These clauses, in my opinion, destroy the whole effect and purpose of the government's Bill. A few men in the cabinet could withhold the consent of the Governor in Council for a considerable time, and in the meantime the British navy might be annihilated. These clauses may become in effect and substance a declaration of independence. Should war be declared against the empire, and should this government decide not to allow our so-called navy to participate in the empire's wars, down would come the British flag and up would go the Canadian ensign. I submit that this is tantamount to a declaration of independence. Should our Canadian navy stand aloof from the British navy in time of great national danger? I would like to ask if our so-called navy, when organized

and constructed, is to be ordered up the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers to be anchored to parliament hill until this fickle, faltering cabinet shall have come to some compromise decision in reference to its ultimate destiny? Personally, I am in favour of the principle of a Canadian navy as a definite permanent policy for Canada, but I want an effective fighting force—a complete 'fleet unit,' under the central control of the British admiralty, and not subject to the delays nor to the whims and caprices of a hesitating, halting, vacillating cabinet, which in the past has not displayed any great alacrity in assisting the empire in time of great stress and danger.

The leader of the government in his Toronto speech said that the British navy had a displacement of 2,000,000 tonnage, while Germany had only about 600,000 tons displacement. He, thereby, made the deduction that the British navy was far superior to the German navy, and attempted to minimize the gravity of the present situation. But I submit that this is not a fair basis of comparison. It is not by tonnage displacement that the efficiency, the effective striking force, of a navy is estimated, but by the number of its Dreadnoughts. It is not the number of obsolete war vessels (of which all count in the computation of tonnage), but it is the number of Dreadnoughts that will decide the naval supremacy of the future. Germany in 1912 or thereabouts, will have more Dreadnoughts, if their present plans be carried out, than England, and hence by this Dreadnought standard of comparison (the only real standard) England is in danger of losing her supremacy.

Hence the present Bill ignores the vital matters in this titanic struggle, and when Germany and England engage in the inevitable final combat Canada's insignificant contribution, handicapped by conditions that will thwart and defeat its very purpose, will not be able to appear in the imperial firing line doing effective service, (along with New Zealand and Australia), in defence of the empire.

Is this inferior position not humiliating to every Canadian subject? Contrast the position of Canada with that of our sister colonies—Australia and New Zealand—and is there a Canadian that does not feel deeply humiliated? In comparison with New Zealand and Australia our efforts are feeble, our efforts are unworthy of our people, unworthy of our vast resources, unworthy of our premier position as the richest and most populous self-governing nation in the empire.

But what else could the people of Canada expect? The leader of the government is always eloquent when the occasion requires eloquent in his loyalty, and loyal in his eloquence—and if loyal speeches could win battles Canada alone could furnish 'invincible armadas' comprising stacks of bound volumes of 'Hansard' and illustrated editions of the Toronto 'Globe'.

But while we indulge ourselves in the harmless and pleasant occupation of making patriotic speeches, and passing loyal resolutions, our sister nations (New Zealand and Australia) are offering Dreadnoughts and fleet units to the empire.

Humiliation! This is not the first occasion on which the bitter draught has been placed to the lips of Canada by this government. This is not the first time Canada has trailed in the rear of her sister colonies instead of blazing the way. When war was declared in South Africa, and German intervention was feared, where was the leader of the government? Where was Canada when all the other colonies were vieing with each other in rushing troops to the scene of hostilities? The right hon. leader of the government was giving an interview to the Toronto 'Globe' of October 4, 1899, as follows:

> The Premier's Statement.—Government has made no offer of Troops to the Imperial Authorities.
>
> There is no menace to Canada, and although we may be willing to contribute troops, I do not see how we can do so. Then, again, how could we do so without parliament granting us the money? We simply could not do anything. In other words, we should have to summon parliament. . . . And so it is that we have not offered a Canadian contingent to the home authorities. The Militia Department duly transmitted individual offers to the imperial government and the reply from the war office, as published in Saturday's 'Globe,' shows their attitude on the question. As to Canada's furnishing a contingent, the government has not discussed the question, for the reasons which I have stated, reasons which I think must easily be understood by every one who understands the constitutional law on the question.

Does that memorable interview display any enthusiasm for imperial interests? What happened is familiar to all: The public clamoured for action, the press was loaded with protests, the wave of patriotism throughout Canada became irresistible and would have swept the government out of existence had it not yielded to the popular demands. Not one, but many Canadian contingents were sent to distinguish themselves along with the Australian and New Zealand contingents, and their life's blood has left indelible stains upon the veldts of South Africa and brought imperishable fame upon Canadian valour. Although all Canada knows full well that the leader of the government resisted to the utmost the sending of the Canadian contingents to assist the empire in the Boer war, and not a man would have been sent, nor a dollar spent if

he had had his way, yet when the war was over and victory had been won by the valour of the imperial troops, the right hon. leader and his supporters took all the credit to themselves—they presented themselves with all sorts of bouquets, waved the old flag and sang the national anthem over and over again. They have been turning handsprings in their paroxisms of loyalty ever since, little surmising that their outbursts of loyalty would soon again be put to the test. The government is now being tested—they are standing under the measuring rod. Are they measuring up to the full stature of their professions? It is for the Canadian people to say after a perusal of this proposed Naval Bill.

Now, we come to the question of what Canada's duty is at the present time. If the supremacy of the British navy is being challenged, and I believe it is, if the emergency be pressing, urgent and compelling, and I believe it is, then this House should act and act promptly, definitely and decisively. It is Canada's duty to order, not one, two or three Dreadnoughts, but a sufficient number of Dreadnoughts to meet the emergency. We should order Dreadnoughts according to the extent of the peril, according to the magnitude of the danger to be apprehended, according to the exigencies of the case. These Dreadnoughts should be manned with British men and officers until Canadians can be trained for the service—all at the expense of Canada. Then the question of Canada's permanent policy should be left to the people. Having thus, in part, atoned for our past neglect, and having, in part, liquidated our obligation of long standing, we could then consider with due deliberation and with due regard to our constitutional obligations to the electors who have sent us here, the permanent policy which this country should adopt in regard to the construction, organization and maintenance of a Canadian navy service. Then we would have time to consider and adjust all imperial questions relating to the navy and its relationship to the empire—the question of the control and final command of the navy in time of war and what voice Canada is to have in deciding imperial questions. The people of Canada have a right to be heard before this permanent policy is decided upon. We have no mandate from the electors. The public have a right to be heard for many substantial reasons. The government, it is true, says that this question has been before the people since 1902. I challenge the truth of that statement, but even if it be true, that this question has been before the people since 1902, what has the policy of the government been since 1902? Absolutely opposed to the construction of the Canadian navy or to any contribution towards imperial defence. If the question has been before the people in the elections of 1904 and 1908, they have pronounced against the construction of a Canadian navy or any contribution to imperial defence, and now the government, by the present Bill, is flying in the face of the result of these two general elections. But, everybody knows that this is a new policy and that it has never been discussed in any general election. The question is far reaching and involves large and permament obligations upon the country. Important public bodies have requested that the question should be submitted to the people before the government inaugurates a new policy upon which the people have not had an opportunity of pronouncing. I refer to the Dominion Grange and the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, and I may add that the 'Weekly Sun' and other prominent papers that represent a very large sentiment that exists throughout the province of Quebec and in other provinces demand that the question should be submitted to the people before any definite permanent policy is inaugurated. Whenever a new and important policy is being framed it is usual, and the constitutional practice is, to appeal to the people or to postpone the inauguration of the policy until after the electors have had an opportunity to pronounce upon it. As I stated a short time ago, I am in favour of the principle, as a permanent policy for Canada, of the construction, organization and maintenance of a Canadian navy. That, to my mind, is the only proper solution of this important question. True, I believe that the prevailing sentiment of Canada is against the construction of a Canadian navy and in favour of a contribution by Canada of cash or Dreadnoughts to the empire. Does any one imagine that a cash contribution or a contribution of Dreadnoughts will discharge Canada from further contributions and relieve her from all future obligations? Not at all. The British navy must be maintained and Canada must continue, in some form, its assistance to imperial defence. Canada must adopt some definite permanent policy of continuous assistance. And, Sir, in my opinion, as a permanent policy, either a cash or a Dreadnought contribution is an impossible solution. The government has, subject to the approval of the people, if it were submitted to the people—adopted in my view, the correct principle, of constructing, organizing and maintaining a Canadian navy, thereby exploiting and utilizing our vast natural resources in building up a great industry in Canada. But while adopting the correct principle, the government has destroyed the objects and purposes of a Canadian navy by not making it a complete fleet unit and by annexing an impossible condition to its service under the control of the British ad-

miralty, namely: that it cannot go to war without the consent of the Governor General in Council. If the government of Canada intend doing anything towards assisting the empire in its time of stress and need, she should do something generous, and she should do that something promptly. To accomplish that it is necessary to organize a complete fleet unit with a Dreadnought at the head and not subjected to any bonds or chains in the form of onerous conditions. Had the government taken this course it would have commanded the respect and support of a large and important body of public opinion.

Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that a Conservative government were in power, do you think that that Conservative administration would have brought down such a Bill as this? I do not believe it would. As this Liberal government refuses to recognize Canada's duty to the empire, and has failed to interpret the will of the people in that regard, and as its contribution is not a true index of the heart and feelings of the people of Canada, it may devolve upon the Conservative premiers of the four provinces under Conservative administrations to get together and devise some scheme whereby one or two Dreadnoughts shall be sent to the empire as Canada's contribution. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is a great misfortune, not only for Canada, but for the empire, that a Conservative administration has not been in control of the affairs of Canada during the past ten or fifteen years. Had the Conservative party been in power during these momentous times, and particularly during the imperial conferences, I am absolutely satisfied that some satisfactory scheme or plan of imperial federation would have been devised, and put into operation, and I believe that long before this an imperial council representative of all parts of the empire would have been created, and the dream of all true British subjects would have become a reality. This Liberal government in Canada has always applied the brakes to any such movement, and it has not only refused to assist, but has absolutely discouraged any such plan at every turn, and on every opportunity. When war was declared in South Africa, the government of Canada lagged behind all other colonial governments, and showed no sympathy with the empire. At the imperial conference of 1907, the leader of the government expressly refused to support a motion, introduced by one of the colonial delegates, which was calculated to unite the empire into bonds of closer union. The grumbling assent of this government to the imperial conference of 1909, to the military and naval defence committee, and the niggardly policy as outlined in this Bill all show a lack of enthusiasm for imperial interests.

Now, Sir, in conclusion, I think, that it is the duty of Canada to place an immediate order for Dreadnoughts to form a part of the Canadian navy and to act in co-operation with and as a part of the imperial navy and under the control, in times of danger and emergency, of the British admiralty. We should then postpone the inauguration of any permanent policy until the Canadian people have been heard from, either by means of a referendum or in a general election. In the meantime, speaking for myself, I desire to go on record, as I have done on previous occasions in my own constituency, and in the corridors of the House, where I have expressed myself in favour of the principle of a Canadian navy. I desire to go on record as in favour of the principle of a Canadian navy as the means best calculated to serve the interests of the empire of the future, and best calculated to work out the great destiny of this country. I regret, therefore, that I cannot support this Naval Bill of the government, because of its meagreness, its niggardliness in not providing for a fleet unit as it should have done, and also because of the impossible condition that the government has annexed to its service in the empire's wars, which condition must render it unsatisfactory to every true Canadian who loves British institutions and British liberty, who is conscious of our deep obligations to the mother country, and who believes that universal peace depends on the maintenance of British supremacy, which is now being challenged and jeopardized by England's greatest commercial, military and naval rival.

Mr. J. BOYER (Vaudreuil.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it would be commonplace to undertake to prove that Canada passes through an important national evolution. Everbody feels this and it is admitted by all, but every one does not see the causes. These causes are not very complicated and I will try to place them before the House.

Modern nations should never be isolated, as China has done in the past to its detriment. The policy of each of them depends more or less upon the policy of the rival nations, and all are ruled by one great law, the international law.

Well, let us see what has given rise to this evolution of this sort of crises through which we now pass, and which forces us at this moment, willingly or unwillingly, to come to a decision upon which our future will rest.

A great European nation, Germany seeks domination. She is fatally brought to that, not so much because her citizens love warfare or hazardous adventures, but because

she has a very large population, and is congested in her own territory, so that she must look for other fields and colonies for expansion. Germany must fight an economical war. England is situated in somewhat an analogous position, but on account of her supremacy on the seas, she has by this very fact the outlets which the other nation needs.

Many will say, this economic war will not turn into actual war. Let us hope that they are right, but we must admit that appearances do not justify this optimism. On both sides armaments are going on frantically, so much that in both countries the budgets are frightfully surcharged and one of these nations thought proper to say to its colonies, "Look at the sacrifices which I am obliged to make. Will you not help me?"

"We will gladly help you" responded the over-seas dominions, of which Canada is one.

"And how will you do it?"

Firstly by taking on ourselves the defence of our territory and our shores; secondly by lending you our troops and our ships, if you are attacked.

This is a natural and proper answer, because:

1. A free nation surrounded by armed nations, must necessarily assume the means of defending herself.

2. Unless being absolutely blind, a people cannot refuse to defend its own home and civilization, when such are threatened with destruction.

The interest of Canada is twofold, because it is inhabited by two races who spring from the civilization of two great peoples, who for a long time were rivals, but now attached to one another. We have not two metropolises, one Anglo-Saxon, the other French. And let this not be forgotten. The latter would suffer just as much as the former by a war which would hand over the domination to a foreign civilization opposed to the ideas and the traditions which animate both of these two national groups.

We are consequently confronted by the following problem:

1. Is it necessary that we should defend the territory and the coasts of Canada?

2. If so, shall we undertake ourselves this country, take charge of it? Is it necesfence or let Great Britain, our mother sary to defend our country? The question is answered by itself; but there are some who hold a different view. But have they ever clearly understood that Canada is one of the greatest countries of the earth, on account of its territory and natural resources; that if it is not parcelled in the future it will be one of the most powerful. Canada holds already almost the foremost rank through its agricultural products and through the development of its merchant shipping. Its mineral resources are immense. Its forests cover the country from one ocean to the other, and we have on that score reserves of the world.

All over the country there is at present a fever of development. Wealth flows like a wave in the west. The great provinces of the centre stand already amongst the strongest foundations of the world. In a word, everything in our country is so great that we cannot grasp it.

Let us merely glance at a part of our maritime coast. Let us go through that region which extends from Montreal, our commercial metropolis, to the extreme end of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The river of that name is the grand waterway of our trade, and through its whole length is navigated by hundreds of ships, the imposing transatlantic steamer as well as the humble schooner or the fisherman's boat. We first come across a pleasing country of a remarkable beauty and fertility, and further on we find mountainous regions, dark and wooded, but everywhere we behold villages, fields, herds of cattle and industrial establishments busy and flourishing, till we come at the entrance of the Gulf, and to the coal fields of Cape Breton; they are immense, and the only ones we find on the Atlantic coast, even if we were to travel from one pole to the other. They are situated precisely at the spot where the American continent is nearest the continent of Europe.

It is there that France erected the fort of Louisburg, under the walls of which the fate of the new world was decided.

Looking at these ruins one is struck by the wisdom of the great engineer who selected this place from which a vessel could go out and offer battle to the enemy coming from the east, between Cape Breton and Newfoundland. While the enemy that might have seized that place, could block the route to Canada and demolish all the plan of defence. That is what happened, as we know, after the capture of Louisburg by General Wolfe. To-day this military position is still most important. The coal fields of Cape Breton had become for modern navy purposes, an inexhaustible and essential defensive post. Who holds it holds doubly the key to Canada on the Atlantic. That fort defends treasures of forests and fisheries which the general of Louis XV. could not imagine. But principally this lengthy north coast, with its aspect so inhospitable, but composed of iron, white coal and deep ports, cannot pally this lengthy north coast, with its dockyard for steel vessels.

The Pacific coast offers the spectacle of natural wealth almost equal; but it is not necessary for me to go on further with this demonstration. We the owners of this wealth, are completely disarmed on the sea. Around us everybody, all nations are

in arms. In the east we see Japan, immediately to the south, United States, one of the great naval powers of the world in Central America, each republic has its war vessels. In Europe, as we know, some great military nations are congested for want of colonies.

Under these circumstances how long will we remain free asd protected against the ills of war, if we do not defend ourselves? We are too rich a prey not to excite the covetousness of others. If Great Britain were not there, is it not evident that we would inevitably fall under the tutelage of some other great nation that would make us pay very dear for the protection which she would give us, and it would be a great chance if she did not absorb us completely? Of this common sense alone will convince us; it is not even necessary to read the significant comments which are printed every day in the papers of the nations that have their eyes on us.

Is it our duty to defend ourselves as much as we can in our present conditions? I say yes. It is not surely for lack of citizenship that some Canadians are opposed to the idea of an effort on our part to defend Canada on the sea. They look at the question from another point of view, and they say that our money would be far better utilized in developing our natural resources. They would be right if the world were disarmed.

Unfortunately, our dignity as well as our interest demands that we should leave no stone unturned to accomplish by our own initiative this essential duty.

I say that it is our interest, and where could we find in the history of the world a people who has succeeded in keeping his national life by leaving the care of his defence to other arms, even to those of friends or allies? We cannot find one. In the life of nations as in the life of individuals, interest is the measure of actions; every one looks before all to things which are of personal interest to himself. It is the law of the world; who will not respect it will fall. The present emergency recalls that law, and Great Britain herself who has protected us heretofore is in need of our help, towards maintaining her rank and dignity among the nations.

Besides, the practice of military and naval arts, carries with it certain important and direct advantages. While increasing the strength of the country, the energy and self-reliance of its inhabitants, it helps powerfully, through the exertions it requires, in promoting the progress of the human race. Is it not owing to war, owing to the efforts made in defending a position or directing an attack that many modern discoveries have been effected.

On the other hand, the establishment of a national navy for Canada will bring with it direct substantial benefits. Great dockyards will be provided which will give employment to many hands, while at the same time developing to great extent our resources. A certain number of our young men will receive from year to year instruction and training in the naval schools; the spirit of discipline acquired while on duty will be an education in itself; numerous families of seamen inhabiting our coasts, and whom the dwindling of the coasting trade has impoverished, will see the good old times recur; a trip to our maritime sections enables one to realize the need for such a revival. As we all know, on the coasts of England, France, and Norway, the sons of fishermen on returning home after doing service on the warships, no longer show the spirit of routine, at any rate not to the same degree as formerly; they show a greater openness of mind, they are no longer chary of innovations which make for greater prosperity and happiness. Such influences are of a nature to transform a people by developing their abilities and imparting self-reliance and initiative.

Of course, all these things will of necessity cost a great deal; and that is the stock argument of our special pleaders. Do you not perceive, say they, that we are disbursing large sums for providing a navy which will never be in a position to hold its ground against those of the great powers. In other words, you are going to provide a mock navy, a tin-pot navy. Under the circumstances we would be better off with no navy at all, and if we are bound to make sacrifices let it be in the shape of a yearly money contribution to the British navy, and let that settle the matter.

Such a plan is entirely without foundation. What I have previously said is sufficient evidence to that effect; but there is more, and much more, that could be said. Canada is not yet a great nation, at any rate in point of population, but that is increasing rapidly. The next census has in stock for us great and pleasant surprises. Twenty years hence, our numbers will greatly exceed twenty millions, and we will actually be a numerous and very wealthy people. Will we be powerful as well? That depends on what steps we decide to take just now. Possibly, we may be a mere human hive without strength or dignity; it might even happen that our national existence would be done away with. A fleet of warships cannot be created in a moment. Several years of preparation are necessary to provide fully equipped dockyards, under competent management, with skilled workmen, well trained officers and men.

That is the work to which we are setting ourselves just now. It might have been wiser to start before now, but we were not at liberty to do so. And when all these meausures have been taken, we will be in a position to hold our own among the na-

tions of the world. Even those of us who are only of mature years will likely see the Canadian nation strong, self-sufficing, on a par with other nations, though stil, let us hope forming part of that great galaxy of free nations working towards the progress and peace of the world, and safeguarding as a sacred trust the ancient and noble civilizations out of which they have sprung.

Is not that prospect preferable to the mean alternative of keeping aloof altogether or of remaining in a state of dependency both inimical to dignity, honour and duty.

The proposal to establish a navy is not a novel one, although never heretofore has any such proposal been brought before the House in so definite a form. While we find references to such a matter in 1897 and in 1902, as far back as 1868, closely following on confederation, a man whose memory will live as long as the Canadian people, Sir G. E. Cartier, undaunted by the ill-success of a previous attempt to pass a measure on the same subject, submitted to the House a Militia Bill providing, as one of its main features, not only the establishment of a land force, but also that of a naval force. I refer the House to section 6, chapter 40 of the statutes of that year, reproduced as chapter 41 of the Revised Statuts of 1886:—

> The active militia shall comprise the voluntary militia, the regular militia and the naval militia.
>
> The voluntary militia shall be composed of corps raised by voluntary enlistment.
>
> The regular militia shall be composed of men who enlist voluntary in the militia, of men obtained by ballot for service, or of men who enlist voluntary to serve with men obtained by ballot.
>
> The naval militia shall be composed of seamen, sailors and persons whose usual occupation is upon any steam or sailing craft navigating the waters of Canada.

Sections 48, 49, 50 and 51 of the Militia Bill of 1868, R.S.C., chapter 40, provide regulations for the naval force. Which shows that at that early date, the establishment of a naval defence service was already proposed.

It is not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of that Bill have ever been changed since it was first voted. That Bill received a great many additions, but its fundamental principle was never altered in any way. Why, even previous to the passing of this Bill through parliament the people had been made acquainted with its provisions, and I find evidence in that regard in the speech delivered by the mover of the Militia Bill himself, Sir G. E. Cartier.

> Another consideration of the highest importance is the defence of the country. In the present condition of things, a province is not in a position to obtain help from another in a case of emergency; but, under confederation we will have a force of 200,000 men and a navy of 60,000; and with such a force, England would be much more inclined to help us in case of need than if we were entirely dependent on her strength. We should do our best to spread a right understanding of these questions.

Apparently the people approved of the proposal at that early date, since Cartier was returned to the House and had the Militia Bill put through parliament. So, Mr. Speaker, I am justified in stating that the plan for the establishment of means of defence on the seas is not a novel one, and did not originate with this government. The question is merely entering on a new phase, as a result, on the one hand of the change in the relative strength of the British navy, which is not quite as dominant as it was in 1867, and, on the other hand, as a result of the great development of Canada, which is in a better position than fifteen years ago to contribute its quota both morally and materially towards the defence of the empire.

I say, Sir, that the recurrence of this proposal, which dates back to early confederation times, should not be a matter for surprise. That was bound to happen some day or other. If those nations which have provided navies for themselves, and particularly Germany, had started ten years sooner to make provision for those gigantic armaments which are seen to-day in their harbours and dockyards, this House would have heard ten years sooner this discussion going on with as much warmth as it is now. On the contrary, if the powers on the other side of the ocean had remained stationary if the principle 'si vis pacem, para bellum' had not prevailed, and been used to screen secret political ambition which nations are prone to cherish in the same way as individuals, the Dominion parliament would continue to be engrossed with no other but peaceful plans for the development of the country's resources.

We have been so much in the habit of boasting of our privileges of self-government, Great Britain herself has granted us such a free hand in the making of our own laws, and the management of our domestic affairs, that we have little by little got accustomed to the idea that we are at liberty to legislate in relation to all possible subjects. However, in dealing with the present issue, we should not lose sight of the actual facts.

I am free to say, Mr. Speaker, that when this Bill was first introduced, I was far from being in sympathy with it, and together with many of my countrymen, was rather struck by the heavy expenditure which would be required for that purpose. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that, from the very beginning, the proposal of inserting in the estimates an item amounting to several millions for naval purposes was not at all pleasing to me. However, after considering the matter in the light of a busi-

ness proposition for the promotion of Canadian interests, and more particularly after the leader of the opposition had made known his own policy, it did not take me much time to alter my opinion. I am not a partisan of militarism, although a military man, and proud of holding a fairly high rank in the Canadian militia, which enables me every year to recruit a number of young countrymen of mine and acquainting them with the duties which would be incumbent on us should some day or other the Dominion or the mother country require men to defend our homes. There cannot be any harm, if I am not mistaken, in imparting to one's folks the teachings of bravery, dutifulness and honour.

I am still less an imperialist. I approve of our present relations with Great Britain, but I do not wish for any closer union, considering that the present state of things is satisfactory from the national point of view.

However, from a comparison of the two policies submitted to the House it is easy to draw the conclusion that the most national and advantageous to the country is that advocated by the right hon. leader of the House.

What do the government say, speaking through the Prime Minister:—

It is our intention to build eleven ships—four Bristols, one Boadicea and six destroyers—It is our intention to have them, if possible, built in this country. . . . . The cost of these ships would be a little over $11,000,000, and the total cost of maintenance, stores, fuel, interest and depreciation is estimated at $24,253,000.

In answer to Mr. Foster, who inquired what the Prime Minister meant by saying that it would take a year to provide the plant for building the ships and four years more to build the navy, the Prime Minster answered as follows:—

That is what I believe.

And what is the Conservative plan? The hon. leader of the opposition proposes in in substance:

That Canada should immediately place at the disposal of Great Britain a sum equal to the purchasing value or the contsruction of two Dreadnoughts, that is, the sum of $25,000,000.

I have first of all studied this question from the economical point of view. I cannot for that reason be accused of disloyality. For in spite of what our opponents have been saying since a few days ago, French Canadians have just as good a right as others to consider this or any measure from a business point of view. The member for North Toronto has proved especially bitter. The other day, in the House, he had taken at task the venerable leader, not only of the French speaking Liberal members of this House, but also of the Liberal party in Canada of which they form part, and he insinuated that the Prime Minister's policy was devised to please the population of the province of Quebec; that he would have this House adopt it with the evident aim of bringing about the independence of Canada. That, Mr. Speaker, was stated not later than last week by a man whose political career comprises certain matters which could not be written on the walls of this edifice in golden letters.

Here is what he said, on the 10th February, 1910: Independence is still his (Sir Wilfrid Laurier's) aim. We understand why in 1902, in 1907 and in 1909, and now in 1910 he has refused to link us to the empire. He refuses to do anything else but to construct in Canada, for Canada and for Canada's use only. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, when has the province of Quebec desired the independence of this country more particularly than any other province? When have the French-speaking Canadians who inhabit it ever attempted, in that sense, to raise the standard of revolt?

From certain speeches delivered by members of the opposition, one might really suppose that the province of Quebec is seething with treason and darkly preparing the ruin of Great Britain. It is high time that these wicked and unjust insinuations should cease. There may possibly be amongst the French Canadians some who would prefer the independence of Canada—the colonial condition. Others might possibly prefer annexation to the United States.

People might be found who think in a like manner in all the other provinces of this confederation, without regard to nationality. But why should anybody wish to attribute to the French Canadians an active propaganda in favour of independence when nothing of the kind exists? If ever the question of independence is raised in Canada. and it may well be, Lord Strathcona is right in supposing 'that at the end of the 20th century Canada will have a population twice as large as that of the British isles.' I have no doubt that when that time comes, all the provinces will have their say, and that any changes then made will be by general consent. Having made these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I claim for my compatriots the right to judge of a political question, whatever it may be, which comes before this parliament in whatever manner they please without being accused of being disloyal or remiss in their conception of duty. At the same time it would be idle to maintain that the naval Bill was received with enthusiasm by the French element of the province of Quebec.

But does this mean that the French Canadians are disloyal to England, because a certain number do not like the principle of this Bill in which they may perhaps find too pronounced a tendency towards imperialism, while a certain number of others here protest more or less discordantly because of the enormous expenditure the measure will entail. After all, let us frankly admit it; the French Canadian cannot have the same reasons as his English speaking fellow citizen to become enthusiastic in this matter, because in his case blood relationship does not exist; nevertheless, his attachment to the British crown is too evident for his loyalty to be one moment doubted; albeit it must be admitted that with him, the favourable appreciation of the naval question comes from a feeling of gratitude and justice.

I might, Mr. Speaker, cite many of my English-speaking fellow-citizens who have taken up either one or the other of the points of view to judge of the merit of the measure that we are at present discussing, and who will never be accused of disloyalty for all that.

I therefore appeal to the spirit of justice of my opponents and I would ask them in future to conduct their plans of attack on other grounds than that of the French nationality. That we have our fanatics, that is true, and they have perfect right to exist, to discuss and to bring forth their theories as the fanatics of the English language, but they are not the less loyal for all that.

One consideration, Mr. Speaker, and this one alone would be sufficient to secure my support to any measure of a nature to help Great Britain to-day or at any other period of danger or difficulty. This consideration is the protection of our mutual trade which has heretofore been the work of British ships alone. But indeed there are many others which justify Canada in following in the footsteps of the other colonies, to answer the pressing appeal of the metropolis as has been put by several hon. members, amongst them the leader of the opposition.

What it behoves us not to forget in the present debate, and that which from my point of view, justifies the Canadian Government, apart from all matters of sentiment, in yielding to Great Britain's appeal, is the immense and increasing trade between Canada and Britain. England is our best and largest customer. Last year Great Britain purchased nine-tenths of the natural products which Canada exported. For the present, I am looking at the question from a business point of view. I am asking myself the following question. Should Canada help Great Britain in maintaining the empire of the sea? Outside of national sentiment, I say, yes. Let us examine briefly the important commercial motives which should encourage and justify such an opinion; and here let me repeat what I was saying a moment ago. England is Canada's best client, and should she for a moment cease to buy from us, the greater part of our population—I mean the agricultural population, for 45 per cent of the Canadians are interested in agricultural pursuits—would feel very ill at ease. On the other hand, who could stop England buying the greater part of the natural products which she consumes from her other colonies instead of giving such a marked preference to the products of our country.

In 1908, the total commerce of Canada with Great Britain was $230,440,043; our exports being $134,484,156, and our imports from Great Britain $95,855,887. You may answer me: but England finds a profit in having commercial relations with our country, since she herself sells for $95,855,887, and that the other obligation in this case is reciprocal. Yes, we might possibly buy elsewhere the manufactured products which she sells us, but we could not so easily sell our agricultural products to other countries, for if England is not an agricultural country, if her dense population on a relatively small territory forces her to buy 75 per cent of the products necessary for her subsistence, it is not likewise for the other part of Europe where agriculture is still in many cases the principal industry of the nation.

It is not in France nor in Germany, the centres of science and of practical agriculture, that we would seek to sell our farm products. It is not in Denmark that we would seek to sell our butter and cheese. In fact, the countries of Europe, with the exception of England, would be very uncertain markets for our agricultural produce shipped in large quantities.

On the other hand, Australia, New Zealand and other colonies would be serious competitors to our agricultural products; if England were to purchase from them exclusively all her natural products and food stuffs she requires.

In 1908 the natural products of Canada were valued as follows:

	Total produce.	Sold to Great Britain.	Foreign Countries.
Agricultural products	$363,126,384	$100,000,000	$10,852,825
Dairy products	29,731,932	23,955,940	
Forest products	51,052,689	11,843,094	27,470,754

It is plain that Great Britain offers a vast market for our agricultural industry;

she buys from us nine-tenths of what we can produce. Our cheese and butter find there an excellent opening. Canadian cheese continues to hold first place, notwithstanding a formidable competition from New Zealand, 80 per cent of Great Britain's cheese importations are supplied by Canada (1908 statistics), and we know how this commerce tends to grow under the impulse which is given to the agricultural class to produce goods of high quality able to compete successfully with those of other countries. We could further add to these figures already mentioned, the sum of $7,472,257 that Canada has exported to Great Britain in manufactured products.

In 1908 Great Britain bought from Canada goods to the value of $3 per head, whilst purchases from the United States only bought $1.15 per head. Nevertheless, half of our commerce is with the United States. But here is the difference. We buy more and they buy less. Our total commerce with Great Britain in 1908, was $230,340,043, that is to say, that we bought from them for $95,855,887, whilst we sold $113,520,500 worth of goods to the United States, while buying from them $220,191,-209.

Now, we must not forget that we are in commercial relation with all the other English colonies, with whom we have special tariffs.

Newfoundland..	$6,963,836
Australia	3,410,396
New Zealand..	1,250,456
British East India..	4,066,973
British West India	694,199
British Guiana..	2,698,353
British Africa..	2,043,575

So far, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with the trade consideration. Let us now review the various incidents which preceded the bringing down of this Bill before parliament and those which have transpired since it was laid on the table of the House. There is nothing more amusing than to review the attitude of the opposition and to analize the conduct of its leaders at each one of the various phases through which the navy question has passed so far.

Let us analyse the incidents, Now, for the first attitude. It was in November, 1909, that the hon. member for North Toronto, in order the better to show to the country his undying filial love for the mother country, as if the British authorities were neglecting or delaying the execution of a project or plan of naval defence which had been examined during the intercolonial conferences of 1897, 1902 and 1905, placed upon 'Hansard' a spech of several hours' duration to show the absolute necessity of speedy action and of building a navy, the immediate object of which would be the protection of our coasts and which would also go to the assistance of the mother country in case of war, should she require our services. Finally, on the 29th of March, the right hon. the Prime Minister, acting in concert with the leader of the opposition, drafted a resolution in the folowing terms:—

> The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of the Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of the commerce the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

That proposition was moved by the right hon. the Prime Minister and seconded by the hon. the leader of the opposition, and agreed to without a dissentient voice; which means that not even the voice of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was heard against the motion. Such was the first attitude of the opposition. The second attitude was that taken in 1909.

In the year 1909, the intercolonial conference of London took place. That conference gave birth to the plan which is the object of the Bill now under consideration, the building of a Canadian navy and the British admiralty endorsed the proposition then made by the representatives of Canada. It was then that one could gather from the reading of the newspapers that the leader of the opposition, as became a good patriot such as he claimed to be, gave his approbation to this pre-eminently national policy and he professed to be in entire accord with the views of the Prime Minister as to the draught of a programme of naval defence. Thoroughly satisfied that the construction of a Canadian navy was what was most desirable in that respect he said that we would by that means discharge our duty to Great Britain, to Canada and he added:

> The establishment of a Canadian navy unanimously asked for by both parties would much better answer the purpose than any gift of Dreadnoughts.

And while the leader of the opposition was thus holding forth, the hon. member for North Toronto took up the burden of the song and in a speech delivered in the capital of Nova Scotia, said:

> That we should be ready to defend our country and that a magnificent future was smiling upon us. That the creation of a Canadian navy would result in giving a fresh impetus to the shipbuilding industry and to the construction of steel ships in Canada, thus creating an enormous quantity of labour and promoting an immense development.

There is a third leader of the opposition who also delivered himself of a speech on that subject, but with a most jarring note as concerns the attitude of the two former leaders. I refer to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who stated at Lachine that he was opposed to any naval contribution to England, either in cash or in Dreadnoughts or by the creation of a Canadian navy. It was peremptory, but such was the attitude then taken by the hon. gentleman.

Now as an ironical rhythmical accompaniment to the statements of these three honourable gentlemen, these came to us from the remote region of the far west that fragment of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) who wanted by all means that we should give millions of dollars or send a couple of Dreadnoughts to England. Meanwhile, the government went on making known throughout the country their programme which was always the same.

I now come to the third attitude of the opposition, which was taken in January, 1910. The leader of the opposition is still in favour of the building of a Canadian navy, but moreover he wants a cash contribution to the tune of $12,000,000, representing the value of a Dreadnought.

The fourth position was that by the opposition on the 3rd of February, when the same leader of the opposition, in his reply to the speech so full of practical sense delivered by the right hon. the leader of the House, bitterly reproached him with not having done enough for Great Britain and was so cynical as to embody into his own speech quotations from the harangues delivered by the Prime Minister when still a young politician in 1866, and thereby he was trying to show that if the Prime Minister had not done more, it was because he was hankering after the independence of Canada or something to the same effect, and in winding up his speech he moved an amendment of which the two main paragraphs are as follows:

> That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character, until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval. That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal contribution form the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or amoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

So, according to this motion, the hon. leader of the opposition proposes nothing more nor less than that the Dominion government should send $25,000,000 to Great Britain, in order that she may buy Dreadnoughts with this money. But after all the hon. gentleman is humane, and he would feel loath at spending the people's money without giving the people a voice in the expenditure of that money; he would agree, but, of course only after the $25,000,000 have been subscribed to England, that we should refer the matter to the people, in order to know whether they want us to give more.

I could hardly give the finishing touch to this authentic description, without referring to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. Well, sir, I am happy to be able to state that among the leaders of the opposition who can speak with any authority, he is the only one so far who has stuck to his guns. It is true the hon. member from Jacques Cartier, like all the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, did approve of the resolution of the 29th March, 1909, which aimed at a speedy organization of a Canadian naval service; but he did not feel like sleeping on his laurels, and in his Lachine speech, he emphatically stated that he was opposed to any kind of contribution or marine, etc. Since then, the hon. gentleman has ever maintained the same attitude.

In another respect the hon. gentleman is entitled to credit, and that is for the manner in which he advocates a plebiscite. He wants the government to refer the matter to the people, befor any expenditure is incurred for the navy, while his leader, less exacting, would be quite satisfied, if the money were spent first. Surely the hon. gentlemen disagree as to the manner of helping Great Britain and as to the manner in which the matter should be referred to the people.

That is, sir, a very incomplete but a truthful statement of the flagrant contradictions into which the leaders of the Conservative party in this House have fallen, since the 29th of March, 1909.

Is such conduct calculated to inspire the electorate with confidence? Is there a single hon. gentleman here, opposed on principle to the building of a navy, who could in the face of such tactics, vote down the measure introduced by the government? He could not even follow my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier in his fictitious opposition, because, if his leader has exaggerated the amount of our contribution, he himself has sinned as much in the opposite direction. That there should arise some difference of opinion as to the mode of assisting the mother country, that is easily understood; but that we should deny her everything, especially at a time when her prestige is threatened, is inadmissible under the circumstances.

The position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) on the Naval Service Act reminds me of the attitude he took in 1905, during the second session of the legislature, when I witnessed an exhibition such as the one which is now being given us. We were then debating the Act to establish and to provide for the government of the provinces of Alberta and of Saskatchewan. The government, going even beyond the limits allowed under the British North America Act, had in the first place brought down their Bill granting to the minorities and particularly to the French Catholic element identical rights to those engaged by the English Protestant element, in the province of Quebec. The opposition which was under the same leadership as they are to-day so bitterly opposed the provisions of this Act in connection with legislation concerning education in those provinces, that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) had to part company with his colleagues and in order the better to explain his flight, he moved, just as he is doing to-day, a motion unacceptable under the terms of the law, that is to say, a motion to make the French language official before the courts of the province.

Do you know what later on became of that amendment or resolution? They caused it to play a very sad part in the province of Quebec. The French Canadian speakers of the Conservative party, wherever they addressed the electorate on the hustings throughout the province took up as their theme the famous Monk resolution: 'Gentlemen would they say, behold the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was the only gentleman who stood up on the floor of the House of Commons and tried to save the French language in the two new provinces. But the Liberals voted down his motion. It is an infamous action.' The gentleman who opposed me in the county which I have the honour to represent failed to tell the electors that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had proposed an impossibility, under the terms of the British North America Act; he also refrained from telling them that his chief, the leader of the opposition and his followers had voted down his motion; but he was severely punished by the electors, so much so that he even lost his deposit. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you know what will happen with the present attitude of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier? At the next general elections, you will find that Conservative speakers, addressing the electors on the very same hustings will tell them that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is the only member from the province of Quebec who stood up on the floor of the House to oppose the establishment of a national navy and they will exclaim that the Liberal members from Quebec did vote down the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. But they will again omit to say that the leader of the opposition and the Conservative members did also vote it down.

You will find that I shall, that at the next elections Conservative speakers will themselves state in the same localities that the member from Jacques Cartier was the only member from the province of Quebec to oppose the creation of a national navy. They will claim that the Liberal members from Quebec voted against the sub-amendment submitted by the member from Jacques Cartier. But at the same time omitting to mention that the leader of the opposition and the Conservative members had also voted against it.

Whilst this comedy will be enacted in Quebec, the leader of the opposition and the remainder of the Conservative phalanx will overrun the English-speaking provinces claiming everywhere that the government did not do its duty towards England, because its leader, the Prime Minister, who is a French Canadian, submitted to the dictates of the members of his race sitting in this House. That is their double game, and the trick is played. Later we will find the Conservative leaders taking shelter under the same umbrella, and the understanding will still continue. Such are the elements of which His Majesty's loyal opposition is actually composed. And certain persons would like the Liberal members to betray the government on the naval question, to vote with such a party!

On Friday, the 11th February, Mr. Bourassa published in 'le Devoir' this significant avowal as regards to the Naval Bill:

'If it had been for a Canadian navy, for Canada's defence, under the Canadian government's authority, I would not have found fault with Article 17, neither with Article 19, not even with the whole article. Even if the executive had abused of the powers that Article 17 gives it, the fleet remained under its authority, and parliament being convened within the fifteen days, might have overridden the government's decision and recalled the ships. But it is on reading Article 18 that I saw the bottomless depth in which we were thrown without warning and by deceit. It seems to me that the point has been made quite clear by the words of the leader of the opposition himself when in his speech he arraigned the government in the following terms: That the government's propositions do not agree with the Admiralty's propositions and recommendations, inasmuch as they allow the government to refuse to unite the naval forces of Canada to those of the empire in time of war; they

are ill-advised and dangerous. In fact many other opposition speakers apparently hold the same views. It would be idle to attempt an analysis of their different shades of sentiment.

Our fleet will be entirely under the Canadian government's control and the government cannot definitely place that fleet at the disposal of England without the ratification of parliament. Sections 18 and 19 make this quite clear:

18. In case of an emergency, the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

19. Whenever the Governor in Council places the naval service or any part thereof on active service, as provided in the preceding section, if parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall be issued for a meeting of parliament within fifteen days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation and shall continue to sit in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

But let us take the trouble of referring to the Militia Bill of 1868 and we will there find section 61 which reads in a far more peremptory manner than that of the navy.

His Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof for actual service, either within or without the Dominion, at any time whenever it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion or insurrection, or danger of any of them; and the militia men when so called out for actual service, shall continue to serve for at least one year from the date of their being called out for actual service, if required so to do, or for any longer period which Her Majesty may appoint:

Has the King ever once exercised the prerogative thus conferred upon him, before it was changed in these latter years by striking out the words: Out of the Dominion? Has the government itself ever forced a Canadian regiment to take part in the wars of the empire, without each one of its members being consenting? But it may be asked, why should the government not consent to a plebiscite?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us be frank. Is it the government's fault if the people are not consulted on this question, or does not this fault rest with the opposition? If on the 29th March, 1909, instead of agreeing and seconding with enthusiasm the government's proposition, the leader of the opposition had asked for a plebiscite, would not such a policy been more reasonable than to come to-day, as does the member for Jacques Cartier, and demand that the question be referred to the people.

Why did he not state his objections at the right time, instead of giving encouragement to the government, by his adhesion to go on with their policy? It is too late now, Mr. Speaker, to ask for a plebiscite; even if the government were authorized by the constitution, they could not virtually do it, at this moment. An appeal to the people at this juncture cannot be admitted; it would be considered as an act of weakness at a time when British colonies and their naval policy towards the mother country it would be interpreted as a want of patriotism on our part. The government is the constituted authority in the land, and as such, they are bound to exercise their authority, more particularly on a question of so great importance, not only to England, which is more directly interested, but also to all other countries which hate and envy England, and which would be the first to rejoice over the least hesitation on the part of the colonies. The time is no more for a plebiscite. It should have been asked for, before the policy of the government was laid down and presented to the House.

I am opposed to a plebiscite for another important reason, besides those already given.

We live under a representative government; we are directly responsible to the people, and every five years the electorate is called upon to ratify or condemn the position taken by their representatives on the several questions that have been submitted to parliament. The people pass judgment upon their representatives at election time, when all the political questions are fully debated on the hustings. It is on that solemn occasion that the electors make a choice of the men that are supposed to be in a position, not only to represent them with dignity and liability, but also to represent their views on the public questions of the day. During the term of a parliament the electorate cannot reasonably interefere and dictate to their representatives in this House.

The Canadian parliament is not a municipal council obliged to submit to the taxpayers every proposal entailing the expenditure of a few hundred dollars. The constituencies and their representatives have wider attributions and the idea of submitting to the people all important questions proposed to the House for discussion would be an anomaly that the people themselves would be the first to reprove.

Let us suppose for a moment that the government accept the amendment sub-

mitted by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and ask the people to give their verdict on the naval policy. How many members outside of the cities, would be in a position to assert that over 25 per cent of their constituents could decide on that question with a reasonable degree of competency, keeping in mind the limited amount of information and knowledge they have on the subject. There is nothing astonishing about it. At the present moment I know for a fact that a great number of my fellow-countrymen look only at the economic side of the question, that is to say, the expenditure it will entail, leaving aside all the wider and higher considerations.

Then, let us suppose that the people of the province of Quebec reject all naval policy, when the English-speaking provinces decide on the other side, this verdict would not mean that my fellow-countrymen are not loyal to the British Crown, and that is, nevertheless, the conclusion that would be drawn from their verdict. We all know what disastrous consequences would follow for that province. We would be isolated from the rest of the confederation. The French Canadians would be an isolated group, looked upon scornfully by the population of the other provinces. We cannot have in this parliament, without great danger of our race and creed, a party not in accord with one or the other of the two recognized political parties of this country.

There is a time for everything: at every election a chance is given to the people to pass judgment upon their representatives and upon the policy they have approved or opposed during the term of their mandate. At election time the electorate become the master, and then we have a real plebiscite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do you happen to know what is said amongst other things that I do not believe in? Supposing that we had a plebiscite, did we not hear it said, that the province of Quebec, under the guidance of the clergy, would vote against all contribution of help of any kind to England, on the ground that it would be a step toward imperialism? Did we not hear it said that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and an ex-member of this House, making appeal to prejudice, would stump the province, would make a canvas from house to house, would knock at the door of every vicarage and would preach the rebellion, shielding their political aspirations behind the Catholic clergy?

That is what is being said, Mr. Speaker. I need not say that I energetically and emphatically denounce all such slanders and calumnies, specially in so far as they are directed against the Catholic clergy of the province of Quebec. The past history of this country is there to teach us what valuable services the Catholic clergy have given to the British Crown in the hours of need, and how they would to-day as in the past, preach devotion and loyalty to the British flag under whose folds we have lived happy and free.

Moreover, is it not that same clergy that assisted in the re-election of Sir George Etienne Cartier, when he came before the electorate with his Militia Bill?

Sir, I have not the mission to defend the clergy of the province of Quebec against certain insinuations that have seemed directed against it in some places. My confidence is strong enough in that clergy, and I admire so much those who direct it, that I can't help saying here, in this House, that the clergy would not pursue such course. There is a tendency to make people believe that if we had a plebiscite, we should be surprised of the mass of English citizens who would be against all contribution to England, direct or indirect.

Well, Sir, I do not believe in this badly calculated prediction, if I may judge by the countenance of this House. Here, all the members are unanimous in having Canada contribute to the defence of the British empire. And, even the opposition expresses a desire to do more than is proposed by the government. On the other hand, all the prominent Englishmen, the large and small journals of the country, are for one or the other policy except, perhaps a few individuals.

Some take pleasure in saying that the English farmers do not agree with the idea of creating a national marine, nor of directly contributing for the defence of England. Here, let us be fair towards them. I may for a moment admit that they would not like to see money spent that way, but as to pretend that their greediness would speak higher than their patriotism, I say that is an injury to their address. So, the best proof that the English farmers are not antipathic to the policy, is seen in the two following facts: Lately, at Toronto, there was a convention of the 'Dominion Grange.' The president of the association at the beginning of the meeting spoke, I may say quietly, but cursing war and brining forth the idea that Canada should not spend a penny for war. Some of the members wanted to convert the opinion of the president into a motion, but the discussion became so hot that it was not thought wise to invite the votes.

Not much later, the 'grain growers' had a convention at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan; there was on the bill a resolution in favour of a direct contribution to English marine by Canada.

It was decided not to discuss this question, because it was not in accordance with the object of the association. Here are

two facts, Sir, that are quite contrary to the idea conveyed that the English farmers are antipathic to the mother country. Supposing that we have to face a real crisis, that our territory and our coasts need defence and that our dignity as well as our interests command that we should at once make ready for self defence; all these thoughts are not suggested by what I just said, but by the reflection that such a subject must bring to every mind. But, these considerations do not cover that ground. We must take a higher standpoint, and perhaps this will help us to understand our duty in this case, always possible, that a storm may break over our heads before we can accomplish all the necessary work of resistance. We are here on the Canadian land the offsprings of two great countries, rivals for a long time, to-day together and friends to defend against the possible aggression which would be principally the result of circumstances than bad will; but, even then just as dangerous.

France and England have the duty to defend oneself. What each want to keep is their territory their riches and their civilization, but it is also and before all their spirit itself which would be apt to disappear with the invasion and remain for men only as a great souvenir, such as are to-day the Greek and Roman spirit.

So, this spirit, this civilization, the languages which are the expression of it are ours also. We are interested to keep them intact and we could not view with indifference a war by which either of these would be in danger. We would feel morally concerned in such a cause, with all our might, our resources, and even our blood.

We would be, we are in solidarity here, and this circumstance will not only bring us closer to our forefathers' countries, but they will unite us better together. It is perhaps a means of creating a durable sympathy, a fraternity between the two Canadian races.

This sentiment does not exist actually, we are bound to declare. We live peacefully, but without sympathy, for we know very little of one another, and each group has his pretensions that the other refuses to admit. The politicians remark this wrong with sadness, and it will not soon disappear since it must do so without abdication.

If, on the other hand, each group could add to the love of the Canadian home which tends to bring them closer, the sentiment of their solidarity in the defence of a still more elevated ideal if this is possible, and for which each group concerned would be ready to sacrifice very much, the unity would become easier and nearer; the result might be a real alliance which would add some day to the rich bunch of civilization, a new variety formed of the two prettiest and most ancient flowers which compose it. Let us not fear to take strong determinations.

Let us enter, without any mental reservation, upon the new path pointed out to us by honour and duty, as well as by the well understood interests of Canada for the present as for the future.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adiourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 2, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

EXPLOSIVES ON DISTRICT 'F,' NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. ROBB:

In view of the report from Dr. J. T. Donald, expert analyst and assayist, on the use and quality of explosives employed in district 'F,' of the Transcontinental Railway, and his report of the principal causes of the accidents on construction work of the railway, have the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners considered the advisability of issuing a circular forbidding the employment in the handling of explosives of all workmen who cannot read printed instructions in either the French or English language?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM:

The matter is under consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY SLEEPING CAR CONDUCTORS.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Have orders been given requiring the conductors of sleeping cars on the Intercolonial railway, residing in Montreal, to remove to Halifax, or at least to live there when not on duty?
2. If so, who gave these orders, and why?
3. Why does not the same order apply to Mr. Archibald, superintendent of the department, who remains at Truro?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No. Sleeping car conductors are required to lay off between runs in Halifax.
2. Orders are given by superintendent of parlour, sleeping and dining car service by instructions of the board of management.
3. It is not considered necessary.

PORT HOOD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. RHODES:

1. What amount has been already expended on the breakwater to close the northern entrance to Port Hood harbour, Inverness county, N.S., and the amount for each year?
2. What amount has been spent on the Port Hood side, and what amount on the Port Hood island side?
3. Has the work been done by tender and contract, or by day's work?
4. Under what foreman or foremen was the work done, and what total amount was paid him, or each of them?
5. What distance has been built from the above on the Port Hood side, and on the Port Hood island side, respectively?
6. What distance is there of channel still to fill in, and what is the greatest depth of water?
7. How much does the government propose to spend this year, and will it be spent by contract?
8. What is the original estimate of the government engineer for the whole of the work?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. 1903-04.. .. ..$ 2,968 85
1904-05.. .. .. 19,942 43
1905-06.. .. .. 9,999 91
1906-07.. .. .. 14,885 13
1907-08.. .. .. 14,999 37
1908-09.. .. .. 15,000 98
1909-10.. .. .. 15,012 31

$92,808 98

2. Port Hood side, $77,796.67; Port Hood Island side, $15,012.31.
3. Day work.
4. James McDonell, foreman, $3.50 per day, $2,212.87; Isaiah Watts, sub-foreman, $2.50 per day, $1,119.38.
5. Port Hood side, 1,660 feet; Island side, 540 feet.
6. (a) 2,400 feet; (b) Greatest depth at extreme low water between the two works, 19 feet.
7. (a) Amount voted for fiscal year 1910-11, $40,000. (b) It is proposed to have the balance of the work done by contract.
8. The resident engineer submitted various estimates ranging from $165,000 to $482,000 according to character and height of work. These plans, however, were not adopted, and the chief engineer recommended loose brush and stone work, estimated to cost $215,000.

INVERNESS HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. BLAIN:

1. Is it the intention of the government to spend any money on making a harbour at Inverness, Nova Scotia, this season?
2. Has any amount been already spent on this work for land, and to whom, for timber, and for foreman's fees?
3. If the work is done this season, will it be by opening up a channel to McIsaac's pond, or in the rebuilding and repair of the old piers outside?
4. How much does the government propose to spend this season on this work?
5. Has the government any word of serious damage being done to the old piers by a late severe storm?
6. What is the government engineer's estimate for building and extending pier and for dredging boat channel to McIsaac's pond, respectively?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. There is an item in the estimates for the purpose, and it is hoped that the work may be proceeded with.
2. The government having been obliged to expropriate the land required, work of construction was necessarily delayed; therefore the appropriations granted so far by parliament have partially lapsed, the only yearly expenditures being as follows:

Year.	Appropriation.	Amount	Expenditure, Nature.
	$	$ cts.	
1907-8..	10,000	70 60	Survey of land and legal services.
1908-9..	10,000	70 00	Foreman's fees.
		611 39	Timber.
		229 63	Stone, hardware, &c.
1909-10.	4,700	750 79	Land and costs—D. J. McDonald.
		520 69	Legal services, witness fees, &c.
		20 00	Foreman's fees.

3. Reconstructing and repairing old protection work on east side and possibly excavating to one foot at low water.
4. Amount voted for fiscal year 1910-11, $10,000.
5. No.
6. Reconstruction.. .. ..$12,324
New channel piers.. 39,970
Dredging.. 9,400

SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BEST:

1. What was the number of sessional or temporary employees of the House of Commons on the 25th of January last, and by whom were such appointments made?
2. What was the authorized number of such employees at said date?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The number of sessional or temporary employees of the House of Commons on the 25th of January last was 175. These appointments were made by his honour the Speaker of the House.
2. All the said appointments were authorized.

CHAMBORD CUSTOMS OFFICE.

Mr. GIRARD:

1. Was an office of customs opened at Chambord? If so, in what year and for what reason?
2. In what year was it closed, and why?
3. Who are the persons who asked for its discontinuation?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Chambord Junction was established as a customs outport from 1st May, 1897.
2. The customs outport at Chambord Junction was abolished by order in council of 22nd October, 1901, with a view of promoting economy.
3. The official reports received through the customs service led to the discontinuance of the outport.

METABETCHOUAN POSTMASTER

Mr. GIRARD:

1. Has Mr. Jean Gauthier, postmaster at Metabetchouan, been removed or has he resigned? If so, in what year and why?
2. Who are the persons who asked for his removal and resignation?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1. Mr. Jean Gauthier was removed from the postmastership of Metabetchouan in October, 1902. The office had for some time been very badly managed and had on several occasions been the subject of official inquiry and report. No improvement being shown in the management, it was found necessary in the public interest, to make a change in the postmastership.
2. As stated, in answer to No. 1, the change was made after official investigation, as a result of repeated complaints made to the department in regard to the unsatisfactory management of the office. Complaints were preferred by the following individuals: Mr. George Perron, Mr. Joseph Dore, Mr. Wilfrid Cote, Mr. Edouard Montminy, Mr. C. P. Renauld, Mr. S. Bouchard, Mr. W. Ratte, Mr. J. Couture, Mr. J. Desmeules.

INDIAN AGENT AT POINTE BLEUE.

Mr. GIRARD:

1. Has a person named W. Donohue, Indian agent on the Pointe Bleue reserve, been removed? If so, in what year and why?
2. Who are the persons who asked for this action of the minister?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

W. T. A. Donohue was removed from the position of Indian agent for the Pointe Bleue reserve in the year 1902, by order in council of 23rd April of that year, as result of an investigation into irregularities connected with the conduct of his agency.
2. The department has no data to enable it to answer this question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

POSTMASTER AT DELISLE.

Mr. GIRARD:

1. Has Mr. Alfred Gagné, postmaster at Delisle, been removed or has he resigned? If so, in what year and why?
2. Who are the persons who asked for his resignation or removal?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Mr. Alfred Gagné was removed from the postmastership of Delisle in November, 1903. Numerous complaints were received in regard to the management of the office, which an official investigation proved to be so unsatisfactory as to render it necessary, in the public interest, to make a change in the postmastership.
2. Several petitions were received on the subject, one very numerously signed petition from the mayor and councillors of the place, recommended the appointment of the present postmaster.

POSTMASTER AT DOLBEAU.

Mr. GIRARD:

1. Has Mr. J. Tremblay, postmaster at Dolbeau, been removed or has he resigned? If so, in what year and why?
2. Who are the persons who asked for such resignation or removal?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. A change was made in the postmastership of Dolbeau in May, 1909. Complaints were made to the department in regard to the management of the office and an official investigation revealed so serious a state of mismanagement that it became necessary, in the public interest, to make a new appointment to the postmastership.
2. The mayor and secretary-treasurer of the municipality and others were complainants in the matter.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION—COUNSEL.

Mr. RHODES:

1. Has counsel ever been employed by this government, or paid out of the public funds of Canada, to represent or act for witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee, or to represent or act for the Transcontinental Railway Commission, in respect of the examination of witnesses before such committee? If so, who are such counsel, and when were they paid?
2. For whom were they acting and what services did they actually render?

Mr. GRAHAM. The information sought is too voluminous to be given in the form of a reply to a question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It stands as a notice of motion.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand the minister to say that this question has been answered?

Mr. GRAHAM. The information asked is too voluminous to give in the form of a question. If the hon. gentleman moves, it is all right.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) wish it to stand as notice of motion for a return?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

LAKE ST. PETER WORKS—FOREMAN ROY.

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. Were any charges laid against Ernest Roy, foreman of works on Lake St. Peter? If so, on what date were such charges laid?
2. Was an investigation held? If so, by whom, and has a report been handed to the department showing the results of such investigation?
3. Will the department place a copy of said report on the table of the House?
4. Is Ernest Roy still in the employ of the government? If so, in what capacity, and if still employed, what is his salary now and what was it when charges were laid?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Yes. On the 8th September, 1906.
2. Yes. By Victor Gaudet, Esq., barrister, of Montreal. A report has been presented.
3. The report was presented to the House on the 11th May, 1908.
4. No.

'COTTON'S WEEKLY.'

Mr. HERRON:

Is the Postmaster General aware that a paper alled 'Cotton's Weekly,' published at Cowansville, P.Q., claims that it is being unjustly discriminated against in the matter of excessive postal charges? If so, what grounds are there for such a claim?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

A communication has been received from the publisher of 'Cotton's Weekly' respecting the rate of postage chargeable on copies of his publication. There has been no discrimination, and, in the view of the department, no ground for complaint exists. I might explain further: The department was informed that the publisher of 'Cotton's Weekly' had sent various bundles of his paper to different post offices addressed to other than regular subscribers. It appears that the postmaster of Cowansville, instead of collecting postage at the transient rate of one cent per four ounces, allowed such bundles to go through at the bulk rate of one-quarter of one cent per pound. The department has contended that persons who subscribe for fifty or one hundred, or a similar number of copies, of but a single issue cannot be regarded as regular subscribers, and, therefore, that such copies can only be transmitted by post at the transient rate of one cent per four ounces, or fraction thereof, to each separate address. The publisher has recently written resenting the action taken, and a reply dealing fully with his inquiry is being sent to him to-day, to the effect that he is not in any manner being discriminated against, but is enjoying the same privileges as all other publishers, and not in any way knowingly treated differently.

NEW BRUNSWICK MAIL ROUTE.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. When were tenders called for the Milledgeville-Holderville mail route in New Brunswick?
2. Who were the tenderers, at what prices did they tender, and who got the contract?
3. Was the contract given to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

	Per annum.
1. February 19, 1909.	
2. (a) Joseph M. Sleep	$636
William Sleep	690
Thomas L. Martin	690
Edgar Miller	700
John Harrity	707
H. A. Currie	800

(b) Mr. Thomas L. Martin.

3. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, but he failed to provide the necessary security and the department was obliged to set his tender aside.

STEAMER 'HUDSON.'

Mr. DANIEL:

1. Has the government or any department thereof recently purchased a steamer in St. John, called the 'Hudson'?
2. If so, what was the price paid, and for what purpose is she to be used?
3. What are the dimensions and tonnage of this steamer?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Yes.
2. $3,600. For patrolling the lobster fishery.
3. 57 feet 7 inches long, 12 feet 6 inches beam, and 4 feet 7 inches depth; 33·59 gross tons.

PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR:

1. Has the Minister of Railways received any complaint or complaints as to the alleged unfair manner in which the Railway Commission has purchased its supplies?
2. Has the minister any information which would indicate that the contractors on the Transcontinental railway are compelled to purchase their supplies from any one firm, or is he aware that such is said to be the case?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. It is not unusual when public bodies or governments are purchasers of supplies or goods, for dealers who think they should sell a greater quantity of such supplies and goods than is purchased from them, to make complaint, and the Minister of Railways has had the usual experience in this respect.

2. No.

POULTRY DEPARTMENT, EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. How many men are employed in the Poultry Department at the Central Experimental Farm, and what is the salary of each?

2. What amount of ground is given up to this department?

3. How many fowl are there at the farm at present?

4. What is the revenue from this department?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

1. Five, with salaries of $1,500, $1,300, $500, $605.31 and $515.70, respectively.

2. 3·05 acres.

3. 323.

4. Revenue:Fiscal year 1908-9, $620.91; 10 months, fiscal year 1909-10, $350.87.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I beg, with your permission, to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss the regulations of the National Rifle Association of Great Britain and Ireland, in which discrimination is made against the official arm of the Canadian militia. I regret that the Minister of Militia, owing to illness, is not here; but as the matter is of very great urgency, I would be pleased if the right hon. the First Minister would kindly bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Militia.

Leave being granted,

Mr. HUGHES. I regret exceedingly that it is necessary to bring this matter before the House; but it is a matter of very great importance to the riflemen of Canada, and in fact involves the honour of the whole Dominion. The old rule, under which our riflemen competed at Bisley, is covered by section 98 of the regulations of the National Rifle Association, page 61, as follows:

Any ·303 rifle as issued by the British government or the government of any British colony or dependency for the arming of the troops, including the Charger Loading M.L.M. and M.L.E. rifles, or similar rifle of private manufacture of bona fide government pattern and bearing the government viewer's mark.

From time immemorial the Canadian riflemen, being armed with the British Snider rifle, were allowed to fire unquestioned; those who used the Martini-Henry were allowed to fire unquestioned, and those who adopted the Lee-Enfield rifle, of one pattern or another, of all the various marks it has gone through, were allowed to fire unquestioned. Last year, owing to the success attending the use of the Ross rifle by the Canadian riflemen, an attempt was made to prevent the use of that rifle on the ranges at Bisley; and although the council of the National Rifle Association, under the regulations, could not possibly object to the rifle, they passed a new rule for future years, which I shall read:

National Rifle Association,
Bisley Meeting, 1910.

The council have decided that no service rifle of any pattern other than the official pattern in use by the British army be admitted in service rifle competitions unless an officially certified specimen of such rifle be deposited with the National Rifle Association at least three months before the commencement of the Bisley meeting and approved for use at the Bisley meeting.

Now, contrast the two rules. The old rule permitted the use of any ·303 rifle, provided it was of British government pattern; but the evident object and intent of this new rule is at least to leave it uncertain in the minds of the riflemen whether this ·303 rifle of Canada may be used or not. After the success attending the use of the Ross rifle at Bisley last year, orders were being received for the Ross rifle, not only from Canada, but from all over the world; and thousands of these rifles would have been ordered but for this new regulation, which made it uncertain whether the National Rifle Association would allow its use or not in the coming year; consequently, thousands of riflemen beyond the seas as well as in the Dominion of Canada, who otherwise would have purchased it, have not done so. This new regulation practically charges the Canadian government with fraud. Let us see what the record in this matter is. For a long time, as long as the Ross rifle was a short one and had no chance of competing at Bisley with a long rifle, there was no serious objection raised against it by any one. Everybody knows that a short-barrelled rifle cannot be held as steadily in the hands of a soldier as a long-barrelled rifle. But as soon as the Canadian service adopted the long-barrelled Ross rifle, and the record of that rifle became known in England, objections began to be raised against it. In 1908 one or two of these long rifles were fired at the Bisley meeting without any serious objection being raised; nobody paid much attention to

the matter. But last year, when the Canadian team went over there, during the two weeks of preliminary practice, there was what was called the 'Pride of the Army' match, in which the Canadian boys fired against the picked shots of the British army. Previous to that the prize shot of the British army, Sergeant Wallingford, reported on the Ross rifle that it was one point per range better than the British rifle. In the early stage of this 'Pride of the Army' match, the Canadians made such scores that had the match been finished they could have made outers at the final ranges and still have beaten the crack shots of the British army. But at the early stage the match was called off, and from that moment serious opposition was raised against the admission of this rifle in the matches. There was no reason for it. It was claimed that it was not the rifle issued by Canada for the arming of her troops. Well, let us see if the British riflemen were using the rifle issued for the British troops. The British army to-day is armed with a short Lee-Enfield rifle, and not one of these was fired throughout the matches at Bisley. It would have no chance there. They fired what has been in the past few years regarded as obsolete—the long Lee-Enfield and the long Lee-Metford. Our people have seen the advantage of the long rifle, and since we have recovered from the fads of the Boer war we have adopted it. The Germans have also adopted the long rifle, even for their cavalry. So that there was nothing whatever improper in the Canadian team adopting a long rifle at the Bisley matches. It was practically the same as the long Lee-Enfield and the long Lee-Metford. Put them side by side and the ordinary observer cannot distinguish one from the other. There were no special changes made in the long rifle. There was not one point of difference between the short Ross rifle and the long Ross rifle, where there were 20 and in some cases 100 points of difference between the various marks of the long Lee-Enfield; and yet objection was made to the long Ross rifle being used on the ranges.

Now, according to the British Bisley regulations, the rifles are classed as service, match, sporting, &c. Then there are the various patterns of rifle, including the Lee-Enfield, the Lee-Metford, the Martini-Henry, and the Ross. Then there are the various marks of each of these classes. There are three marks of the Ross rifle—I, II and IIxx, while there are about thirty different marks of the Lee-Enfield and the Lee-Metford. Why should mark IIxx be an objection to the Ross rifle when the various marks are not held to be an objection to the British rifles? The long Ross rifle has exactly the same action as the short Ross, having a straight pull. Practically the only difference is in the length of the barrel. I do not blame all the members of the National Rifle Association for the intrigue which brought about this new regulation. Nor do I blame the range officers as a whole for the treatment of certain members of the Canadian team on the ranges. The feeling got so high last year on the ranges that one officer of the highest standing in Canada, a man of honour, Captain Neil Smith, of Chatham, who is known throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and who was complimented by Lord Roberts on the magnificent score he made on the long ranges, when about to shoot, heard one of the range officers come up and say to the register keeper: 'Watch that Canadian and see that he does not change his ammunition'. This is something like what happened to Lieutenant Spittal, the year before last, when objection was made to him to prevent him winning the King's prize. These gentlemen are determined to force out the Ross rifle. Last year they coaxed and begged our men to use the Lee-Enfield, offering to sell the rifle under the cost price, which by the way they said was $15. Finally they offered to lend them, practically to give them for nothing, if they would use them in the matches. But the Canadians stood firm, as they had authority to use their own rifle, and refused. There is another aspect of this case. We are told that the price of this Ross rifle is altogether out of the question. Here is an advertisement in the 'Territorial Service Gazette' of Great Britain:

Bisley Rifle Meeting, 1910. £1,000 First Prize. £1,000 (One Thousand Pounds Sterling), will be paid to the winner of the All-comer's Aggregate Competition at the N. A. R. Meeting at Bisley, 1910, provided such winner shall, throughout the several competitions embraced in the aggregate, have used an 'Ommundsen' service rifle purchased by him from us on or after 1st September, 1909. And, subject to the same conditions, we undertake to pay the following additional prizes to the—

Winner of the	'Daily Graphic'	£50
" "	'Graphic'	50
" "	'Daily Telegraph' ..	50
" "	'Stock Exchange' ..	50
" "	Alexandra	50

The 'Ommundsen' Service Rifle, of the highest quality and finish, costs 9 guineas, cash with order. Territorial pattern, 10s. extra. Obtainable only from Daniel Fraser & Co., Edinburgh. London office: 48 Dover street, W.

Thus the British competitor, when he purchases a private rifle, has to pay $50 and upwards for it, whereas the Canadian rifle, the Ross, is retailed at $35. Therefore, the charge as to the excessive cost of this rifle will not hold. I am not charging that it was deliberately arranged to shut out the Ross rifle, but that was the effect, had not certain action been taken by the government of Canada in regard to the rear aper-

ture sight, which it is found expedites shooting. The National Rifle Association passed this regulation:

Subject to the provisions set out in this subsection, an additional backsight may be used, or either of the backsights as issued may be removed, by withdrawal of the hinge pin only, and another backsight may be substituted for the removed backsight.

That would permit the use of the rear aperture sight; but it could be used only on a rifle which had already this rear aperture sight, so that by the removal of the hinge pin it could be used. They might as well have put in that regulation that no one could use the rear aperture sight except on a Lee-Enfield or a Lee-Metford rifle. Objection was taken to the fact that the Canadian rifle had a different rear aperture sight; but it having been authorized by the Minister of Militia, it was therefore within the rules, and objections were reluctantly withdrawn.

As to the success of the long Ross rifle, I may be permitted to point out a few of the winnings last year. It seems impossible that these can be a mere matter of chance. I do not want to take up time giving reasons why the Ross rifle is superior to others, but any of those skilled in the use of rifles can easily explain why. At Bisley last year it won the McKinnon cup, for the first time in history, with a score of 1,609 out of a possible 1,800. It won the Kolapore cup with a score of 765 out of a possible 840. It also won the Graphic cup with a score of 35 out of a possible 35; the Daily Graphic cup with a score of 35 out of a possible 35; another Daily Graphic cup with a score of 35 out of a possible 35; the Jubilee trophy, with a score of 2,375 out of a possible 2,640; and the All Comers aggregate, with a score of 167 out of a possible 175.

In the province of Quebec the long Ross rifle swept the entire match. In the Ontario matches, in the Tait-Brassey match, it took the first six places in Toronto last year. In the Osler match, it made a score of 49 out of a possible 50, and took the first five places in the extra series No. 1. In the Great West Tobacco match, it took the first two places, and in the Militia Aggregate, the first three places; and in the All Comers Aggregate, the first four places.

At the Dominion Rifle Association Meet, in the Bankers' match it won the first seven places, except the second. That could not be a matter of chance at all because the same class of men shot all round. In the Governor General's match, it made a score of 198 out of a possible 210. In the Bisley aggregate it took the first four places. In the Tyre match it took the first two places. In the MacDougall challenge cup it made a score of 68 out of a possible 70, and took the first two places. In the President's match it took the first three places. Extra series 'a', first two places; extra series 'b', first two places; Barlow match (team of four) it made a score of 361 out of a possible 420, all Ross rifles; in the extra series aggregate, 213 out of 225 and the first nine places; Gillespie aggregate, 233 out of 245, first five places; Grand aggregate, 334 out of 350, first ten places.

I have a list of the other matches in England but it is not necesary that I should refer to them. What I maintain is that this regulation is very objectionable. I would not seriously object to the rifle having to be submitted in advance, although I think the three months is altogether too long. The object of withholding approval all that time is evident. On the 1st of April, let us say, the rifle must be submitted at Bisley for approval, and it will not be known for another month whether it is adopted or not. What is the consequence? Every rifleman, who would have bought a Ross rifle last year, were it not for that arbitrary rule, is held in suspense. Then we find a bonus of £1,000 held up to men to buy the Lee Enfield, manufactured in Great Britain. Even Canadian riflemen, under the regulation, are not certain whether they can use the Ross rifle or not. It is a regulation which no self-respecting association or government should submit to. It is claimed that the troops are not armed with the Ross rifle. Well, that rifle is in the hands of the troops in Canada, and has, moreover, the approval of the government of Canada, after having been put to the most severe tests in comparison with the Lee Enfield. In every instance in which the two rifles were brought into competition, the Lee-Enfield failed to touch the Ross rifle. After thousands of rounds had been fired, the latter came out ahead and stands to-day the best rifle in the world. No doubt our troops are not all armed with this rifle, but neither were the British troops all armed with the Lee Enfield. And to say that because a few hundred short Lee Enfield rifles were issued to the British troops in Matabeland years ago, the British army was not armed with the Lee Enfield, would be absurd, and the man who would say that would be laughed out of court. All our troops are not armed with the Ross rifle. Some are armed with the old Lee Enfield and the Martini Henry and maybe some with the old Snider Enfield, but that does not prevent the Ross rifle being the official arm of the Canadian troops, and is no excuse for this regulation to which I object, and to which no self-respecting country should submit.

The old regulation provided that:

Any ·303 rifle as issued by the British government or the government of any British colony or dependency for the arming of the troops——

But, now there is a change. The new rule provides that the rifle authorized by a colony shall not be used until it is submitted for endorsation, thus keeping the people in suspense until within three months of the match, and the National Rifle Association may take six weeks to come to a decision. Here is the rule:

The council have decided that no service rifle of any pattern other than the official pattern in use in the British army be admitted in service rifle competitions unless an officially specimen of such rifle be deposited with the National Rifle Association at least three months before the commencement of the Bisley meeting and approved for use at the Bisley meeting.

You must walk up three months in advance and say here is the rifle authorized by the Dominion, in use by the troops of the Dominion, manufactured in the Dominion, which swept Bisley last year and put the Lee Enfield out of existence, and yet you have nevertheless to walk up hat in hand and say: Please, will you let me shoot with it next year?

The other objectionable part is that the Ross rifle must be approved for use at the Bisley meeting. What we should insist on is that the rifle authorized by the Canadian government should be admitted to the competition at Bisley without any demur. Otherwise, no Canadian riflemen should go to Bisley. I think this whole business is engineered in Canada by conspirators in the pay of the small arm companies of England to discredit the Canadian rifle and make it appear that there is something crooked about it, when there never was a straighter transaction. What do we do? We adhere to the British caliber and a ·303 bullet. What we should have is a ·280 bullet, that is what we want. Still, in order to be able to use the same ammunition in any part of the world, we adopt the ·303. We should have a rimless cartridge. The British use the obsolete rim cartridge. We maintain the old pattern so that the soldier who uses the Ross rifle may use the same ammunition as is used in the Lee-Enfield. We maintain these obsolete ideas merely to comply with the standard set up. But, moreover, only last month, the British government themselves have come out with the statement that their rifle is obsolete, and they are going to change it at an early day. Yet, they want to force us—no, I am not speaking of the British government now, but of the National Rifle Association, which is a sort of private institution—that association is endeavouring to force us to give up the use of our long Ross rifle. But the self-respect of this government cannot rest under that rule.

Mr. J. D. REID. How are you going to make them change?

Mr. HUGHES. I am very glad my hon. friend has asked that question. How are we going to make them change? Let the Canadian boys stay at home, if the British government will not step in and take action. The British government allow a lot of their officers to take part as range officers, and thus save the association thousands of dollars every year. Let the government be notified that the use of these obsolete ideas in regard to rifles does not meet with the approval of the Dominion of Canada. Then, if our boys go there, let them carry the rifle bearing the official stamp of the Dominion of Canada, and with the order in council in the pocket of the commandant of the team. They go on the ranges and say: 'Here is the official certificate, and here is the rifle bearing the stamp of the Dominion of Canada.' That is is all that should be necessary from any colony in this empire, and no self-respecting colony would tolerate the demand of more. If they do not agree to that, so far as I am concerned not a Canadian rifleman will fire at Bisley this year or any other year until these gentlemen are brought to time. If they cannot be brought to time by reason, why, we can bide at home, shoot our own matches, and get along without them. We have shown at Bisley what the Ross rifle and the Canadian boys can do.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I desire to add just a word to this rifle controversy. I have no intention of detaining the House, for I know that it is desirable to go on with another debate. I do not hold a brief for the Ross Rifle, nor do I hold a brief for the private manufacturers of the Lee-Enfield rifle, which latter, I believe, are at the bottom of this trouble. We must look at this matter fairly and sensibly. Rifle matches, to my mind should afford a test of the marksmanship of the men and of the qualities of the rifle as well. We all know that the rifle, at the present moment and all over the world is in a transition state. The Boer war showed the necessity of improving, not the shooting quality of the rifle, but the sights and the means of manipulating the sighting with a view to giving greater effectiveness than had up to that time been attained at the long ranges. The old sights on the Lee-Enfield are almost identical with the sights on the old Brown Bess. The most experienced sportsmen and marksmen know that in order to obtain the highest degree of skill in the use of the small-bore rifle some improved methods of sighting must be adopted over those in vogue during the Boer war. While I do not wish to take any particular part in the

controversy, I may make a brief statement of the matter. The difference between the Lee-Enfield rifle and the Ross rifle is largely a difference of the action, and the action has nothing to do with the shooting properties of the rifle, but is simply a matter of the mechanism that puts the cartridge into the barrel of the rifle. The shooting qualities depend entirely upon the quality of the barrel and also on the sights, plus 'the man behind the gun.' Now, the whole trouble with the National Rifle Association is that any Canadian who wishes to go to Bisley where he must fire the Lee-Enfield rifle or the Lee-Metford rifle must go down in his pocket for an expensive rifle manufactured by one of two or three well-known private makers of rifles in the old country. If he does not do that, he stands no show in the matches. After our men went to England, immediately after we had adopted the Lee-Enfield—which was different from the rifle they had, the Lee-Metford—our men carried off prizes to about the same extent as last year. Mr. Hayhurst carried off the Queen's prize, and did it with a rack rifle—not with a private rifle. This caused great clamour amongst the manufacturers of rifles in the old country, for it is an extensive business with large interests, as can be seen by the prizes offered for those who shoot a particular rifle. The British government then adopted the Canadian Lee-Enfield.

My view of the whole matter is that the self-respect of both countries should see to it that these matches are made contests for rifles as well as of skill. This is necessary for us, and Great Britain, in order to have rifles more modern than any other nation. The English rifle is entirely obsolete. I agree with the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, (Mr. Hughes), on that point—its calibre is too great and the cartridge is useless, for it is a rim cartridge, instead of cannelured, and besides the sights are altogther obsolete. In view of the fact that this whole question is in a transition state, I think the self-respect of both countries and of all colonies that compete at Bisley should insist on virtual free trade in the matter of rifle shooting. If any colony insists on adopting a certain pattern of rifle, it must necessarily, in my opinion, carry a bayonet. I think that was the chief fault of the short Ross rifle. But the short Ross rifle was as good as the territorial rifle which is the standard arm of the British soldier to-day. I claim, as I said that there should be free trade in this matter, and that Canada should insist that the rifle she adopts, whether the Ross rifle or any other pattern, shall be authorized in these matches, so long as the ammunition and the bayonet are the same as those in use in Great Britain, and that the length of the rifle we fire is not too great. Also, marksmen should be permitted to experiment with their sights, in order that some sight may be invented which will make this rifle deadly accurate up to two thousand yards. The old open rifle sight is not accurate for more than six hundred yards, and everybody knows that in modern warfare the casualties occur at from about 1,800 down to 1,000 yards. A man must be able to use a rifle with deadly accuracy at 1,800 yards. What the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton says is right; this rifle which they want to have used at Bisley is of an obsolete pattern. The rifle with which the British troops are armed is the territorial rifle, the short-barrelled Lee-Enfield, which they adopted after the Boer war. They cannot and will not use that arm at Bisley, because it is not nearly so good as the rifle they formerly had. Therefore, they want to insist that we should follow their method, they want to compel our riflemen to purchase expensive rifles from the old country manufacturers of the match rifles. It seems to me that this is all a matter of 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.' I do not care in this matter to use such strong language as that of my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), but it is not right to compel our marksmen to pay up to $60 or $70 for a rifle in the old country which is no better than our standard rifle with which we carried off prizes, greatly to our credit as I think. We are no more breaking rules than they are, because the rifle that they use at Bisley is not their official arm. I think the time is opportune for us to make a protest. And, in view of the fact, that the British army is about to change their weapon—and possibly we might change also—this match at Bisley this year should be an open competition both as regards the rifle and as regards the sights. From the experience thus gained, the British government and this government will be better able to judge the right kind of rifle to choose. Unless rifles are subjected to the test of these great matches we cannot tell which one of them is the best. I might say that it is a matter that concerns every nation in the world to know which new rifle is to take the place of the old. The Japanese have adopted a new automatic rifle which fires ten shots automatically. The new Mauser fires seven or eight shots without reloading, by simply pulling the trigger. The recoil of the rifle after a shot is fired is used for reloading. These changes have been adopted in rifles now in use. But the most important question of all is to know what form of sight we are going to use, and in order to develop the ingenuity of mankind, and help our soldiers to perfect a good sight, we should insist that they be allowed to use whatever sight can be adopted to the rifle, that might be used as a military sight. I am glad this ques-

tion has come up, and I hope the National Rifle Association will not stand for the welfare of the English private rifle makers against the interests of the empire.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I think, with all due respect to self-respecting nations and Diana of the Ephesians, that we have here a tempest in a teapot. I think the real question before the National Rifle Association to-day is the question whether Mark II. double star, Ross rifle is the standard arm of the Canadian militia. I maintain it is not the standard arm of the Canadian militia to-day, and I base my statement on answers to questions which I have asked during this session. As to how many of this Mark II. double star rifle have been ordered, I was told that 500 had been ordered. Now it is not intended surely to arm the Canadian militia with 500 Mark II. double star rifles; if it is, it is only for the purpose of issuing this rifle to rifle clubs and to sharpshooters in different regiments so that they may compete, if necessary, with the rifle associations here and abroad. In doing this, I think the department is taking an unfair stand, because it is not every one who has a Mark II. double star, which is, I may say, a very good rifle. I think the fact of its being a good rifle is due largely to the fact that the Conservative party have been insisting upon the Ross rifle being perfected. I think if the Conservative party had not insisted on this matter the militia of Canada would be armed to-day wtih the Mark I. rifle, which is a very inferior brand of rifle. I think the only question before the National Rifle Association of England to-day is whether this rifle is the standard rifle of the Canadian militia or not. If it is the standard rifle of the Canadian militia, further orders would be given for this rifle, and we would not find so few rifles of Mark II. being ordered, but we would find an order given for enough rifles to arm all the militia with it. Now, as to the idea of conspirators throughout Canada who are said by the hon. member to be in the pay of the small arms companies of England, and are consequently objecting to the manufacture of the Ross rifle, I think this is only a delusion which exists in the imagination of some people, whose form of paranoia may lead them ultimately into the belief that they are actually Ross rifles themselves, doing business at both ends simultaneously.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to express my regret that my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Militia and Defence could not be in his seat to-day. I appreciate the fact that my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) has given a great deal of attention to this matter, which is one of so much importance, and that he should not delay to lay it before the public. I do not pretend to be an authority on militia matters, but it seems to me that the facts which he has advanced are worthy of consideration, and I will ask my colleague to give them special attention.

Mr. HUGHES. I thank the First Minister for his approval. I am not surprised to find that the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) is so well posted on the reasons actuating the Rifle Association of Britain in their improper action last year. We know to-day that the National Rifle Association had piles of newspapers about two feet high, and of questions put by the hon. member in the House of Commons here, and of letters written by gentlemen who should know better, and who should be above such things. All these letters were written to the National Rifle Association, and for what purpose? Was it done for the purpose of improving rifle shooting in the empire? No, but to prevent the use of the Ross rifle at Bisley. These are facts which can be substantiated at the proper time and place. Why is it said that this is not the standard arm of Canada? When Britain sent her troops to Matabelaland with 1,000 short Lee-Enfield rifles, was it not the standard arm of the empire? It was used in war by the British troops, and it was used, not after two years of testing, but after two weeks of testing, yet the government sent the troops into action with these rifles. Nobody would pretend to say that a man, because he carried one of these rifles in Matabelaland and presented himself at Bisley, should not have a right to use that rifle. I may inform the House that there are 1,500 of these long Ross rifles ordered, which is an infinitely greater number for Canada relatively than 50,000 would be for Great Britain.

My hon. friend says that he speaks for the Conservative party. The Conservative party, let me inform him, was not behind the conspiracy against the Ross rifle. A few irresponsible gentlemen in the party were in that conspiracy, but the Conservative party was not behind it. And let me inform my hon. friend that before he ever opened his mouth in this House of Commons, for or against the Ross rifle, criticising it one way or the other, every change that has been made in the rifle to-day had been proposed, and had been practically carried out, and was being experimented with, more than a year before he ever came into the House, much less before he opened his mouth on this question. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the various marks of the Ross rifle. There are three marks of the Ross rifle. There is Mark I, which was the first rifle; then there is Mark II, which rifle is in the hands of the soldiers, and the shooting from which has surpassed any shooting done by the Lee-Enfield rifle. The shooting from that Mark II rifle in the hands of the soldiers through-

out Canada last year, was infinitely ahead of any shooting that was done with the Long-Lee-Enfield rifle. Then there is the 'Mark II**' rifle, whose record I have given you from Bisley, and which surpasses any other rifle that has ever been made in the history of the world. I shall not detain the House any further than to say that although we have three marks of the Ross rifle which I gave to the House some years ago, taking the long Lee-Enfield, the short Lee-Enfield, the long Lee-Metford and the short Lee-Metford, some 30 different marks. We have not four or five changes, but hundreds of changes in one part or the other, in the construction of these rifles, yet we never object to them. Competitors are allowed to come and shoot with any service rifle they like at the Dominion or any other ranges in Canada. We claim that when the Dominion of Canada puts its stamp on a rifle as the rifle of the Dominion of Canada and furnishes the committee with a copy of the order in council authorizing that rifle, there the duty of any self-respecting colony should end, and the National Rifle Association of the British empire should be too big a British institution to be worked and run around by any rifle company, I care not what it may be.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. As the hon. gentleman has used the word 'conspiracy', in relation to my connection with this discussion, I wish to say that any connection I have had with the discussion of the Ross rifle has been actuated by a desire to see in the hands of the Canadian militia a good, safe, sound and efficient rifle. I have no interest, as some other people may have, either with the company or as A. D. C. to the Minister of Militia; I am simply here to see that a good, safe and efficient rifle is put in the hands of the militia, and by taking a stand against the first brand of that rifle issued to the militia I think I may safely say we have been successful in having at least 200 changes made in the rifle. To-day the result has been the production of an excellent shooting rifle, but a rifle which experts claim is not an efficient service rifle, that is the Mark II**.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not want to impugn the motives of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington); I shall let his actions speak. If he can assure the House that he has not been instrumental in inspiring the Rifle Association of Great Britain to refuse the use of the long Ross rifle I will be only too glad to accept his explanation; but he cannot do it.

Motion negatived.

Mr. HUGHES.

PRECAUTIONS AGAINST RABIES.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the Minister of Agriculture what the recent regulations of the government are in respect to requiring dogs to be muzzled. This regulation applies, I understand, only to western Ontario. What agreement is there between this government and the government of Ontario in respect to the enforcement of the regulations? Has my hon. friend any news to communicate to the House as to whether this regulation is likely to continue in force for any considerable length of time?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. The Department of Agriculture in its administration of the Health of Animals Law has the authority to issue an order placing any particular part of the country under regulations which may be formulated to protect the health of animals. The provincial authorities have certain powers in regard to the protection of the health of human beings. These powers are largely exercised through by-laws of the municipalities, or orders of the local or provincial health authorities. The outbreak or epidemic of rabies in the western part of Ontario assumed a dangerous form, not only to dogs and other animals, but to human beings and seemed to call for some action. The director-general of the Veterinary Branch of my department communicated with the provincial authorities of Ontario, and after visiting Toronto and discussing the matter with the provincial authorities, it was agreed that the Department of Agriculture here should issue an order putting certain parts of the province of Ontario, in which there seemed to be danger, under a regulation for the muzzling of all dogs that were at large. Unmuzzled dogs were required to be kept in and tied up. The provincial authorities issued at the same time an order from their department by which the municipal authorities of the province were to enforce our order and their own similar order. The object of both authorities issuing similar orders was that there seemed to be some doubts in the mind of the legal authorities as to which department had the full control, and in order to make sure that there would be no mistake and no difficulty in the enforcement of the orders the provincial authorities and the Dominion authorities issued identical orders covering the same area, and the provincial authorities undertook to enforce these orders through their municipal officers and machinery.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it expected that this order will continue for any considerable length of time?

Mr. FISHER. We are not in a position yet to note any condition of affairs which would justify a cancellation of the order.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is there any possibility of compensating farmers whose stock are destroyed by rabies in western Ontario? It is very unfortunate that a poor farmer wakes up in the morning and finds that a mad dog has entered his premises, and has bitten several cows and possibly his horses. The first he knows of it one of his cattle takes this disease, the farm is quarantined, the veterinary officer orders the destruction of the cattle and horses as they develop the disease. I understand the law permits compensation in the case of rabies, the same as in the case of hog cholera and glanders. No compensation has been given, and no attempt has been made to sift the cases and give compensation to the sufferers, many of whom are not guilty and may not even own dogs. The whole amount of compensation that would be paid would possibly not amount to more than $8,000 or $10,000. Has the minister the matter under advisement, and can he say that some system may be devised that would afford relief to these people?

Mr. FISHER. I think in such a case as the hon. member describes the owner of the cattle would have recourse against the owner of the dog,

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. A mad dog runs perhaps fifty miles in a night and nobody knows whose dog it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. EDWARDS.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the attention of the House to a question of privilege. In yesterday's issue of the Toronto 'Globe' there appeared a very lengthy editorial. I shall not quote the whole editorial, but inasmuch as it referred to myself unfairly I shall take this opportunity of correcting some misstatements. In referring to myself it says:

> His blind partisanship is revealed by the fact that he made no allusion to the position of Messrs. Monk and Bourassa. He preferred to quote the alleged utterances of Mr. Tardivel, who is dead, and of Father Hamon, who is not a French Canadian. The correctness of his translations even from the utterances of these gentlemen were denied by his own fellow-Conservative, Judge Doherty.

I wish to state that as regards my reference to the first of these works I gave my authority, the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Quebec. I have only this to say: that the amount which I said had been given, $300, was given on the authority of the Provincial Secretary out of the vote for education, for prize books, and if it was not used in that way then the government of Quebec at that time stands convicted of a misappropriation of public funds. In regard to my reference to Father Hamon's work I wish to say this: I was incorrect in saying that the extract was altogether from chapter 18. Two-thirds of the extract that I gave is a literal translation of what is contained in chapter 18; the other one-third is not contained in chapter 18, but is the substance of parts of chapter 17. Therefore, the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) was quite correct in saying that the part of the quotation to which he took exception, was not to be found in chapter 18. I was incorrect in saying that it was all from chapter 18; the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) was quite correct, I repeat, in saying that the particular part of the extract to which he took exception was not to be found in that chapter.

Mr. HUGHES. You did not make the translation.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not. I have the book here, and I am perfectly willing to submit to any gentleman in the House who is able to translate from the French, and I think he will verify what I say. I wish also to take exception to the editor of the Toronto 'Globe' accusing me of a wish to raise the race cry; and I think it comes with very bad grace from the editor of that paper. My memory carries me back to a memorable election which took place in the province of Ontario, a very bitter election in fact, the bitterness of which may very well be indicated by a pamphlet which was circulated by the Liberal party at that time, and which was given expression to in the Toronto 'Globe,' and one verse of the poem contained these words:

> Beware the French Canadian horde,
> Who robbed you of your just reward,
> Ontario, Ontario.

I think any allusion of the kind I have referred to comes with very bad grace from a paper like the 'Globe.' As regards the reference to the member for Jacques Cartier and to Mr. Bourassa, I wish to say simply this, Mr. Speaker, that I do not share the Nationalist views of Mr. Bourassa, and neitner do I share the separatist views of the editor of the Toronto 'Globe.' But I respect Mr. Bourassa to this extent at all events, that he is a man who expresses his opinions fully and freely, and I despise the editor of the 'Globe' as a fawning, cringing sycophant, who advocates a policy of separation and which, to use his own words 'should be advocated in such a way as to attract little attention.' I do not think the 'Globe' is quite fair in wishing to deny to me the privilege of expressing my views, because, Sir, when the 'Globe' gets into a tight place through following its well known policy of misrepresentation and calumny, its editor is very quick to show the yellow streak in

him and to whine like a whipped cur for the privilege of the press.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before opening my remarks on that important question, I wish to refer to certain arguments employed by hon. gentlemen on the other side in support of their position. If we are to accept the statements of the hon. members for Beauce (Mr. Béland), and for Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer), universal peace, the safety of Canadian trade, and even the supremacy of Great Britain, are all dependent on the presence, the coming in the near future, on the Pacific and Atlantic oceans of that great naval force represented by Canada's imperial fleet.

Now is not that awful? And where will these good farmers, their electors in Beauce and Vaudreuil, be compelled to go in order to sell their eggs, potatoes and onions? Strange to say, they only thought of that quite recently, and goodness knows what wonders of imagination they have already accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, we will try and reassure these good folks by saying to them: My good friends, in time of peace there will hardly be any change. You will sell your eggs just as you did before. Only you will please to lay aside a little percentage out of each dozen, just a few cents, to enable you to pay the cost of those floating fortresses and the salaries of the great and high officers who handle them.

In time of war, your fleet will have to be protected by the British navy, or else it will soon be blown out of existence.

What amuses me, Mr. Speaker, is to hear all these great pacifists of 1896, to whom I shall refer presently, shouting 'To arms, Canadians! Nations are arming around us! The United States, China and Japan are arming themselves all around us! To arms, Canadians!'

Close your ears, dear hon. member for Maisonneuve. For polishing warlike implements and treating us to a smell of powder in time of war, such colonels as the hon. member for Vaudreuil have no equals.

What sounds rather strange is to hear such constant appeals to the memory of Cartier. Here is a statesman who by his death, gained a great deal of praise from hon. gentlemen opposite. Cartier was a far seeing politician. He has endowed his country with great and lasting benefits. But as far as defence is concerned, and I challenge contradiction on this point, I have no hesitation in stating that in his military legislation he never had in view anything further than the defence of Canada, his 'own beloved country.'

I am glad to notice the admission made here last night by the member for Laval (Mr. Wilson), that even if we were to strike out sections 17, 18 and 19 of the Bill, the fleet would have to take part in the imperial wars. Such is my own opinion and I must tell the hon. member that he is making my task quite easy, because my intention is to demonstrate that very fact.

Mr. WILSON. In case of emergency.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) At all events, Mr. Speaker, by keeping silent, I voted for the resolution of the 29th of March, and yet, I shall vote against the Bill. I shall also vote against the proposal in amendment. I am in favour of the sub-amendment and of that only.

On the 29th of March, the German peril was the outcry. The right hon. Premier said: Germany is preparing to treat England on the ocean as she has treated France on land in 1870. He recently stated at Toronto, and he repeated in this House, when he introduced his Bill, that the German peril had ceased to exist. If the German peril justified the resolution, we have no more need of the latter. The Bill itself has no more reason to exist, and neither is there any justification for the military navy.

The resolution referred to a Canadian naval service for national defence. The Bill contemplates a military navy which, in time of war, shall be put at the disposal of the empire.

In my estimation, national defence means the defence of Canada. I am a British subject, and I am proud of it. I am a Canadian, and I am doubly proud of it. Canada is a part and parcel of the empire, but within the empire, each component part has its duty especially assigned to it, and Canada's duty is the defence of our homes, of the country, for the country and for the empire, and for my part, when I speak of my country, I mean Canada.

If there is no more German peril, we have no need of being in such a hurry to establish this military navy and put it at the disposal of England. After all, is it likely that Canada will before long have a naval war on its own account? I do not think so. Evidently this fleet will only be useful for the wars of England. It will only exist for that purpose.

In time of peace it will not be useful. The hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) stated at the imperial conference of 1907 that Canada had her boats for the protection of her fisheries. In time of war, will it really be useful to England? The question is disputed and is very doubtful. It will evidently be a fleet destined to serve in

imperial wars and the efficiency of which will be more apparent than real.

I shall vote against the Bill because it involves the recognition of military imperialism, because it aims at having that principle recorded in our statute books. I shall vote against the amendment because it involves the same principle and because I do not admit that there is any emergency under the present circumstances. I do not wish to justify the motion of the leader of the opposition. I have just said that I am against it. But I believe, in all sincerity, that it does not involve such serious consequences as the government measure. It involves an expenditure not of $25,000,000, as stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, but of only 18 or 20 millions, the cost of two Dreadnoughts, without consulting the people, because it assumes that there is a case of emergency. Furthermore, the policy to be carried out later on would depend upon that appeal to the people. The proposal of the government involves an initial expenditure of 15 millions, with a yearly expenditure of $7,157,000. Then, everybody knows that this military navy will cost, later on, more than 100 millions, with a proportional yearly expenditure. And in that policy there is no provision for any emergency which might arise within three or four years. 'La Patrie,' a Montreal newspaper, which is in favour of the government's scheme, published the following despatch from Washington, dated January 14th last, which shows the extent of the consequences which may result from the policy to which the Dominion is being committed:

MILITARY NAVY.

This question is hotly discussed in the United States.

(Special despatch to 'La Patrie'.)

Washington, January 14,—The Canadian Navy Bill as introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier is being discussed with great interest in diplomatic and naval circles. While the diplomats hold that the present debate shows the dependence of Canada as regards Great Britain in case of war, the naval officers are of opinion that Canada is binding itself to an undertaking much more costly than her people think, and that the Canadian navy will have no importance unless the Canadians are willing to spend hundreds of millions of dollars. You cannot have a navy with a few vessels only. Such is the opinion expressed by a distinguished naval officer, and he adds that shipbuilding is not the only expenditure to be considered and that the recruiting of the crews and the general organization are sources of expenditure which call for the most serious consideration. Others express the opinion that it would have been preferable for Canada to have built six or eight vessels of the most modern type and to have made a present of them to England. A certain group even go so far as to pretend that the United States would defend Canada in case of war and that the Dominion had no reason to fear an invasion in the future. Sir Wilfrid Laurier having declared that any war with England means war with Canada, many persons are of opinion that any war with Canada would mean war with the United States.

The sub-amendment, which calls for a referendum to the people on a question of such importance, is the only proposal which meets my full and entire approval.

Personally, I believe that the policy to be followed by Canada is, and will be for a long time to come, the policy which has been followed ever since 1863, admitted by British and Canadian statesmen such as Gladstone, Disraeli, Salisbury, Sandfield, Macdonald, Cartier, J. A. Macdonald, Blake, Mackenzie, until the days of Chamberlain, and which is limited to the defence of our land, to the defence of the empire on Canadian territory, so as to entirely dispense the mother country from any such trouble and care.

Up to date, three different modes of contribution to the defence of the empire have been recognized and accepted, both by England and by the colonies. First, a contribution in money or materials. Secondly, a local fleet which, in time of war, shall be put at the disposal of the empire. Thirdly, certain local works, which, if they were not built by the colonies, would have to be paid out of the British treasury. Canada has adopted the last mentioned mode and has contributed to the imperial defence in that way until the present day. Now it is proposed to make a change and adopt the second mode of contribution.

If it is thought proper to do this, let there be an appeal to the people. It is only fair, and there is ample time to do it, for there is no more German peril, as admitted by the Premier himself.

Then, if it is found that, by reason of the circumstances, another kind of contribution must be given for the defence of the empire, it seems to me that there would be much to do and to settle previously, as between the empire and the colonies.

So long as the colonies have no voice in the chapter, and until they have their word to say in the council of the empire, which decides of war or peace, no system devised to make the colonies participate in the general defence will have any chance to live or to last.

For my part, I have very little confidence in this kind of vague, optional and indefinite support which certain colonies are now giving to the imperial defence, without ceremony, and in proportions more or less generous and accentuated, with ostentation, in certain cases, on the part of some colonies, as if they sought to humiliate others. It will not produce any durable affect unless it engenders friction, rivalry, hatred, dislocation and rupture of bonds which unite the colonies to the empire.

We are not a nation; we are simply a

self-governed colony, making our evolution within the bounds which unite us to England with a proconsul who represents the point of junction. It is all very well to say the contrary in election time, to flatter the people, or after a banquet among the fumes of wine which lead to boasting, to overestimation, and to the burning of frankincense.

Our treaties are made through the intervention of the British diplomacy, our own ministers being, however, allowed to act freely, just as the master often allows his subordinate to act, and feels very much amused when he sees the latter put on airs as if he was a real ambassador.

Our constitution of 1867, defines our station, the part we are to play in the empire, determines our rights, our powers and our obligations. Thus, on the question under discussion, section 91, sub-section 7, traces our line of conduct—authorizes the parliament of Canada to create a militia and a naval service for the defence of the country —just as sub-section 5 of the same section authorizes the establishment of a postal service for Canada.

Under those powers, could we establish a postal service for New Zealand? Evidently not. Could we create a naval service for the defence of Australia? No more. Could we create a naval service for the defence of England, when our constitution authorizes us to do so only for the defence of our own country, Canada? I do not think so. Unless through a fiction, it were held that the defence of England is the defence of Canada. Such an interpretation would be improper and unacceptable.

We are a portion of the empire; but our duty, the part we have to play as concerns the defence is limited to Canada. Everything is restricted to Canada; to the defence of our own country we have but the powers which are delegated to us, and those powers allow us to legislate only for the defence of Canada.

The Militia Act of 1906 is based on those powers, and could be construed only in the light of those principles. So, in section 2 of the Militia Act, paragraph B, should the word 'emergency,' which means war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended, be construed as meaning a war; an invasion or an insurrection, real or apprehended outside of Canada, as in India, for instance? I do not think so.

As to the naval service, are we clothed with larger powers? No, it is the constitution itself which grants us that power. Why then should we take larger powers under this Act than those contained in the Militia Act passed by parliament in 1906.

Our Land Militia Act is known as: 'An Act respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada.'

The present Act should be intituled: 'An Act respecting the Naval Service and Defence of Canada. The words 'and defence' have been omitted and it merely reads: 'An Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada'

Subsection 7 of section 91 seems to admit of no other idea but that of defence; it seems to eliminate for Canada all wars except that undertaken for the defence of Canadian territory.

In the Militia Act there is no similar clause to clause 18 of the Naval Service Act. Still, under section 69, chapter 41, Revised Statutes of 1906, the Governor in Council may place the Militia, or any part thereof, on active service beyond Canada, as well as in Canada, provided it be for the defence of Canada.

When this Bill was brought down, it was stated that when England is at war, in any part of her empire, Canada is at war.

Theoretically, that axiom is true, in so far as Canada could be attacked; but practically speaking, it is neither correct nor should it be taken in an absolute and strict sense.

Then, there is a permit which should be well understood and made clear to us; namely, in case of war, when and where should Canada be set in motion, to participate in the war?

Under the constitution of 1867, according to the letter and the spirit of the Act, and the construction placed upon it, as well as by practice and custom, Canada, so far has never had to go to war, except for the defence of her own territory, while at the same time she participated in the defence of the empire, in compliance with the part she had to play, and as she had been called upon to do.

When Great Britain is at war, Canada is at war. Be it so; but there is a distinction to be made between civil or intestine war, and offensive or defensive war. Should a civil war in England or in Ireland, or an insurrection in India break out, would Canada be at war? I do not think so.

In the case of an offensive war of England, a war of conquest; say against Belgium, would Canada be at war? I say no. We are under no such responsibility, and we should beware of assuming any. Section 91, subsection 7, provides only for defence. A defensive war? Just so, the British North America Act provides for it and imposes upon us such responsibility. Let us defend the Canadian territory, within its limits and beyond those limits. Then if, by defending Canada, we happen to protect the empire, so much the better. Let us in that way promote the defence of the empire, according to our means and with all our strength.

In order to achieve this end, that is to say the defence of Canada, while at the same time protecting the empire, or vice versâ, we need no more provision than

that which is already ambodied in the Militia Act. Under that Act we may defend Canada, by placing our militia on active service, even beyond the limits of Canada. Through a certain fiction of the law, we could even send our militia to fight on the coasts of England, should it be desirable to prevent an attack being made upon Canada by the enemy, we could send our troops ahead to fight against the enemy. Under the Act, as it is worded, the Governor in Council may simply declare that, in thus sending our militia beyond Canada, his intention is to prevent an attack being made upon Canada by the enemy and thereby to provide for the defence of Canada. The Governor in Council exercises that power and discharges that duty, under his own responsibility to parliament and that is all.

But because it would be justifiable for Canada in a defensive war, in a war waged by England upon a powerful enemy, to go to her assistance by contributing men and money, in order to prevent an attack being made upon Canada, it would not be warrantable to participate in a war of conquest, when Canada has no quarrel nor any ground for a quarrel, nor any fear of an invasion and it would be impossible to plead the defence of Canada.

Were the wording of this Act similar to that of the Militia Act, and especially were clause 18 eliminated, it would be just as easy to do with our naval forces what we are now doing with our land force, under the same responsibility. Those naval forces could be sent beyond Canadian waters to fight the enemy, and participate in the defensive wars in which Canada or the defence of Canada might be concerned.

Then there would be left no room for doubt; the control of the navy would be similar to that of the Militia; the constitution would be safeguarded and the present policy would be the very course followed by Sir George Etienne Cartier, whose name has been invoked, when this Bill was brought down.

In order to make of this Act the counterpart of Cartier's Militia Act, the preamble ought to be amended and clause 18 struck off; then the only thing it could be reproached with would be that it is from twenty to twenty-five years ahead of the times.

By embodying clause 18 into the present Act, this legislation is given an imperial character and it is thus intimated that the intention is to amend the Militia Act in the same direction, by introducing into it a similar provision. And the conclusion which is inferred therefrom is this: that the intention is to take part in all the wars of the empire, whether offensive or defensive wars; that the end aimed at is to establish solidarity between Canada and England; that the intention is to place Canada at the mercy of England, every time England may go to war; now, such a policy is at variance with our constitution, and cannot be applied, so long as the relations between Canada and the empire remain what they are, or the constitution remains what it is now, and so long as Canada has no voice in the council which will be called upon to decide those wars. It is the infringement of the principle: no taxation without representation.

If the defence of Canada is what is aimed at, while occasionally lending a helping hand to the empire, as I explained a little while ago, that could also be done without clause 18, by the Governor in Council under the ministerial responsibility. Then, clause 18 serves no useful purpose here.

The hon. Minister of Militia said the other day: 'For the navy as well as for the militia, there is no doubt that, in a case of emergency the Governor in Council would not want to take action till the meeting together of parliament. That would not be necessary and such is not the intention of the law. The militia may be called out for active service whenever required by critical circumstances, but the law provides for the meeting of parliament. Should parliament then pronounce itself against the action taken by the government, the ministers should resign.'

I think that this is the right construction. But what leads to confusion is that, on the 15th of November last, the right hon. the Prime Minister, when replying to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, said: 'My hon. friend also said that if we were to build a navy we would be drawn thereby into European wars. Need I say to my hon. friend that whether we have a navy or not, we do not lose our rights to self-government; that if we do have a navy, that navy will go to no war unless the parliament of Canada, including the hon. gentleman, choose to send it there.'

The doctrine propounded by the Minister of Militia seems to me sounder than that laid down by the Prime Minister. The Governor in Council takes action for the navy, just as for the militia, although the wording of the law be somewhat different; then parliament comes in and gives or withholds its sanction and there is an end of it. The meeting of parliament does not involve any other remedy; the downfall of the cabinet or their remaining in power. In time of war, it would be better not to drive the government out of power; and there would be nothing left but for parliament but approve and to pay.

It is none the less true that clause 28 which is not to be found in the Militia Act, as the Minister of Militia told us, is not necessary in order to empower the Governor in Council to call out the militia for active service, for the service of the

King, for the defence of Canada, within the limits of the country as well as beyond those limits. Why then should that clause 18 not be eliminated from the Naval Service Act, and thus be deprived of its imperialistic character? Should that clause remain in this Act, undoubtedly it will be also embodied into the Militia Act and we shall have military imperialism, carried into action.

The hon. the Postmaster General, cited here, the other day a pretty definition of the word 'imperialism' given before the Canadian Club at Quebec by his Excellency the Governor General of Canada. Has the minister been entrusted with the special duty of imparting this precious definition to the House? I do not know, but all the same I congratulate him; he has discharged his duty very well. By the mouth of the hon. minister, as a preparation to his definition, Lord Grey tells us:—

> Is there in the world a people more privileged than the people who inhabit the fine province of Quebec? Your laws, your language are under the special protection of the British Crown. In return for so many privileges and advantages, the Crown exacts nothing from you except sentiments of loyalty. The word 'imperialism' does not imply active intervention from England in the government of this country; the word 'imperialism' symbolizes the power of each of the units of the empire and absolute unity in each of these units.

I desire to say to the hon. minister, whether he be or not authorized to express the views of the noble lord: Our feelings of loyalty in the province of Quebec towards the British Crown are well established and they cannot be shaken. We were loyal in 1775 and in 1812, we are loyal to-day and we will die in loyalty. We regret, however that certain parties seem constantly to question that feeling of loyalty.

It may be quite true that the right hon. the Prime Minister may in former times have said more than he should during his travels to Boston in the matter of annexation.

The Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. (Translation.) Annexation?

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Independence.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Annexation. . . At least that is what I understood, that at that time independence meant annexation; but that should not be counted against us. He was at that time in the cold regions of the opposition; those were days of rampant democracy, as Mr. Bourassa says, when the premier himself despised medals and badges which he called 'tin pot decorations.' He desired to scale the heights of power; that was all. Times have changed.

Let us return to imperialism, a word which does not mean loyalty. There is a great difference between them. In spite of the euphemistic and optimistic definition of the word imperialism that I have just read, in spite of all my loyalty, I decline to accept any such definition any more than I could be made to accept the doctrine of free trade in the name of loyalty. I cannot avoid stating that military imperialism is the enemy of Canada and of the empire.

The Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, father of that doctrine, has given us a different definition. 'Imperialism or the empire,' says he, 'is trade and trade is the empire.'

But in truth imperialism as it is sought to impose to-day is a union, a solidarity between the colonies and Great Britain for trade, defence and war, under imperial control and dominion, without representation of the colonies in the councils of the empire which decide as to peace and war, it is, therefore, militarism begetting pauperism as it exists in Europe and particularly in England; I repeat it, such an idea is inimical to Canada.

It is also inimical to the United Kingdom and to the empire, because it will end by bringing about the disaffection of the colonies.

Great Britain lost her finest colonies in 1776 because she sought to impose upon them 'taxation without representation.'

What difference is there between the taxation of the colonies for the benefit of the empire. . . . . the direct method of taxation, and that which consists in obliging them to tax themselves for the maintenance of armaments to be used in defense of the empire and for wars of the empire? Is it not the same thing under a less forbidding aspect, that is imperative, ruinous hideous taxation?

The fact is contrary to the principle of autonomy, whether it be sought to force the payment of the money directly or indirectly by the maintenance of ships of war, that fact remains unaltered.

As far back as 1778, by the statute 18, George III, chapter 12, England, repealed the tax which caused all the harm in the thirteen colonies and consented to molest them no more; but this came too late to put an end to the revolution; the cry of independence had been raised. The effect was useful, however, as concerned the other colonies. England adopted a magnificent colonial policy resting upon the principle of autonomy and the most absolute colonial liberty, the control exercised by the metropolis became gradually less tangible and more and more of a moral influence. This was the secret of the success of England's colonial policy; and what a splendid policy it was! Colonial autonomy, defence of the colonies at their own expense and consequently at a cost corre-

spondingly less to the British government. By this system, the British fleet was untrammelled, the immense British domain could be freely patrolled, commerce protected and food stuffs brought in for the inhabitants of the British isles, while a base was to be found at every fortified colonial post.

The consequences of a return to the former system might be most unfortunate. The Anglo-Saxon resents the idea of taxation without representation. Empires do not exist eternally. The British empire has been preserved by its wise policy and if in the future that policy is abandoned for that followed by other empires, its fate may also be the same. The new system will not last as long as did the old.

When the military budget of Canada becomes unduly large—it represents at present $7,000,000 for the militia alone,—when the present Bill becomes operative, 15 or 16 millions will be expended for the building of the fleet and the annual expenditure for the fleet will be about $7,157,000, with a gradually progressive increase; this will be a yearly sum of $14,157,000 which will probably be doubled within a few years. The amount is enormous if it be considered that not quite half a million is voted for agriculture. When the war budget of Canada shall have reached the proportions of that of an independent nation, when Canada has a fleet, Ontario may begin to grumble as well as Quebec and the west, the cry of independence may be raised. It may be that the cry may not at first be raised by a Canadian from Quebec, but that it may originate in the other provinces for history repeats itself, and the liberty cry in 1837 and 1838 came from Mackenzie as well as from Papineau. The breaking of the colonial bond will then be close at hand. The burden of war will have proved too heavy for a young country obliged to attend to its population, organization and development, while at the same time furnishing money, men and blood for the wars of the empire.

The blue book: 'Naval and Military Defence of the Empire' is not an ordinary official publication; it is a plan, a programme, imperialism in action.

Everything seems to be determined, concerted, decided, ordered and settled. All these polite suggestions and requests are none the less formal and imperative, and I see there written in letters of fire: You must bend or be broken.

That programme will be adopted, the Bill will pass, soon the Militia Act will be so amended so as to place our land forces on the same footing as those we have on the sea.

When our army and navy are so organized that at the slightest invasion, insurrection or apprehension in India, for example, they may be placed at the disposal of the imperial authorities, or rather when, in time of war, they will always be at the disposal of the empire, our autonomy will be a vain word, it will have ceased to exist.

Hon. J. BUREAU. (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to put a question?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Certainly.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) The hon. member fears that our autonomy will have ceased to exist as soon as we have a navy, yet he asserted a moment ago that this autonomy did not exist and that it was spoken of only on the hustings and at banquets where the fumes of wine had let loose men's tongues.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) There is a great difference between the two positions. We have autonomy, but not that independence as a nation of which so much has been said. That is a boast to be used on the hustings and at banquets. We are not an independent nation since we are under the control of a governor appointed by England.

In fact, in order to comply with the suggestions of the military and naval authorities of Great Britain, we are creating a fleet to be used by England in time of war, and can it be supposed that in any case of war those forces would be withheld from the very purpose of their creation. Such a contention cannot be seriously sustained.

When Canada builds a fleet at England's request to help in time of war, that fleet will go to war every time there is a war. That is certain.

Such a conclusion is the more easily reached if it be admitted that the word 'may' is imperative when the prerogative of the Crown or the execution of the laws and wishes of parliament are concerned.

An argument in favour of this interpretation is found in the wording of the Bill. On examining closely sections 17 and 18, the following words will be found at the end of section 17: 'or when it is considered advisable to do so;' these words have been omitted in section 18, as it was desired to get rid of the restriction.

Then, in time of war, will any government or cabinet be found to give it any other interpretation? No, never. If in time of war, it were sought to make the word 'may' imperative, as will invariably be done, will anybody object to such an interpretation? No, never. The present Prime Minister will be the first so to interpret it, if we may judge by what he did at the time of the Transvaal war.

The word 'may' in section 18 is, therefore a mere delusion.

The programme is being carried out and it will be carried out. Not with good grace.

I would be unjust if I stated that the prime minister bows gracefully to this necessity.

On the contrary he complies with a very bad grace and I believe that he is acting against his better judgment. He may be doing so unwillingly, but he is complying none the less. He is an imperialist, albeit an unwilling one and while denouncing imperialism——

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to put him a question?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) With pleasure.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) The opponents of the navy bill in the province of Quebec contend that there is an understanding between the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition on this question.

I would like to have my hon. friend's opinion on the question.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) My answer to my hon. friend is that on this side of the House, we are allowed to entertain different views from those of our chief. I do not know if they enjoy the same privilege on the other side, but we have it here.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation.) That is not an answer to my question: in your opinion does an understanding exist or not?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) I know nothing about it; I was not there.

Mr. LAPOINTE. (Translation). Mr. Bourassa was the only one present, I suppose.

Mr. PAQUETTE. (Translation.) My hon. friend could ask that question from the right hon. getnleman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Translation.) There is none.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) There is two kinds of imperialists; those who profess imperialism openly, avowedly; they stand erect and are moved by their convictions; they are entitled to our respect. Others wear masks and disguises; they think that they are obliged to preach imperialism in a spirit of conciliation, not to say of weakness; they are to be pittied, to say the least. I am inclined to think that on the present occasion, the right hon. Prime Minister is an imperialist against his will, as he has been in 1899, when he sent volunteers to South Africa.

We all know that he sent volunteers to South Africa, after having solemnly declared that he would not send any. He had to let them go grudgingly. In the bottom of his heart, he cursed that war, but he took part in it because he was compelled to do so.

Mr. NANTEL.

On the 17th January, 1901, at the New Reform Club of London, the Hon. Lloyd-George said: 'The Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in a public speech, the other day, stated that Canada was an independent nation, and yet, that colony pretending to be independent has sent troops in South Africa to crush down the independence of men who have an equal right to the independence that Canada claims for herself.'

Later on I have heard the right hon. Prime Minister eulogize that campaign and state that the Boer war was a just one. I did not suppose then, and I do not suppose to-day that he was in earnest; his mental tendency does not lean that way. If he became convinced, it is by persistent efforts and under the strain of circumstances. The right hon. gentleman, it is my sincere conviction, is an imperialist against his will, and what is more astonishing, is that he speaks against the imperialists.

But I say without the least hesitation that the most dangerous of all imperialists are the disguised imperialists, because people are not on their guard, because they do not show their hand, because they instill their doctrine drop by drop, as a deadly poison.

Unhappily, the province of Quebec has sent here to many adepts of that doctrine, imperialists against their will, disguised imperialists, ever ready to bow passively at the command of the big chief, and not enough, on this side of the House, of anti-imperialists to check effectively the tendencies of the ultra-imperialists.

Mr. Jules Edouard Prévost, editor of 'L'Avenir du Nord' of Saint Jerôme, whose liberal orthodoxy cannot be doubted, Mr. Prévost, the recipient of numerous favours from both Liberal governments, the bestower of patronage in the county of Terrebonne . . . .

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) And who is to-day a member of the Council of Public Instruction.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) . . and who in that capacity, sits with the bishops of the province. Mr. Prévost has been appointed lately to the Council of Public Instruction, by the Hon. L. Gouin, Prime Minister of the province of Quebec. Mr. Prévost is a good Liberal, a descendant of the 'Lions of the North,' who have fought the battles of the party in that part of the country since 1854. That same Mr. Prévost has conscientious scruples about that naval service Bill. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to quote what that gentleman wrote on the question, and my hon. friends from the other side will not complain that I quote only Conservative papers. The following editorial was published on the 21st January last:—

NAVAL SERVICE BILL.—A DESIRABLE AMENDMENT.

Mr. Prévost begins by a comparison between sections 69 and 71 of the Militia Act, and sections 18 and 19 of the Naval Service Act, and says:

The Militia Act is intended for the defence of Canada, the Naval Service Act is intended for the wars of the empire generally.

Since we are not admitted in the councils where the wars of Great Britain are decided, since we are not represented in the British diplomatic service where international conflicts originate, we think that it should be left to the Canadian Parliament to decide on the opportunity of our participation in the wars of the empire, before the government can dispose of our ships and our men.

We base our theory on the old english saying 'No taxation without representation.'

The help that Canada might decide to give to the mother country will never be so necessary and urgent that the Governor in Council will not be in a position to foresee the situation early enough to call Parliament together before interfering.

It would be quite different if the defence of our territory was in question, and we see no objection to section 69 of the Militia Act, nor to section 17 of the Naval Service Act, where the power granted to the Governor General in Council affects exclusively the defence of Canada.

In our opinion the order in which sections 18 and 19 are given, should be charged so as to give parliament the undeniable right, before engaging Canada to decide upon the opportunity of our participation to a war of the empire declared without and perhaps, against our parliament's consent.

In that way we should preserve our autonomy without disowning our obligations.

And further:

Our rights and our obligations would be more in accord. That is all.

So much so, that the Bill, so drafted, would be more in conformity with the national policy so ably and so energetically pursued by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

You will please note that the question here is not as to the principle of the Bill, but as to its application.

Just as we have openly and firmly recognized our obligations towards Canada and our ally Great Britain, we proclaim with the same energy, the same frankness, our sacred rights, as a self-governed country.

We do not retract a single word of what we have published on the question of a Canadian navy. As a citizen of Canada, as an ally of Great Britain, we see in that proposition a necessary obligation which Laurier will make as light as possible for the country.

And further again:

But we want and we ask that Canada upholds her right to judge and her freedom to act

That is a fundamental principle that Laurier has affirmed more than once and that should not be departed from.

The government, it is true, are responsible to parliament who will approve or disapprove their decision taken in 'critical circumstances.'

We concede that. We also admit that the Bil, as drafted, does not completely fail to recognize the legitimate exigencies of our autonomy. But, if parliament must be consulted, why not consult it before the country is involved in an imperial war, rather than after?

We say it again it is not possible to suppose a case...

Here is the conclusion:

This objection is a serious one, but not without a resolution.

Let parliament be called together before all participation from our port, in a war of the empire, and let it decide by a division taken 24 hours later, if yes or no, Canada ought to participate in that war.

In asking that the Naval Service Bill be so amended, we are inspired by the broad British principles upon which rest our constitution and our autonomy, and we were greatly surprised to read in the speech delivered in the House of Commons by the leader of the oposition, Mr. Borden, on the 12th January last, the following sentence:

J'ai été un peu surpris de la déclaration que le très honorable premier ministre a faite dans les premiers jours de cette session lorsqu'il a dit que si nous créons une marine canadienne, que cette marine ne prendrait pas part à aucune guerre de la Grande-Bretagne avant que ce parlement y donne son consentement. Je suis heureux de voir que mon honorable ami abandonne cette attitude aujourd'hui, si je le comprends bien.

Contrary to the views entertained by Mr. Borden, we deplore that change of front.

We believe that all Canadians subjects, be they English, French, Irish or Scotch, would be unanimous to approve a law reserving to the Canadian parliament, the right to give its consent before saddling the country with the burden of a war, and the most painful of all contributions—the contribution in blood.

Once more we say: No taxation without representation.

I am free to admit that the situation is a difficult one, that the right hon. gentleman stands between two fires. I can understand that he thinks it proper for him to be more or less nebulous as said Mr. Bourassa, to conceal, to dissemble his thoughts.

It is not an easy task to build a navy which Canada does not need and will not need before twenty or twenty-five years; to build a navy for Great Britain, to comply to Great Britain's exigencies, to Great Britain's injunctions, given in the form of suggestions, and to say in the same breath that this navy will or will not participate to the wars of the empire, as the parliament sees fit. Surely it is very hard for one to preach military imperialism, to lay down its most fundamental principle, and

to say and make believe that one is fighting military imperialism.

On such occasions, one must accomplish wonderful feats and display a prodigious suppleness; one must have recourse to biblical language and indulge in parables. One must even go to the length of borrowing the words of Jesus of Nazareth who, knowing that the end was near at hand, was weeping over Jerusalem.

But instead of going to Jerusalem, the right hon. gentleman went to Toronto, and there he exclaimed: Oh, Toronto! oh, Toronto! thou that killeth the prophets, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings! Cannot you see the scene from here, Mr. Speaker? The good people of Toronto, sticking to the sides of the leader of the government, and the right hon. gentleman, trying to warm them up under his wings. During the process, he gives them a lecture on feudality in the Middle Ages; he explains the meaning of sovereignty and suzerainty. But the good people of Toronto, were not satisfied, and did not understand him. And now, it is the prophets of St. Jérôme, represented by Mr. Prévost, which do not understand him, and threaten to disregard his teachings.

Sir, the war fleet is established and created as a help for the wars of the empire, and evidently to be placed in the hands of the imperial authorities, in time of war, although this may not be mentioned in clause 18. And when parliament will have a chance to approve or blame the government, the fleet will be far away, wrecked and in the bottom of the sea perhaps.

But why speaking, what is the use of those texts which can be differently interpreted? Why, sir?

In order to keep the power of Quebec in her illusive hope and pay her with words; for the purpose of giving a chance to the Prime Minister to go and tell his good Quebec friends: 'My old friends, I built a war fleet, because I could not help it. But I did not forget you, just listen to me; that fleet is yours, she will not be called to help England except on your consent, when you will be willing to allow her to go, when your parliament will be willing to let her go.'

And in Ontario, to the people of Toronto, who kill the prophets, he will say: 'My friends, you know me, you understand better than that, I had this fleet built for the defence of the empire. It is the raison d'être of that war fleet. The fleet is England's property as well as my heart, my own being and my whole person, I am "British to the core."'

Why not playing the cards on the table, why not tell frankly what is the aim in view? If it were believed that it may be necessary to change the policy followed so far in this country as regards the question of defence, and that England really needs another participation different from that which Canada has given so far for the defence of the empire, and that she has a right to have it, let it be openly known; let us work effectively and endorse the responsibility of our action.

Would it be given through irony of fate, to the right hon. Prime Minister, he an imperialist in spite of his own will, to crown his work not with a national railway, but with a war legislation; with the institution of militarism, which he is to establish under the great principle of conciliation, a principle which he has adopted and wishes to follow to the end, and which will cause him to sanction a compulsory conscription, a compulsory military service in this country, if he would be called to do so by that government beyond the sea.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear!

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Sir, the German peril? I find there are two German perils. There is the industrial and commercial German peril, the most dangerous for England. Canada is powerless against that peril. If England is not sound in that point, let her strengthen herself, and apply a suitable remedy. As for the other, the military peril, I do not believe in it. I am in good company, because I am with the Prime Minister.

The latter German peril sounds to me as an imperialist attempt. The noble Lords do not believe so much in the German peril as the endeavour to make others believe in it, because if they did so, they would not have opposed the Budget in a critical time, because such an opposition might have brought about a disaster, and fatal consequences for England. The return to power of the Hon. Lloyd-George has decidedly convinced me that the people of England are not so strong believers in the German peril as we are in Canada. I am positive that at least the majority of the English people does not believe in it, and that same majority of the people of England is not so fond of imperialism and militarism as we seem to be in Canada. And I cannot but help to come to this conclusion, when I think of that Lloyd-George, whom the English people have returned to power, that Lloyd-George who never missed a chance to protest with his eloquent voice, against the South African war, and who was, they say, so cynical as to scoff the British troops' defeat. Since that time, the English people was kind enough to give him his confidence and maintain him in power, as a consequent reward. I do not believe in the German peril, because France will not consent to the desertion of England, although England closed her arms in

face of France's disaster in 1870; because I believe in the European equilibrium which is worth something better for national peace than the school of peace; because, those who are the opponents of ancient and modern butchery are gaining ground. Imperialism is the enemy, and is called to do more harm than profit to England; it might hasten the German or any other similar peril.

Sir, shouting again and again, with all means, here and there, everywhere: Let England rule the waves, let her hold her supremacy on the seas; she must have it, it must be her own against all comers; supremacy is her right! And for such a maintenance of supremacy, let her group all her colonies around her and be furnished with fleets and invincible armies.' All that noise is, in my opinion, wrong diplomacy. The principle is lovable, but it was useless to blare it out so loudly. If they had maintained it quietly, I mean that supremacy on the seas, and had taken the necessary means for its maintenance, without awakening up all echos, I believe the result would have been better. All that noise has contributed to the fast building of Dreadnoughts by the rich and powerful nations, and that state of things may finally weary the two countries, if they keep on so sturdily. Moreover, if, at the present time, those untimely roarings, those appeals to the colonies, would be put to an end if we showed more calmness and self-control, it could likewise stop.

A wise and loyal Englishman. who offers no ground for suspicion—I speak of the editor of the 'Witness,' of Montreal—wrote what follows:—

Those who use this argument surely fail to see that there is in it a challenge to all the other nations, that it call for hostilities at their address, individually, a provocation to dispute Great Britain's supremacy if possible. There is in it a claim which is impossble to keep up if the nations, including the United States decided to set against it. It is impossible to make, without proof any statement of a more dangerous or injurious nature than this to Great Britain.

Justice and fair play do more honour and give more credit to a nation than the armaments and Dreadnoughts. It is this justice and this British fair play that gives Great Britain its force more than would do its men of war. Let England keep and firmly hold its supremacy on sea, but it must not be boasted of too much. On the contrary, let her be seemingly ignorant of the fact and conduct herself with other nations as though she was not superior, or as if she was ignorant of that supremacy. By this means she may keep it longer. As soon as this justice and this fair play become an object of suspicion to other nations, there could be no possible supremacy. In life, a man who defies everybody finds his superior. Napoleon had for a long time European supremacy, he at last found his way to Ste. Hélième through Waterloo. The grouping of colonies around England with their Dreadnoughts will defy other nations.

I believe that the imperialists who wrote a lot of things besides their appeal to the colonies, and in so saying could lead people to the belief that there is some weakness about England, and such being only in their own imagination, do a very bad turn to the mother country. There is no worse enemy than an imprudent friend to a nation or a policy.

On this subject Mr. J. A. Macdonald, editor of the Toronto 'Globe,' chief organ of this government, one of the delegates to the imperial conference of the press in London last June, relating his voyage impressions and his visits in the streets and suburbs of London and other English cities, has been one of these imprudents in making following picture:

The thing, he says, that impressed me most, the thing that stands out as the background of every reminiscence, was the bloodless, mirthless, hopeless face of the common crowd. He declares that the pale, sunken faces of the nameless city crowd haunt one like a weird. He says: We could not shut our eyes or steel our hearts to that Britain which is out of work, which may not even want to work, and which has long forgotten how to play.

The social problem in England, Mr. Macdonald says, everywhere is appalling almost to the point of despair. Wherever we went, it forced itself upon us. The least dangerous aspect of it was that hollow-eyed procession of the homeless of London kept moving along the pavements by the police in the early dawn, waiting for the opening of the soup kitchens. London, Sheffield, Manchester, Glasgow, Edinburgh—each had its distinctive features, but everywhere the marks were deep of disease and degeneracy in body and mind and morals.

In some of the smaller places where the industrial percentage is large, Mr. Macdonald continues, or the occupation unhealthy—as in the black country or the pottery-making communities—the blood-poisoned workers present an appearance that to unaccustomed eyes is simply ghastly.

In places like Portsmouth, where we drove through the streets after viewing the greatest array of warships ever presented in the whole world's history, the human sediment that littered the doorways and lanes crowded out of mind all thought of Britain's glory.

It was hard to exult over the spectacular realism of the sham-fight on the shore with those haggard skeletons of lifes real conflict shuffling before our eyes uncheered and uncheering on the street.

Mr. Macdonald adds: 'Sheffield staggered all the delegates. Its residental districts and its neighbouring hills are good to see. It is a hive of industry. Its name the world over is a warrant for good steel. But its human specimens! The conditions of the poor may, perhaps, be worse in other industrial centers in England, but certainly no delegate to the im-

perial press conference had ever seen the like in any white country overseas or even imagined it possible within the limits of human nature.

He says again: 'What struck every observant delegate was the utter blankness of the faces that looked up at us from the pavement, or down on us from the windows, with scarcely enough capacity for human interest to wonder who we were or what we wanted. Block after block it was the same. Never a sign of humor. Never even a flash of human envy. Stooped shoulders, hollow chests, ash-coloured faces, lightless eyes, and ghastliest of all, loose-set mouths with bloodless gums, and only here and there a useful tooth. Literally hundreds of women between seventeen and seventy crowded close to our motor cars that day, and the marks were on them all. Those toothless mouths of men and women and children told the story. One touch of disease made the whole crowd kin. 'What do you think of it?' asked a London reporter of a Canadian editor. 'It's hell,' said the Canadian. And his companion from Australia could not suggest any other fitting word.' Finally Mr. Macdonald says: 'How long will a great nation go on breeding weaklings? How long will such a nation remain great? And how long will it be counted safe for Canada to admit the human output of Britain's drink-cursed slums?'

Mr. Speaker, to my mind, such statements cannot be justified. I rejoice that their author is not a French Canadian from the province of Canada. If they are without foundation, their author is guilty; if they are founded on fact, he is indiscreet. If that description corresponds to reality, the inference is that an economic and social reform is of greater urgency in England than armaments or the building of Dreadnoughts. Because, after all, such specimens of the human race are not likely to spread terror in the enemy's ranks, even with the help of any number of Dreadnoughts.

And that reform, it is the British authorities who are in a position to effect it, not the colonies. There are numbers of landlords in England holding large areas, in some cases extending over 175,000 acres, while swarms of human beings fill the suburbs and slums of London and other British cities. If only those great landowners would dispose of those lands in favour of the people and workers, recruits would be forthcoming as by magic from all parts of England. It is in the ranks of the ploughman who tills the land at the sweat of their brow, that soldiers are to be obtained ready to fight like lions for the defence of the territory in time of war. As for us in Canada, who have nothing to do either with pauperism or militarism in England, let us endeavour to keep aloof from both these scourges.

I oppose with all my might such legislation; I openly expres my opinion, I would express it in the same manner in Ontario and in western Canada, as well as in the province of Quebec. In doing so, I do not consider myself disloyal to the British Crown, neither am I appealing to race prejudice.

I shall now read an extract from the 'Daily News,' of Peterborough, dated the 27th December last:—

The French Canadian newspapers, without exception, are decidely viewing this question from a narrow race standpoint. They are repugnant more than ever to the idea of closer relations with the empire. French Canadians are breaking party ties to subserve race interests. Should it be necessary in connection with this issue to go on the battlefield, we are ready. Canada is part of the British empire; any attempt to change that state of things, will terminate in war.

I shall not express any opinion regarding the author, as I do not wish to say anything disagreeable. I shall be content with stating for the information of the 'Daily News' and other papers, which had taken the lead in that kind of thing, that such writings are not likely to improve matters and forward their view of the case. The French Canadian Conservatives of the province of Quebec are not breaking away from their party; they remain faithful to the policy followed by Macdonald, Cartier and Sir Charles Tupper when the latter lived in Canada. The French Canadian Conservatives of Quebec are not changing their policy; those who are open to the charge of so abandoning the old policy are imperialists of to-day, who no longer follow in the footsetps of the statesmen I have mentioned.

The views I have expressed have partisans and advocates outside of the province of Quebec, and why should not the people of the province of Quebec have the liberty of making known their opinions on a question of such importance. Why, who would expect us to put up with the denial of such a right?

The French Canadians of Quebec have never spoken nor written on the subject in stronger language than some Ontario people, for instance, contributors to the 'Weekly Sun,' of Toronto, the 'Farmer's Advocate,' 'Farm and Dairy,' 'The Grain Grower's Guide,' Prof. Marshall of Queen's University, Prof. McCurdy of Toronto. The latter is not a resident of the province of Quebec, and his opinion cannot be lightly set aside, holding as he does professorship in a university of the standing of that of Toronto. The same may be said of Prof. Marshall of Queen's. I shall read a letter which Prof. McCurdy wrote to the Right Hon. Prime Minister on November 11 last. It is rather long, but I am anxious it should apear in 'Hansard':—

Canada and the World's Peace.

Prof. J. F. McCurdy has addressed the following open letter to the Premier:—

The Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Premier of Canada:

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—I venture to address a few words to you and to as many as may be of the people of Canada upon the question of the creation of a Canadian navy, because, so far as I have seen, no attempt has as yet been made to set forth in a succinct form the most obvious arguments against the immediate building of a navy from the standpoint of the common people of our country. To be as concise as possible, I shall present the statement in a series of propositions:

1. In all our conferences with the imperial government, and in all legislation affecting matters of imperial concern, our first consideration should be regard for the well-being of Canada, for the sake of Canada herself, and also more remotely but not less really for the sake of the empire. Loyalty is good, but patriotism is better. We have no direct responsibility for the empire as a whole, whose policy we cannot control, and whose real and fancied difficulties we have done nothing to bring about. We are responsible to our fellow-citizens for the destiny and fair name of Canada. Canada is the home of our people and our most sacred trust, and where our treasure is there will our heart be also.

2. Expenditure upon Canadian war vessels, such as will ultimately satisfy the demands of agitators in England and Canada that hold the popular ear, will go far to ruin our country financially, just as the present draft upon the people of England is bringing England herself to ruin, according to the statement of the British premier. Let Canada avoid the malestrom while it is yet plain sailing.

3. The motive of the demand for a Canadian navy is not Canada's own needs, but the possibility of foreign wars, or rather of a foreign war, in which it is remotely possible that England may be engaged. We do not need warships to protect our sea coasts or lake shores. 'Our natural enemy,' the United States, is now regarded as our natural ally. She has also been recognized as the inalienable friend of England in declarations recently made by the English government in connection with the so-called two-power standard. On the other hand, we have constant occasions of friction with the government of the United States, which warships, in the place of revenue cutters, would render much more serious and perhaps dangerously irritating.

4. We have no voice in the making or unmaking of foreign wars, or in the policy of the empire generally. All the more should we consider our moral obligations both to ourselves and to the empire.

5. Our obligations and our self-respect as citizens of Canada make it out of place for us to involve ourselves and our children in wars over whose beginning, conduct and ending we have no control. To do so is to forfeit our Canadian birthright.

6. The fact that some of the wars waged by England, within our own recollection, have been of doubtful justification, makes it incumbent on us in every case to consider well the motives and grounds of England's wars before pledging ourselves to take part in them. To quote from an editorial in one of Toronto's dailies, 'the brain and brawn of Canada must have her quarrel just.'

7. The power now dreaded is Germany. A war between England and Germany would be the greatest crime and folly in modern history. Both the victor and the vanquished would be humbled and crippled almost beyond repair, and they would deserve and receive the condemnation of a war-cursed world.

8. If England and Germany go to war, both would be about equally to blame, because, apart from other considerations, principles and motives of humanity and tolerance will play little or no part, though these two countries have been the leaders of the world in Christian civilization. Canada cannot afford to aid and abet such a war by practically intervening at a moment of only half-abated national excitement.

9. What England most needs from Canada is not ships and money, but respectful, sympathetic counsel and possibly solemn warning. At this moment, the best way for us to 'think imperially' is to take account of England's obsessions of panic and other signs of national weakness and lack of self-control, which no munitions and men-of-war can counteract. England's worst enemies are not her armed competitors. Her foes are those of her own household. If a modern Isaiah were to arise in England, he might say of her: 'The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint.' Millions of England's population are unfit to serve their country with head or hand or heart, and that in large measure because of economic and social conditions fostered by those who are foremost in their clamour for a vigorous foreign policy. The most pressing question for England is not who shall fight her battles, but who shall do her work.

10. Canada is seemingly predestined beyond all other countries to a mission of peace and good-will to men. By systematic co-operation with England in military and naval expenditure and armaments our thoughts and impulses will be habitually turned to war, and, poisoned by international jealousy and suspicion, the most promising democracy which the ages have evolved will be diverted from pursuits of peace, and our country will be made a less desirable home for the war-burdened people of the world.

11. Germany is now held to be England's enemy. A few years ago France was placed exactly in the same position. Are England's supposed enemies always to be our enemies also? Are we always to think mechanically and automatically and along zig-zag lines? Let us try to see and think clear and straight on the deepest and the most vital problems of our relations to the empire and to the world.

12. It was at a time of panic in England that the original resolution of the Canadian parliament was adopted. Since then there has been some time for consideration. As we are not yet committed to the building of warships, the question should be taken up more soberly in the light of changed conditions. The arguments used by the advocates of the immediate construction of a Canadian navy consist largely of traditional generalities, and are chiefly addressed to the preju-

dices of our people, and not to their intelligence and reason. They have little regard to the lessons of the past and to the problems of the future—a fact which may be due to the substitution of a policy of death-dealing force for methods of tolerance and conciliation. Canada is being treated as an impulsive, half-grown boy, and not as a man, and a man of business. Let the people who have to pay the bills and bear the burdens of a national military policy have an opportunity to decide the question for themselves after calm and mature reflection.

Yours respectfully,
J. F. McCURDY.

8 Prince Arthur avenue, Toronto, November, 11.

Here is an extract from the 'Weekly Sun,' of Toronto:—

It would be scandalous if two hundred and some odd men, returned at a time when nobody even dreamed of the question, took on themselves to tie for ever the hands of 7 millions men.

The paper 'United Canada,' of Otawa, has just published the following:—

Under the influence of fear and frenzy, a government grown old and feeble, criminally binds a great country to a policy of corruption and graft at home, and of folly outside.

I have just quoted, Mr. Speaker, utterances not of Quebec French, but of Toronto and Ottawa people, and though a Quebecer, I have the right to repeat those utterances, and to state my approval of them, and that I do.

Especially do I congratulate Professor McCurdy, who shows his courage and talks Canadian patriotism and not only sentimentalism towards Great Britain.

I have said what I thought of the obligation on the part of Canada to contribute towards defending the empire, and I think I am in good company. I will add that in an urgent case and well characterized as such, in a defensive war and not in a war of conquest, each case to be considered according to circumstances, I would be in favour of granting the mother country a substantial aid, without laying down any principle for the future.

This is what has been done in the past. But as much as some are wedded to the idea of having parliament embody in our statute books an obligation towards the empire for the future, so much do I oppose the idea of inserting and sanctioning this principle without first consulting the people.

But we do not want any solidarity in the wars of the empire. We have no use for militarism, the curse of European countries. We are disposed to defend this immense country of ours so as to relieve the empire from that burden, as far as our strength and our needs will permit, and in proportion as it is necessary.

We have a military budget of seven millions already. We want our money to develop the country and our population, and to put ourselves in a position, when the time comes, though we hope it shall never come, to help England in a substantial manner and to receive here those of her children who wish to escape militarism and pauperism. Canada provides for her own defences, she is not a burden for the empire and has not been for many years.

She has a service of coasting vessels which has been deemed sufficient, as England has withdrawn, since 1870, her Atlantic and Pacific squadrons, so as the garrisons she used to keep at the naval stations of Halifax and Esquimalt, which are now defended and protected by our own soldiers, thereby leaving Canada without any other defence but her own.

Sir Charles Tupper was quoted in the course of this debate. I shall also quote him, but I shall quote him as he spoke in 1893, when he was in his prime, when he was merely a Canadian, before he had become a 'jingo,' and Sir Charles Tupper, as I shall quote him, said in Winnipeg on the 22nd of September, 1893, the words which I am going to read:

Note.—We add a few extracts from the speech of Sir Charles Tupper, translated from the 'Winnipeg Free Press,' September 22, 1893.

I deny that we are a burden to the empire. I say that if to-morrow Canada was dissevered from the Crown of England; if to-morrow Canada became a portion of that great republic which lies to the south of us, England could not reduce her army by a man nor her navy by a ship. She would want more soldiers and sailors and ironclads than she has to-day in order to maintain her prestige. I say if this great continent was closed, as closed it would be to the ships of England under the circumstances I have named, if they had no harbour in which to run nor a place where they could obtain a ton of coal instead of England being strengthened she would be enormously weakened. Her power in the Pacific, her posessions in India and China would be imperilled, and her prestige as a nation entirely changed. If Canada ceased to belong to her, instead of relieving her from any charge for diplomatic services or her army or her navy, it would impose greater burdens upon the taxpayers of Great Britain than at present. I deny that we are a burden. There is not a pound of British money spent in the Dominion of Canada from end to end for any Canadian purpose.

I have a word or two more to say with reference to the defence of the empire. They say why should Canada, with her enormous mercantile marine, her sails whitening every sea, not contribute from her resources to the defence of the empire? I say she does. I say Canada is discharging that duty nobly and well. No person holds more strongly than I do the unquestionable duty of every British subject, wherever he may be found, to contribute to the support of the defence of this

great empire. If you are going to strengthen a fortification what would you strengthen? The strongest or the weakest part? Where is the weakest part? Is it in England, in the United Kingdom, or Canada, or Australia? No person can question that if England was engaged in war with any great power in the world they would strike, not in its strongest but weakest part and therefore if you wish to strengthen the defences of the empire, to increase the power, to resist invasion, the best way to accomplish this,—I have no hesitation in saying it is by looking after Canada. Those who say that Canada contributes nothing to the defence of the empire must be very ignorant of facts at all events, and I would recommend them to peruse a little of that very interesting literature contained in blue books.

Then he enumerates the great public works executed in Canada the Canadian Pacific Railway, the canals, etc.

But some might answer that these works were not done for that purpose but for commercial purposes. So much stronger our claim. The greatest the most important, the most vital question in connection with the defence of Canada, which means the defence of one of the most important sections of the Great empire, is to people it. This railway, although a commercial line, opens up this magnificent future granary of the world for settlement by stout hearts and strong arms, not only from Great Britain but by the best men from Scandinavia and Germany and Ireland to become settlers and as brave defenders of British institutions as native born Canadians.

Is not this assisting in the defence of the empire? There is no way of contributing better to this object than in this practical manner in which we are spending annually $10,000,000 for services of the most vital importance alike to Canada and Great Britain. I do not intend to detain you longer than to say I am quite sure it was only right for me to seize an opportunity—the only one I have had in Canada—to say something upon this question of imperial federation, and of pointing out what, in my judgment, is the fallacy and the mistaken policy of those who have adopted the line of advocating the unity of the empire upon a basis calculated, in my judgment not to promote that unity but to destroy it.

Mr. Balfour himself has already declared that even should the colonies of England be snatched from her, she could not dispense with a single one of her ships. The defence of Canada never obliged England to build a single ship more for her fleet or to spend one cent more for her budget, as far as the army or the navy was concerned. Canada has no enemy nor could she, for a long time to come, have another enemy but the United States, and England will never be at war with the United States for our sake. So as to help up towards settling our dispute with our neighbours, she might lend us her diplomatists but never would she lend us her warships.

If it is humiliating to accept the Monroe doctrine, it will not be claimed, however, that we should lose all the advantage of our geographical position and that this geographical position is not better than that of Australia and New Zealand, as far as Canada's defence is concerned. Should we build the Georgian Bay canal, should we put ourselves in a position to favour the English people with a rebate of two or three cents on every bushel of our western wheat, we would render England a more important service than by building up this war fleet.

Mr. Speaker, how times have changed! I am told by the older members of this House that, formerly, it was hardly possible to discuss this question of imperialism, even the most inoffensive part of it, such as commercial imperialism, without running the risk of speaking to no purpose, before empty seats. To-day, the most complete military imperialism is warmly discussed. Mr. Speaker, before the question of military imperialism was raised we should have had commercial imperialism. But we are far from commercial imperialism, because the kind of imperialism which we have to-day is but an 'ex parte' commercial imperialism where Canada concedes and gives without getting anything in return.

We have favoured England commercially, by granting her goods preference duties on our markets as against similar goods of other countries. And the other country, in order to please her own traders and cattle-breeders and to protect them while preaching against protection, to protect them, I say, against Canadian competition, continues steadfast keeping the 'British embargo' in existence against our Canadian cattle, at the risk of defaming it and of leading the world to believe that our Canadian cattle from the west, the driest and the healthiest country on the face of the earth, is contaminated and struck with dangerous diseases. I say again that our Canadian statesmen: Sir A. McKenzie, Sir George Etienne Cartier, whom the Liberals have vilified to such a great extent and upon whom they now rely in order to have the present Bill adopted, and Sir John A. Macdonald, have rejected this doctrine of imperialism at all times, and especially in 1863 and 1885. And it is more than probable that if Sir John A. Macdonald had been the leader of this country in 1889, our Canadian militia would not have gone to fight in South Africa. We are an integral part of the empire, but are we authorized, for that reason, to meddle with everything concerning the empire? I really think, however, that the intention is to have us meddle with the wars rather than with the affairs of the empire.

A few years ago, this parliament adopted

a resolution of sympathy for the Irish cause and the Home rule, and that resolution was comunicated to the imperial parliament. We got an answer to the effect that we should meddle with our own affairs, and to-day something would be said against us if we thought, to some extent, of meddling with our own affairs.

If we are called upon to support together with the English people, part of the defence of the British Isles, called the heart of the empire, it is obvious that our lot, our task shall be more onerous than that of the population of the Isles. Our condition is, economically, different. The Isles are a country which is already built up and organized, their population has only to live and to defend itself, whereas, here, in Canada, everything remains to be done, created and organized. Will they help us doing that work? Yes, perhaps, by lending us money. But then, if they are rich enough to lend us money, they do not need us for their defence. It is said: 'this policy has been before the public for a long time.' What free and easy talk? What audacity? I was about to say: what shamelessness? Mr. Speaker, who has set before the country this war policy and this navy question for a long time? Is it the honourable Minister of Marine who, as another St. John the Baptiste, would have prepared the way to that war policy when he said, on the floor of this House, on the 22nd of April, 1896 (Hansard, session 1896, vol. II, page 6171):

Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the proposition now before us be carried, without protesting loudly against its adoption. The government asks us an estimate of one million dollars for the purchase of rifles.

It is sufficient that we need this million of dollars to pay a certain debt contracted towards the English government; debt that would have been contracted during this present session. I regret, Mr. Speaker, to learn that on this occasion the government had bought these rifles from the English government and not from an individual, nor from a particular company, but that he has bought these rifles from the English government and that the same government asks us to be repaid. Is that the kind of protection promised by England to Canada? Is that the situation which is destined for this colony? I think that we have the right to expect another treatment on the part of England.

Parliament is asked to spend this sum of $1,000,000, when our debt is already over 300,000,000 dollars. I think this debt is sufficiently high and that there is no use of propounding a jingo policy, and increasing by that fact, by a few millions of dollars the debt of the country without justifying in any serious manner the expense. I don't think that this expense is needed under the circumstances, and I, for one, I will strenuously oppose the vote of that sum.

And the elections of 1896 were made in the province of Quebec on that question, appealing to every prejudice against the Conservative ministry who had thought proper to spend $3,000,000 for the armament of our militia and the defence of Canada. And the most ardent and zealous in this campaign of prejudices were the Minister of Marine and a few friends whose names I will not mention because they have received their reward, some by seats on the bench and others by lucrative positions. The organ of these gentlemen, 'l'Electeur' of Quebec, superseded since by 'Le Soleil'; published amongst other extracts which I will read, an article to the applause and delight of all these gentlemen, the great peacemakers of the time, and to-day don't mind laying upon the country an expense of over fifteen millions for battleships, guns and rifles. 'l'Electeur' father of the 'Soleil' said this:

Why these armaments? Why fight for England?

Why all these armaments said 'l'Electeur' if we are not to have any war?

And why fight for England? Their electors must not forget that these high and great chiefs who are always anxious to show themselves more patriotic than are others, more loyal than others, always ready to launch the country into wars for the benefit of others, will not be those who will bear the burden.

These rifles, these guns, will have to be manned by the electors. You are looked upon as only fit food for cannons.

The Tuppers, the Angers, the Taillons will sit quietly in their cabinets, and will send you to death joyfully, while they will drink champagne. Once more why have all these rifles, these bayonets, if these Tuppers and Co. do not meditate some underhand work? They will send your sons to Africa or Asia whence they will never come back.

If you vote for the 'bleu' candidates, you approve of all these preparations for war. Does the government come to your help when some casualty comes upon you, either a flood or a fire? And they have spent $3,000,000 for rifles.

Vote for Laurier and his candidates if you want your country continue in peace, and we do not want to be sent some day to foreign countries, leaving at home our wives, our children, and our dear ones.

Spirit of 'l'Electeur,' spirit of Ernest Pacaud, how much you must have trembled when you saw Canadians departing for South Africa, not by the orders of those whom you were denouncing in 1896, but the supreme will of the right hon. Prime Minister, whom they admired and adored. They must also shiver on seeing this sinister juggling with millions, organized and prepared by the same first minister to burden this country with cannons, engines of war, murder and destruction, which so

haunted with fear at that time the patriotic and ardent Pacaud.

Spirits of the Dorions, the Laflammes, the Jolys, the Merciers, the Marchands and the Frechettes, you must be tempted to cry from your outer world to the hon. gentlemen opposite: 'You vilify, you taint the memory of Papineau in your organ, 'Le Canada,' that Papineau, father of all of us who have praised him to the skies, Papineau the founder of the 'rouge' party in Lower Canada, and this only to demolish his grandson, because he refused to sacrify to opportunism, because he had the courage to remain firm and attached to the tradition of the past, and retain the liberty of speech of olden times.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) It was the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton who attacked Papineau.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) You now exalt Cartier whom we have together vilified and despised, for the sole object of justifying your naval law with the Militia Act, which you misrepresent. You adore what you have burnt, and you burn what you have advised.

Have the ways not been prepared for this policy by the first minister, when, on the 15th April, 1902, he said in this House:—

It would be the most suicidal policy that could be devised for Canada to enter into the vortex in which the nation of Europe, England included, are engaged at the present time, and which compels them to maintain great military armaments. Sir, what is the relative position of Great Britain and Canada? Great Britain is one of the foremost nations of the world, in many way, perhaps, the foremost nation, certainly the head of the greatest empire which exists to-day, the greatest which has existed since the Roman empire. Great Britain, by reason of her situation, has to maintain a large and permanent army. Hon. gentlemen are aware how repugnant to the British people ever was the necessity of maintaining a standing army; hon. gentlemen are aware how the English people have constantly fought against that idea, but they have been forced by events, forced by the position the empire occupies in the world to maintain a standing army. To-day the principal item in the British budget is the expenses for naval and land armaments, and my hon. friend says that Canada should follow in the same course, that we should, that we should take part in a scheme of naval military defence! Sir, Canada is in a different position. Canada is a nation with an immense territory, but with a sparse population of five and a third million of souls, scattered over an area 3,000 miles in extent from east to west. The principal items in the budget of Canada are what? Public works, the development of the country, the construction of railways and harbours, the opening of ways of transportation. This is the work to which we have to devote our energies and I would look upon it as a crime to divert any part of that necessary expenditure, to the supply of guns, cannons and military armaments generally.

But we must be fair. 'Le Canada' of Montreal, a paper who looks solely through the eyes of the Prime Minister, who obeys at the lift of his finger, reproaches, in its issue of the 17th of February, to the 'Devoir,' the paper of Mr. Bourassa, that he does not quote integrally, quote the speaker of the Prime Minister in this circumstance, and specially to omit this part of its speech which I will read:

Certainly we must improve our own militia, and we have a scheme before us to-day for that purpose; we must look after our own defences. But there is all the difference in the world between undertaking this military expenditure and embarking in such a scheme as is embraced by my hon. friend's vast conceptions.

And also of not saying a work about the memorandum which the Prime Minister presented in London a few months after and which concluded in this way:

Presently the expenses of Canada for the defence of the country is limited to militia; the Canadian government is exposed also to bear some expenses for the creation of a marine.

Mr. Speaker, when making these declarations which I have read from the speech and from the memorandum, declarations which after all related only to the defence of Canada, has the First Minister declared that he intended to put them to execution so briefly? At a near date, and that it would be a part of the programme at the next elections, either of 1904 or 1908? Has he given to understand that the war navy would be put at the service of the empire in time of war? No, never, neither in 1904 nor in 1908, a single word has been uttered that would mean that. But in the meantime, in 1907, he said and his Minister of Marine said also: Let us begin by the Minister of Marine.

Colonial Conference, 1907, page 487, 8th May, 1907.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was a discussion in previous years to the effect that we should contribute something directly to the British navy. I may say with regard to that, there is only one mind in Canada on that question, and if it was necessary I should be able to quote the remarks made lately in an article published by Sir Charles Tupper, who is certainly one of the men best qualified to speak in Canada, upon the question. I think, perhaps, I might mention what he said in regard to that. He said: 'It is known that from the outset I have felt the interests of Canada and the true interests of the empire to be opposed to the demand for colonial contributions to the imperial navy,' and 'I maintain that Canada has discharged that duty in the manner most conducive to imperial interests.'

So it shows that both sides of politics in Canada agree with the policy which has been

going on for some years there. He adds, also, in that article that 'Canada protects her fisheries by her own cruisers.'

9th May, 1907, p. 47. Dr. Smartt: Resolution.

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the upkeep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contributions to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty, and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

Page 548. Dr. Smartt.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in that respect in our country before committing ourselves to a general claim. The government of Canada has done a great deal in that respect. Our action was not understood, but I was glad to see the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted we had done much more than he was aware of. It is impossible, in my humble opinion, to have a uniform policy on this matter; the disproportion is too great between the mother country (you must remember they have no expenses to incur with regard to public works), whereas, in most of the colonies, certainly in Canada, we have to tax ourselves to the utmost of our resources in the development of our country, and we could not contribute, or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

And the resolution of Dr. Smartt was lost owing to the adverse attitude of the Prime Minister of Canada. And on his return the right hon. gentleman had the satisfaction of reading in his organs that he had saved Canada and Canadian autonomy.

It is evident, therefore, that the policy was not before the country, and had not been accepted by the Prime Minister, neither at the time of the 1904 election, neither at the time of the 1908 election; that neither he or his ministers were thinking of submitting it to parliament, since they never uttered a single word on the matter at either of the elections of 1904 or 1908. Indeed, they were opposed to it at the time. Not only that, but I have no hesitation in saying that the position taken by the right hon. gentleman during the imperial conference of 1907 accounts in a great measure for his success in the province of Quebec at the 1908 election.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. NANTEL

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NANTEL (Translation). Mr. Speaker, up to the time of the sending of a contingent to South Africa, in 1899, the Prime Minister was actually an anti-imperialist, and in no uncertain way, just as our Canadian statesman had been without distinction of party, in times gone by. In 1899, after flatly refusing, he gave way, he hauled down the flag, although still contending that such action should not be considered a precedent. Since then, he has time and again taken a stand against any participation on our part to imperial wars.

Mr. M. BEAUPARLANT. (Translation). Will the hon. member allow me to put a question?

Mr. NANTEL. Certainly.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT (Translation). Does the hon. member consider that the question of the building of the navy, which is now under discussion is the most important question that has come up in Canadian politics since 1902?

Mr. NANTEL. I believe so.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT (Translation). Does the hon. member approve of the stand taken by the hon. the Prime Minister at the conferences which took place in London in 1902 and 1907?

Mr. NANTEL (Translation). The policy followed by the Prime Minister in 1902 and 1907, as regards the navy has been approved, because it was on the same lines as that followed by all our statesmen.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT (Translation). If the stand taken by the right hon. Prime Minister at the conferences of 1902 and 1907 commended itself to the hon. member, and if the navy question is the most important that has come up in Canadian politics since that date, may I inquire from the hon. member whether in 1908 he was up for election as a supporter, or as an opponent of the government?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) The hon. member is perfectly well aware that I was not a candidate of the Prime Minister or I would not occupy a seat on this side of the House. As a matter of fact, I am at a loss to answer such a question, and I wonder if my hon. friend knows exactly what he is driving at?

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. (Translation.) You were returned as an opponent of the Prime Minister whose position you approved?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) The Right Hon. Prime Minister opposed me in the course of that election. He even came to Ste.-Thérèse and elsewhere, and was well re-

presented by supporters of his. But the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe is perfectly well aware that not a word was spoken in connection with the navy at the elections of 1904 and 1908.

In 1902 and 1907, as previously stated, the Prime Minister took a decided and effective stand against militarism. But, in 1910, he gives up the sponge just as he had done in 1899.

Mr. Speaker, in years gone by, when the Prime Minister was sitting on this side of the House, he was fond, during the great debates of 1880 and 1884 on the question of the Canadian Pacific, of trotting in at all times his famous wizard, whose devilish incantations was to his mind the only satisfactory explanation of the policy followed by his then opponents.

Mr. GERVAIS. (Translation.) What wizard?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) One moment and you will hear enough of him. On September 21st, 1880, he spoke as follows:

> Like the wizard in the legends whose life was at all times imperilled by the scratches and bites of his strange progeny, he has brought to life a monster who threatens to take his life at any time...
>
> They have taught us to look on the government as that servant in the Scriptures who answered every call and went whither he was bid.

In 1884, the right hon. gentleman once more called in his magician. I find the following at page 441, vol. 1, of 'Hansard' for 1884:—

> We can see no other reason than this, that the government are to-day controlled by a power mightier than they. They are like the wizard of old, who, through his incantations, gave life to a monster which made him its slave and in the end destroyed him. The government are in the hands of a company which it must obey, just as the servant in the Scripture, to whom his master said: 'Go, and he goeth; come, and he cometh.'

I thought it desirable, Mr. Speaker, to quote these utterances, even if it were the sole object of recalling to the right hon. gentleman old-time memories, and point out to him how unmerciful he was in his attacks on his then opponents. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that these evil spirits, these magicians, these goblins, will not trouble our public men of to-day, and flit about over their heads. That is my sincere prayer, and may the powers above grant it.

In regard to this important question, our friends on the other side show some anxiety as regards the province of Quebec, any hypocritical tears fill their eyes. They fear that through its present attitude, that province may put herself in a state of isolation. Indeed, these hon. gentlemen have become over scrupulous and wise. Fear is the beginning of wisdom; they have not shown the same reserve or nicety in the Manitoba school question, or in the Riel question, when the right hon. gentleman was intent on shouldering his 1837 musket; or again, throughout the elections, from 1896 to 1908 inclusive, when hon. gentlemen opposite made the most of the race and religion cry, crying out unceasingly to the electorate: Vote for a French Canadian, one of your own people, a Catholic who should be given a preference over a Protestant or Orangeman. Mr. Speaker, let me say to these gentleman in closing: You have sown the wind, you will reap the storm. When principles are lacking, expediency is the only door left open.

Mr. WILSON. (Translation.) Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Go ahead.

Mr. WILSON. (Translation.) Does the hon. member for Terrebonne intend to support the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) at the next election?

Mr. NANTEL (Translation.) I may say in answer to the hon. member for Laval that on this side of the House we are free to differ from our leaders. We have opinions of our own. We stick to principles in preference to mere expediency.

Mr. CYRIAS ROY (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this late phase of the discussion on the Bill now before the House, I hope I am not expected to take up seriatim the various statements made by the previous speaker (Mr. Nantel) in support of the sub-amendment submitted by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). However, I do not wish to leave the impression that the arguments, or so called arguments, brought forward by him are uncontrovertible, and with that object in view, I may be permitted to refer to a few of them.

The hon. member, I observed, opened his remarks by stating that he was in favour of the creation of a navy for the defence of our coasts, but not of a navy to be under the control of England. That statement seems to be for circulation in the province of Quebec; but in that case, it seems to me that instead of coming to the conclusion to which he has come, that is of voting in favour of the sub-amendment, he should have decided to support the Bill now submitted to this House considering that it provides for that very control of our government over the Canadian navy.

I shall now rapidly go over the notes I have taken while listening to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman for Terrebonne. He stated that the proposal made

by his leader (Mr. R. L. Borden), if adopted, would lead to results less objectionable than those which would follow on the passing of the Bill. Nevertheless, he has just stated that he is in favour of providing a Canadian navy. Now, as we all know, the Bill provides for that contingency, while the hon. leader of the opposition contends, in his amendment, that the Bill is not far-reaching enough. That is the first inconsistency which strikes me in the speech delivered by the hon. member for Terrebonne.

Then again, the hon. gentleman says that under the British North America Act, this House has not the power to provide a navy for the defence of the empire, but solely for the defence of Canada. The hon. member is a lawyer, and a few words will be sufficient to show that—if he will pardon me for so stating—he cannot be taken seriously. The British North America Act was passed to define the respective powers of the Canadian government and of the governments of the various provinces making up confederation If, as the hon. member suggests, there is a provision in the Bill whereby the Canadian navy will be made to serve as part of the imperial navy, we are making a gift, and there is nothing in the constitution to prevent us from making such a gift to England. No such clause exists.

Mr. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) If my hon. friend thinks that we are making a gift to England in providing a navy which is to take part in the wars of the empire, he must approve also of the proposal of a money contribution, without involving the principle of imperialism. Does he really believe that we are laying down a principle of imperialism by making a gift to England in the shape of a money contribution?

Mr. ROY. (Translation.) I do not hesitate to answer no, and when I say that it is a gift, I am merely repeating the arguments of the member for Terrebonne in order to show their inconsistency.

Now, the hon. gentleman is of opinion that the Bill would be much better if clause 18 was struck out. But he holds that even then the measure would be premature. It seems to me that it is precisely that very clause which protects the rights that the hon. member wishes to preserve for the province of Quebec, for it is therein provided that the government reserves the right to send out the navy whenever it sees fit to send it out.

A great part of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Terrebonne aimed at showing that the leader of the government and all his supporters are imperialists. I believe that such remarks ought to apply to the hon. gentlemen sitting on his side of the House.

When speaking of imperialism, and when charging the members of the Liberal party with being imperialists, I believe that the hon. member has only been summing up and repeating what he thought he had from the members of the party with whom he is sitting.

He has used the words: 'No taxation without representation.' Well, is that an argument to use against this Bill? If adopted, this Bill, as submitted, will oblige us to build a Canadian navy, but it will be at our own expense. We are here as representatives of the people, and we have a right to decide whether or not we shall build a Canadian navy at our own cost.

Therefore, the argument, 'No taxation without representation,' is not applicable to the present case. The people are represented in this House, and we have a right to decide whether we will allow the government to build a navy or not.

I have a lot of other notes, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House by using them all. However, unless the hon. member is very hard to suit, he will find in my further remarks a full answer to the arguments adduced by him before this House.

The Bill now under discussion has been met by two amendments moved by the opposition. I would like to show to this House that neither of them amends anything, and to do this, I will take as a basis the allegations contained in these amendments and certain remarks made by those who spoke in favour thereof. I think I can prove that these so-called amendments are wholly inconsistent, that their conclusions do not derive from the premises laid down, and that their movers have not spoken as business men, but that their sole aim has been to court popularity.

But before doing that, if you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I intend to reply to certain criticisms, to refute certain charges made in the most gratuitous and overbearing manner against the Liberal members of this House, and especially against the members from the province of Quebec, by the nevertheless called hon. members from North Toronto, Jacques Cartier, Frontenac, and other members. These staunch champions of patriotism, of sincerity, and of all virtues, have suspected our sincerity. They have charged that our approval of the government measure can only be explained by promises of personal favours and favours for the constituencies we represent; that our opinion cannot be freely given. The hon. member for North Toronto even went so far as to say—forgive him that expression and forgive me for repeating it—that our faithfulness was only the faithfulness of a dog who barks to defend his master. Mr. Speaker, no time ought to be lost in replying to such utterances. It is better to leave them in the foul depths into which.

whoever has made use of them, has seen fit to dive in order to find them.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, besides charging us with lack of patriotism, says that we are treating the present scheme in a childish manner. It is the hon. member himself, not us, who is acting like a child when he uses such an expression before any hon. member from Quebec has expressed his opinion before this House.

Mr. Speaker, although I am still a young member of this House, and perhaps because I am a new member and therefore need to establish my reputation in this House, I throw back to him this insult gratuitously aimed at his colleagues from the province of Quebec. We remember the history of our young Canada as well as he pretends to remember it. Our ancestors fought to vindicate our rights, that is perfectly true, but the gospel of recriminations which he has preached in his remarks will not be favourably received by the French Canadians in this country.

Administrators who have ignored our aspirations, have persisted in refusing to recognize our rights, but we were glad to find, later on that the British government, after having been fully informed as to the real situation, had recognized them. Is it good policy, under the circumstances in which the province of Quebec is to-day with regard to the other provinces, when we all admit that we are enjoying in this confederation an almost illimited freedom, to unearth the hatchet of war and to appeal solely to the French Canadians, as has been done by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier? Would it not be better, instead of trying to promote the sole interests of one political party, to let both French Canadians and English speaking Canadians consider this question from the standpoint of business, of Canadian interests, of a practical spirit of loyalty and justice? Before I was called upon to represent my constituents in this House, I had heard, in my own province such speeches as the one delivered by the hon. member. His new companion in arms is still making some. I allude to one who is well known in this House, who had the reputation of walking on the waters, but who, for all of that, often stoops to use prosaic expressions of his own in order to insure the triumph of his ideas—and I was under the impression that the English speaking Canadians were ill-disposed towards us. Allow me to state, Mr. Speaker, that I now hold an opinion quite different with regard to our fellow citizens who speak a language other than our own. I am not speaking now of the hon. member for North Toronto, nor of the hon. member for Frontenac, but I have noticed that here, we French Canadians from the province of Quebec, may obtain justice by appealing to the spirit of uprightness which characterizes the English Canadian element.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must fulfil my promise. I said in my opening remarks that I intended to dissect the amendments submitted, in order to ascertain whether, after having been thoroughly and impartially examined, they are found to contain any good. All honour to whom honour is due; I shall begin by the amendment moved by the leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition.

I will take the first words of the amendment: 'The proposal of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty.' I do not admit that statement, but I will, for a moment suppose to be well founded, and there I will come to the conclusion, that if we are bound to follow the recommendations of the admiralty, there is no need of this appeal to the people, which the hon. leader of the Conservative party is asking, with the obvious object of coaxing another leader who has the reputation of being the leader of the numerous Conservative members from the province of Quebec. But I do not think this assertion is well founded, and among other proofs already adduced before this House by others than myself, I will add the following extract from the memorandum of the British admiralty paragraph marked 3, page 23 of the Report of the Proceedings of the Imperial Conference, parliamentary paper No. 29. It says:

> The various circumstances of the oversea Dominions have to be borne in mind. Though all have in them the seeds of a great advance in population, wealth, and power, they have at the present time attained to different stages in their growth. Their geographical position has subjected them to internal and external strains, varying in kind and intensity. Their history and physical environment have given rise to individual national sentiment, for the expression of which room must be found. A simple contribution of money or material may be to one Dominion the most acceptable form in which to assist in imperal defence. Another, while ready to provide local naval forces, and to place them at the disposal of the Crown in the event of war, may wish to lay the foundations upon which a future navy of its own could be raised. A third may think that the best manner in which it can assist in promoting the interests of the empire is in undertaking certain local services not directly of a naval character, but which may relieve the imperial government from expenses which would otherwise fall on the British Exchequer.

Furthermore, what do we find in the summary of the result of the sittings of the conference with regard to Canada? After the Caandian representatives had declared that they could submit two plans, one of which involving a yearly expenditure of £600,000, the admiralty suggested after discussion I am quoting textually:

That the Canadian government might provide a force of cruisers and destroyers comprising four cruisers of improved 'Bristol' class, one cruiser of the 'Boadicea' class, and six destroyers of improved River class.

Such is the opinion and the suggestion of the admiralty, and it has been accepted by the Canadian government. Therefore, any contention that the government has not acceded to the wishes of the admiralty is futile and unfounded. Many other details were discussed and finally the whole was 'unanimously agreed to.' I am quoting from the report of the decision of the conference. I will now continue to read from the amendment:

The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty and in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war are ill-advised and dangerous.

I, also have always understood that it was in case of the empire or any one of the colonies being a war, that the admiralty wished to obtain help from the colonies. It is for that reason that the Bill says 'in critical time," or 'in case of war,' so that instead of withholding the naval forces of Canada, as stated in the amendment, the Bill provides that those forces may be sent out. By the way, Mr. Speaker, you can see in that part of the amendment a good answer to be made to the contention of those who, together with the leader of the opposition, are working against the adoption of this Bill, of those speakers and newspapers in the province of Quebec and elsewhere who, in order to promote a cause which has nothing to do with the fulfilment of a duty, are making never ending dissertations with regard to 'shall' and 'may' or 'peut' and 'doit.' He, the leader of the opposition, contends that the government may withhold the naval force, while the contrary is affirmed in the province of Quebec. Any means whatever, are good for such people.

'Ill-advised proposals' are the words used in the amendment. Has the hon. leader of the opposition any doubts as to the soundness of his own judgment, and of the judgment of every member of this House, or of the judgment of those who will succeed us, that he should be unwilling to leave to parliament the discretionary power which the government intends that it should have?

Those same provisions offer certain dangers. I have always thought that the creation of a navy was caculated to ward off danger. Such is the opinion of the British admiralty, even though that opinion were not shared by the leader of the opposition. But I know that it is his own opinion, as in another portion of his amendment, the only condition required by him previous to the discussion of the project of a permanent navy is that it should be referred to the electorate. He would be loath, I suppose, to present to the people a measure fraught with danger.

The amendment goes on:

The proposals do not insure that unity of organization and of action without which there can be no effective co-operation to any common scheme of empire defence.

In giving expression to that opinion, the mover of the amendment seems never to have read clause 48 of the Bill which says:

The Naval Discipline Act, 1866, and the Acts in amendment thereof passed by the parliament of the United Kingdom and now in force and the King's Regulations and admiralty instructions now in force, shall apply to the naval service and shall have the same force in law as if they formed part of this Act.

If the rules of discipline, the King's regulations and the admiralty instructions form part of this Act, how may any one seriously pretend that this Act does not insure unity of organization and of action, and that there can exist no effective co-operation.

It is a most singular coincidence that, last year, the leader of the opposition, with all his followers including the member for Jacques Cartier, gave his support and approbation to a resolution to the effect that the House would cordially approve of any necessary expenditures designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service.

This House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service.

Now, this year the House is seized with a Bill providing for such a naval organization, but the hon. gentleman will have none of it. He was ready to approve of any necessary expenditure, but is no longer willing that parliament should make any expenditure with that object in view. Last year a plebiscite was out of the question; this year a plebiscite is an absolute necessity, but when should it take place? He does not say so; and still he speaks of 'the impending necessities of the empire.' But to cap the climax, when the hon. gentleman is making his speech, he thinks that the government does not go far enough, and when he drafts his amendment, he does not even think to suggest the creation of the navy which he means to have. In order to please his friends of Jacques Cartier and of Terrebonne, he proposes to consult the people, but about what project? I would not like to say that the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about, but I may well say that he does

not know his own mind; and it was with good reason that the Minister of Militia explained to the House why that change of mind had happened and how the hon. gentleman had got into that trouble.

I now come to the last paragraph of his amendment. 'In the meantime,' that is to say when the hon. leader of the opposition shall have made up his mind, 'the best means of discharging the immediate duty of Canada,' which means that later on important business will be dealt with, 'and of meeting the impending necessities of the empire,' here is that sublime means, 'consists in placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two Dreadnoughts.'

Now then go it: I have just said that he felt loath at spending a small portion of our yearly income for the organization of a Canadian navy; and now he is ready to borrow $25,000,000, to be spent not in this country, as the government intends to do, but to make a gift of it to England. Did you notice, sir, that the word 'Dreadnought' had been inserted at the end of this amendment just to please the extremists of his party who are always clamouring for Dreadnoughts? Personally, he is not anxious to have any, for, down to the end of his amendment, he says, 'giving to the admiralty full discretion to spend the said sum, at such time, &c.,' therefore, he is not quite sure about those 'impending necessities,' 'and for such purposes of naval defence,' for any purposes whatever, that is quite immaterial to the hon. gentleman, he forgets that this money was offered for Dreadnoughts; 'for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire.'

Yes, union is strength; but surely, all the members of the opposition did not combine their efforts in order to give strength to such a colourless amendment.

All the Conservative members who have addressed the House did state that they would support the amendment proposed by their leader. Let me tell them that they have very little pride. It cannot be said that they are urged and induced to do so by the allurements of ministerial promises and favours; but what may safely be said is that they are zealous party men, burning with a zeal which nothing can damp, not even a feeling of the heart or a breath of their intelligence.

But I also said that I would try to show that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had not been happier than his leader in the statement of his views.

This Bill, to his mind—I quote his own words— 'with the exception of clause 18, does not present any very striking feature; it is the extension of legislation which we have had in a diminished form upon our statutes ever since the mother country called upon us to assume our proper share of the burdens of defence. Elsewhere he tells us that 'it is impossible to grasp and to thoroughly understand the meaning of a policy which the right hon. Prime Minister has not explained to him.' Further on, he says: 'This policy is absolutely new and novel, differing in every way from any policy enunciated or suggested before, and as to the real meaning and import of which the people have been so far kept in the dark.

What a mass of contradictions! How are we to believe now that the intelligent gentleman (Mr. Monk), the mover of an amendment to a bill, the meaning and import of which he does not grasp, can speak with authority on the question? This Bill 'does not present any very striking feature,' and yet he is impressed by clause 18. The Bill has not been explained to him; he does not grasp its meaning; still he admits that it contains a policy that is absolutely new and novel. That proposed policy cannot be new and novel, if, as he says, 'it is the extension of a legislation which has already been placed upon our statute-books.' Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman tries to show that this policy is new and novel, and with that end in view he gives quotations from newspapers.

As we are called upon to interpret the provisions of this Bill and not the statements of newspapers, let me rather quote a few words from the speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Asquith, at the conference of 1909, and which the hon. gentleman himself did quote. Here is what the Prime Minister of England said:

> This conference was of a purely consultative character. The result is a plan for so organizing the forces of the Crown wherever they are that, while preserving the complete autonomy of each dominion, should the dominions desire to assist in the defence of the empire in a real emergency, their forces could be rapidly combined into one homogeneous imperial army.
>
> As regards Canada, it was considered that her double sea-board rendered the provision of a fleet unit of the same kind unsuitable for the present. It was proposed according to the amount of money that might be available, that Canada should make a start with cruisers and destroyers.

It is those decisions of the imperial conference that are embodied in this Bill. There is nothing new in all this, and such has always been the policy of the Liberal party: the safeguarding of our autonomy and loyalty to the empire.

The hon. gentleman asks by his amendment that the people be consulted. Have the electors changed their minds since 1908? They were consulted when it was decided to build the transcontinental and we all know the nature of their answer.

A member of parliament has something else to do here besides moving amendments to bills. The mandate he has received at the hands of his electors is quite sufficient to enable him to vote in the passing of new laws, and were we to be called upon to go before the people, whenever there arises a new question to be decided, there would be no end to elections. Is it necessary to have a plebiscite and to consult the people, in order to know whether they are willing that the government should consult parliament when a new war breaks out in the empire? The government is only doing what the House last year with one voice and without any plebiscite, decided what it should do. We know the people's opinion just as well as you do, gentlemen of the opposition pro forma, and we have not found that the people is anxious to be consulted, no more than the people from the other British dominions.

To put the public under the impression that this is a new policy, an innovation, the hon. gentleman stated in his speech that the Canadian delegates at the conference of 1909 fully endorsed everything that related to naval defence.

His political leader, on the other hand, thinks that the representatives of Canada did not follow the suggestion of the British admiralty. Both the hon. gentlemen state what is contrary to the truth; the hon. member for Jacques Cartier does not even attempt to substantiate his statement. But in order to convince us that the delegates yielded to the demands of the British authorities, he sums up all the conditions required from the colonies that desire to establish a fleet unit.

The hon. gentleman also went in a disquisition bearing on the word 'suzerain,' used on a certain occasion by the right hon. the Prime Minister, and all this in order 'to show the province of Quebec what lurks behind the government mea sure.' Whether this word was rightly applied or not, the use of a word cannot change the terms of the present Bill nor the decisions of the imperial conference. The delegates of the various dominions had been called together in order to be consulted as to the intentions of the dominions which they represented; the responsibilities assumed by those delegates had to be submitted for approbation to the respective parliaments of these dominions, and in the famous clause 18 of this Bill which the hon. gentleman seems to find fault with, we find the words: 'The Governor in Council may.' Should parliament pass this Bill it will not be in pursuance of an order of the sovereign or the suzerain, if you like, but it will be enforcement of a suggestion of the sovereign, represented by his ministers. It is a pact or a convention which both parties must respect. He who makes a promise binds himself, after acceptance of the promise; but he does not bind himself beyond what he has promised. After having agreed to do a certain thing, a dominion cannot be forced to something else, unless the relations between that dominion and the empire be severed. Under our constitution, the sovereign can disallow our laws, but he cannot modify their terms.

In the light of these incontestable principles, the three conclusions arrived at by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier are illegal, invalid and void and it is right to call public attention to them in order to prevent the errors they contain from spreading. He says: 1. We will be more closely bound by the foreign policy of the British government and will, therefore, undertake to support by force of arms its action abroad. 2. If we approve of the plan submitted by the Imperial Defence Conference we will be bound to take part as belligerents in imperial wars. 3. We will be held responsible for Great Britain's engagements towards foreign nations.

In short, the hon. gentleman's argument rests upon nothing when he contends that we have undertaken to take part in all the wars in which England may be concerned, the contrary being stated in section 18 of the Bill. Let us, therefore, set aside as idle phraseology all the instances given by the hon. member of circumstances under which we might be obliged to go to war and his declaration that we explicitly 'guarantee the integrity of the empire.'

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier points to the declaration of the right hon. the Prime Minister that 'When Great Britain is at war, Canada is also at war.' The present bill is not required to make such a statement true. The government of a nation has a right to make use of all the resources of her colonies, without however infringing upon their constituencies, if they have any. But apart from this consideration, should not a colony which enjoys the advantage of the protection, prestige and generous policy of the dominant power, in its own interest and from motives of gratitude, place its resources at the disposal of its benefactors? In that sense it is true that Canada, like all other British possessions, is at war when Great Britain is at war. When there is a question of duty at stake, whether that duty arise from gratitude or from interest, or from both, the members of this House are bound to accomplish it. It is not necessary in such a case to consult the people; on the contrary, our constituents would blame us if we hesitated to accomplish that duty, especially when it is enacted that our navy shall be used only when we so desire it, 'if at any critical period the Governor in Council wishes to place the navy at His Majesty's disposal.'

In support of the same contention that

we will be for ever bound, the hon. member quoted the Ontario 'Sun' that 'if the Canadian people are bound to bear the responsibility of British policy, their attention will be more and more turned from Canadian to English affairs.' If such were the case it might suit some of our Conservative friends who are ardent partisans. It is in no case a gratuitous insult to the people of the province of Quebec and of the other provinces to state that they are not sufficiently educated to perceive that they are being led away from the path leading to their own interests and aims.

The hon. member quoted another extract from the same paper: 'There exists a plan conferring upon the government power to send the Canadian land forces wherever the central authority may desire.' The hon. member should be well versed in Canadian policy; has he discovered any such plan? If it exists why has he not disclosed it to the people? No, the statement is without foundation and the question which arises is always the same. If any such plan exists, before carrying it out the consent of the government and of parliament are required. Moreover, our Militia Act says the contrary as to our land forces.

Here is another bad reason: 'We have neither control over nor representation in the British parliament which makes war and peace and guides our destinies.' If we were represented in the British parliament would he then favour the government's measure? Would he who refuses to take any part in the wars of the empire be better satisfied if we had four or five members in the great imperial parliament? Does he suppose that we would be then in a better position than he is now in a House of Commons called by the Governor in Council to decide as to the advisability of taking part in any special war?

In another part of his speech the hon. member admits 'that Canada is obliged to provide for its own defence and that the duty should be carried out.'

He must therefore be in favour of the present Bill. Canada faces two great oceans. It is possible to defend the country against any enemy without a navy?

The hon. member mentioned the name of Sir George Etienne Cartier in an attempt to prove that former Conservative leaders never contemplated the creation of a navy, except for the defence of Canada. We find here another proof that the question is not a new one. The very memory of that great Conservative leader is a reproach to the hon. member. Cartier did not consider it necessary to appeal to the people when he first submitted the Militia Bill to the House. In doing so he was not at first in accord with the feelings of the majority in his province, but appealing to the interest of the country in its own defence and also to Canada's debt of gratitude to England, he won the people over to his views. In doing so he did not hesitate to make use of the same arguments as might have been used in any other province. If he still lived, he would not be the man to shirk his responsibilities by demanding a plebiscite. He would declare that in consequence of our increased wealth the time had come to create a Canadian navy for the protection of Canada and also, as he said in his lifetime, to offer England out of gratitude all our available resources in time of need.

The hon. minister also mentioned in his speech the reply made by the Canadian cabinet in 1862 to a communication of the Duke of Newcastle concerning the sending of a military contingent. The principles stated in that answer are precisely those contained in the present measure, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will allow me to submit in his name that reply to his leader. The hon. member will not object as he said himself in his speech that 'the whole note the Canadian cabinet is a protest against the principle that the military and naval forces of Canada should be submitted to any control but that of the legislature that established them.'

The hon. member next descants on the attitude of British governments in the past in negotiating treaties concerning Canada. He is perhaps right in claiming that we have not always obtained justice and it is probably for that reason that thanks to the persistent efforts of our distinguished leader we have obtained almost complete liberty as regards our treaties of commerce. Why should he have made such a digression when he had only to show, which he did not do, that a plebiscite was necessary before beginning to discuss this measure. All this may be useful in proving his erudition, but will not in any manner help to prove his case.

Many other similar contradictions would be found were we to take the necessary time for dissecting the speeches of our opponents on this question of the navy. But I have held long enough, Mr. Speaker, the attention of the hon. members who have listened to me.

Let me therefore sum up: Although a Canadian of French origin, I am none the less disposed, as are all my countrymen of the same origin, to help the mother country inasmuch as the condition and resources of the country allow. The empire is not now at war; should such a case unfortunately occur before our navy is fully built and equipped, it will then be time for the parliament of Canada to decide as the nature and amount of the help to be sent over.

Certain opposition newspapers and leaders are endeavouring to mislead public

opinion as to the loyalty and sense of duty of the French Canadians. It is of the utmost importance that the position we intend to take should be well understood. In compliance with a desire expressed by the admiralty, we think that we should increase our share of imperial burden in proportion to our resources. But, contrary to the impression sought to be conveyed to the people of Quebec, we have no intention of beginning a career of militarism. They are deliberately deceiving the public, those parties who, speaking without any sense of responsibility, declare that the policy of the government will entail expenditures which will cripple our public works. Without our present revenue of one hundred millions, as the hon. the Finance Minister has declared, it will be possible, without resorting to a loan, to provide for the building of our navy and also for the normal development of our natural resources.

But the government will never agree to give of the slightest portion of responsible governments, of that autonomy which we enjoy, by consenting to waive the right of complete control in the future over a fleet built by us and with our own money.

What can be the meaning of this sudden zeal for placing our fleet under the control of the empire, even in times of peace, when we find that in a memorandum from the general staff, it is stated to be the 'duty of each self-governing portion of the empire to provide as far as possible for the security of its own territory.'

Some have gone to the extent of spreading throughout the province of Quebec the falsehood that the government is building a fleet with the view of obliging every person able to bear arms to take part in the wars of the empire. In the face of such an absurdity we are obliged to explain that those only who desire to take service in the navy will be called upon to go to war if the government and parliament of the day so decide.

I need not add, Mr. Speaker, that I will vote against both amendments in support of the government measure.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, that so much thought and energy and wealth are still being devoted throughout the world to the invention, construction and operation of instrumentalities designed to destroy our fellows shows that as a race we have not entirely emerged from savagery, nor yet within measureable distance of the millennium. That such conditions and others akin thereto obtain nineteen centuries after the advent of the Prince of Peace shows that from a finite viewpoint the upward movement of humanity is exceedingly slow. It will thus be seen that I am not one of those who believe that war or preparations for war are per se essential to the highest weal of this or any other country. While it would seem that all right thinking men regard the horrors of war as too terrible to contemplate, and deplore the many evils incident to the preparations for war, still we must adjust ourselves to world-wide conditions, and to escape the greater must manfully endure the lesser evil. And there are greater evils than war or preparations for war. There are grounds for the belief that the best way to avoid war is to be prepared for it. A few months ago, at the launching of a great battleship by the Japanese government, one of the ministers declared that the ship would be used to maintian peace in the far east. At the same time they liberated a large cageful of white pigeons as an emblem of peace. Mr. Roosevelt, when president of the United States, said: 'I hail the building of the American navy. Our voice is now potent for peace, and it is so potent because we are not afraid of war.' A few months ago our own King declared at Liverpool that the best guarantee for peace was thorough preparation for war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the conditions in which we are more immediately interested? One hundred and fifty years ago Canada became a part of the British empire, and it seems to me that the first question we have to ask ourselves is: Do we desire that Canada shall remain a part of the British empire? Do we appreciate the privileges and advantages of being a part of the British empire? Is the British empire worth preserving? If these questions are answered in the affirmative, we are imperialists; if they are not so answered we are separartists; and when the Prime Minister of this country says, as he did the other day, in introducing this Bill that he did not pretend to be an imperialist and did not pretend to be an anti-imperialist, the two positions are absolutely inconsistent. He is either an imperialist or a separatist; there is no middle ground between the two. I say that one hundred and fifty years ago Canada became a part of the British empire comprising today the United Kingdom, the four great self-governing nations of Canada, New Zealand, Australia and South Africa, and numerous other smaller possessions scattered over the globe, separated from the centre and from each of the parts by thousands of miles of water. The high seas are the world's highways of the different parts of the British empire, and the continuance and integrity of the British empire depends upon the safety and security of these great highways. The United Kingdom for two hundred and fifty years, ever since the Dutch fleet bade defiance to the British fleet in the Thames river, has been mistress of

the seas. Russia, Sweden and Denmark in 1801 challenged the supremacy of the British navy at Copenhagen, and challenged it in vain. France and Spain in 1805 at Trafalgar challenged the British navy, but in vain. The continuance of Canada as a part of the British empire depends upon a continuance of the supremacy of the British navy. We have a country growing up near the United Kingdom, a country that has developed more strength during the past fifty years than any other country in Europe, the German empire, a great people, an intelligent people, a moral people, a skilled people, a thrifty people; sixty-five millions of them, and increasing at the rate of a million a year; with an army of four millions of soldiers who could be put in the field in a few hours. There is but one obstacle that stands between the ambition of the German Emperor and the leadership of Europe, and that one thing is the British navy. With sixty-five millions in Germany, and increasing at the rate of a million a year ,and her lands nearly all occupied, Germany must emigrate her surplus population or burst. Where are they to go? It is the ambition of the emperor of Germany that when his people emigrate from Germany, they shall go to a place where they shall still be under the flag; that is, Germany must have colonies. Where is she to get them? Where are there any colonies that she desires? Only those that are held by the British empire. In the year 1900 the German people undertook to rebuild their navy, and in the preamble of their naval Bill they put these words:

> Germany must possess a battle fleet so strong that a war with her would, even for the greatest naval power, be accompanied by such danger as would render that power's position doubtful.

'Even for the greatest naval power'—read between the lines. What is the greatest naval power to-day? It is the British navy. So that, in the preamble of their Naval Bill, the Germans say practically that they must build a navy stronger than the British navy. Why? Can any one suggest for one moment any reason for building this navy except to be prepared to challenge the British navy. Such a navy is not necessary to protect Germany's coast, and there is no other navy in the world that calls on Germany to build such a navy as she is building except the navy of England. Therefore it seems to me perfectly clear that what the German people are aiming at is to have a navy stronger than the British navy for the purpose of challenging it. And if they succeed in getting such a navy, and if they should challenge the British navy and the German admiral should come off triumphant in the North sea, where the fight would be bound to take place, that would be the end of the British empire as it is constituted to-day. There can be no question about that. The Germans are systematically going to work to educate their people in favour of a great navy. How do they go about it. They build a battleship and give that ship the name of some inland city or town. The one I have in my mind they christened the 'Nuremberg'. They built a model of that battleship and sent it to the city of Nuremberg in Bavaria, over 300 miles from the sea. The model was placed in the city hall, the people were invited to come and inspect it, and they came in hundreds and they said: This is our battleship; this is the 'Nuremberg'. In that way the whole people of Germany are becoming imbued with the desire to possess the greatest fleet in the world. For what purpose? For the purpose of challenging the British navy. There can be no other object.

We have had a good deal of evidence brought forth to show that there is no ground for alarm. Newspaper clippings have been read by the score, brought to us second or third hand, and written in the old country during the excitement of an election campaign. One hon. gentleman read a letter from some one who had put in a few weeks in South Africa. Another read what purported to be a copy of a telegram sent by some unknown individual in the old country. We all know how much reliance can be placed upon political statements written during the excitement of an election campaign and published in party organs, whether on the one side or the other. We all know that little if any reliance can be placed upon these, and for that reason I do not propose to read newspaper articles written during the excitement of an election, but I want to read a few words delivered by responsible statesmen in the English House of Commons at a time when there was no political campaign on hand. You will find the few words I am going to quote from Sir Edward Grey, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in the English 'Hansard' on March 9, 1909, page 50. Sir Edward Grey said:

> We desire by a just, fair and reasonable statement of our position to get not victory but confidence. Let me review the situation in that light. First of all, the House and the country are perfectly right in the view that the situation is grave. A new situation in this country is created by the German programme. Whether that programme is carried out quickly or slowly the fact of its existence makes a new situation. When that programme is completed, Germany a great country close to our own shore will have a fleet of 33 Dreadnoughts. That fleet would be the most powerful which the world has ever yet seen. . . . That imposes on us

the necessity of rebuilding the whole of our fleet.

Consider that for one moment. The German programme proposes to build thirty-three Dreadnoughts. A country with which she is now in close alliance, Austria, has eight Dreadnoughts; and if a war were to occur between Germany and England, Austria would be in the line with Germany, so that England to-day requires to rebuild her navy, requires to build at least fifty Dreadnoughts, which are to be the great battleships of the near future, to meet the German programme. What does that mean? Each Dreadnought costs about $10,000,000, and the complements of smaller vessels in each case, costs another $10,000,000. Fifty Dreadnoughts and their complements at $20,000,000 each, means $1,000,000,000. That is what it will cost to rebuild the British navy. And that British navy is to be rebuilt for what? Not for the mere purpose, as these statesmen said in the House of Commons, of protecting the British isles, but for the purpose of protecting the remotest part of the British empire. It is necessary for the British exchequer to expend $1,000,000,000 in rebuilding a navy to protect us as well as to protect the British isles. Are we to take advantage of that expenditure for our protection, at least during the next twenty years while we shall be constructing our navy, and contribute nothing towards it. That does not strike me as being self-respecting or honourable. Let us see what Mr. Balfour, the leader of the Conservative party, said in the British House of Commons:

NAVY ESTIMATES.

I therefore do most earnestly beg the government and the committee to consider not indeed in any spirit of panic, but with a full recognition of the absolutely novel and as I think alarming circumstance in which this country finds itself whether they cannot do something with the enormous resources which we have at our disposal in the way of the building of ships, guns, mountings and armaments, and our power of finding the necessary funds for dealing with the question of national defence. I ask them not to hesitate, not to delay, but to use to the utmost and as quickly as possible without paltering every possible machine which they have at their disposal for restoring to this country what I greatly fear we have temporarily lost—not that two power standard which is far beyond question in this debate, but the one power standard in the matter of ships of first-class power which for the first time in our history seems to be slipping from our grasp.

And Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister, said on the 16th of March, last, as reported on page 962 of the English 'Hansard':

If any one will refer to the speech I made a year ago, he will see that I said, with some confidence, that whereas it would take the Germans 30 months to build one of these ships, we could do it in 24. I was not, of course, committing myself precisely to the number of months, but I did maintain that we had a substantial advantage in the rate of construction, which would always enable us to quickly overtake them when the event occurred. I am sorry to say that is not the case. I believed it to be the fact at the time at which I spoke, but there has been such an enormous development in Germany, not only in the provisions of shipyards and slips on which the hulk or fabric of a ship can be built or repaired, but in what is still more serious—in the provision for gun mountings and armaments of those great monsters, those Dreadnoughts, which are now the dominating type of ship—such an enormous development—and I will venture to say this without attempting to excite anything in the nature of unnecessary alarm in this country—such an enormous development as to be so serious a development from our national point of view, that we could no longer take to ourselves, as we could a year ago with reason, the consoling and comforting reflection that we have the advantage in the speed and the rate at which ships can be constructed.

He said also, in the same debate:

I made two assumptions which have turned out, I shall not say to be inaccurate at the time I made them, but which have not been verified by subsequent experience. I admit it to the full. I got my information from the best possible sources, and I am perfectly certain that the admiralty had taken every means in their power to satisfy themselves of the actual facts. What were these two assumptions I made? The first assumption was that the German paper programme was one that might not be realized and certainly would not be exceeded. That has turned out not to be true, because it is undoubtedly the case that during the autumn of last year there was an anticipation with four ships which belonged to the German programme of 1909-10, in the sense that orders were given, materials collected, and it may be in one or two cases, possibly in more, ships were actually laid down. It was in view of that most grave, and to us not only unforseen but unexpected state of things that we had to reconsider our programme of the present year. When we had that state of things brought home to us, it was a great surprise to us, I confess—the falsification of one of the hypotheses on which we had hitherto proceeded. The discovery of that state of things made it necessary to reconsider our programme and to submit a different set of proposals to parliament.

Now, I wish to read a little authority for the benefit of some of our friends on the other side of the House, which they may appreciate even more, perhaps, than that of the statesmen whose views I have just read. I desire to quote a short quotation from the Toronto 'Globe', which my hon. friends opposite will probably accept as a very good authority. The 'Globe' of 24th March, last, said in its leading editorial:

British feeling for Germany until the last few years has ever been friendly and admiring. Germany's feeling for Great Britain, as was manifested during the Boer war, has been jealous and unfriendly. This unfriendliness reached its climax when Britain and France recently entered upon a friendly understanding. The policy of Germany since the war of 1870 has been to isolate France in Europe. The friendly relations with her neighbour across the channel have been openly and avowedly resented by the Berlin war party.

The German nation has groaned for years under the weight of military preparations. Without lightening that burden an ounce, the Kaiser and his advisers have superimposed the burden of creating a great navy. There is not another nation in Europe which, if in the same position as Great Britain, would allow another nation to prepare an engine for its destruction without asking for explanations and an understanding. There is not another nation in Europe which would impotently stand by and see an instrument forged for its destruction. They would seize the reptile while it was still weak and strangle it.

But that is not the British way. They have instead endeavoured to keep pace with German activity in augmenting naval power. The contest has become a desperate one. It is a contest between a nation of 65,000,000 and constantly growing, with a nation of 42,000,000, from which its sons swarm across the seas year in and year out. War is deprecated, but, as a matter of fact war is in progress. The contest in ship-building is war. If the mother country were engaged in a deadly conflict, Canadians could not get across the ocean fast enough to the aid of the motherland. The Canadian exchequer would be open to the last dollar in such a cause. But we must recognize that our aid is as much needed now as if a physical war, instead of a war of ship-building were on. Germany appreciates that if ever she is to challenge British supremacy and break up the British empire, now is the time.

This is from the Toronto 'Globe', I would ask my hon. friends opposite to remember:

Every year is adding to the might of the British possession, and ten years hence would be too late. The colonies can show by prompt and decisive action that it is already too late. They have it in their power to proclaim to all the world that the empire is one and indissoluble. It will be a stroke for peace, for the moment Germany perceives that the strength and resources of every colony have been cast into the scale, from that moment she will see that she has lost the game. She began her programme too late. It is Canada's duty, from every point of view, our affection for the land of our fathers and our own self-interest to take prompt and practial action.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the author of that article is one of those whom the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) and the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Congdon) so modestly and elegantly referred to as 'old women of both sexes'. I shall have occasion to give my hon. friends opposite some more light from the Toronto 'Globe' before I finish.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a few minutes ago, we have for a hundred and fifty years been living under the protection of the British navy. No one for a moment will dispute that. We propose to live under the protection of the British navy. Even hon. members opposite will admit that they cannot construct anything in the way of a navy, that would protect this Canada of ours, in less than twenty years. They will admit that, during the next twenty years, at least we Canadians are to be protected by the British navy. And we have never contributed one dollar to the construction or maintenance of that navy; we have never promised to contribute one dollar to the construction or maintenance of that navy; we do not propose now, under the Bill before the House, to contribute one dollar for the construction or maintenance of that navy.

Now, the Prime Minister in introducing this Bill spoke about the position that was taken at the imperial conference of 1902.

The Postmaster General was good enough to put upon 'Hansard' the whole of the material part of that memorandum of 1902. The Prime Minister said, at page 3032:

This was in 1902, nearly eight years ago, and for eight years this policy of the present government has been before the country. From this policy the present government has never deviated. This policy we affirmed again at the imperial conference of 1907.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look, for a moment and see whether these statements are true. We will examine the memorandum of the Imperial Conference of 1902, we will examine the memorandum of the British Conference in 1907, to see whether these statements are true. The Postmaster General was kind enough to place upon 'Hansard', at page 3114, the material parts of the memorandum of the Imperial Conference of 1902. The substance of it is this:

At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval system of defence as well. They are willing—

Now notice the condescending generosity in this proposition:

—they are willing that these expenditures should be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which she now bears.

Wasn't that generous? What is the proposition? The proposition was that:

We are prepared to consider a naval system of defence as well.

We are prepared to consider it. Five

years afterwards there was another imperial conference, in the year 1907. I do not remember whether the Postmaster General was a member of the government during those five years, or any part of the period from 1902 to 1907; but if he was, I am asking him if the government, during those five years, considered this proposition that in 1902 they declared they were prepared to consider. Now there is nothing in that memorandum of 1902 promising to do anything more than to consider the question, that is the whole thing. Did they consider it during those five years? I do not know whether they did or not. If the Prime Minister was here I would ask him. The Minister of Finance is here, perhaps he knows whether the Cabinet, during those five years between 1902 and 1907, considered a naval system of defence as well. He does not answer.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not making a speech.

Mr. CROTHERS. I have the report of what occurred at this general conference in 1907, and I think I shall be able to show that although they promised to consider it, they said they were prepared to consider it in 1902, I think it is fair to assume that they did consider it during those five years, and I think the action they took in 1907 shows that having considered it for five years, they came to the conclusion that tney would do nothing. Now let us see. At page 541 of that report you have a motion moved by Dr. Smartt, one of the members of that conference, the Commissioner of Public Works for Cape Colony. He moved a resolution in these words:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire—

Is that something, Mr. Speaker, we can all agree to?

—to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy—

Do we all agree with that?

—in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the upkeep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty, and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

Now, where was the representative of this government when that motion came up? Remember they told the British government in 1902, five years before, that they were prepared to consider the establishment of a naval force. Here was a proposition submitted by Dr. Smartt, recognizing the duty of the over-seas dominions to make a contribution towards the up-keep of the navy. You cannot get out of it by saying that it was a proposition to give a money contribution

The contribution to take the form of a grant of money, or the establishment of local naval defence or such other services.

Or in such other manner as would suit the circumstances of each dominion Now what was the evidence of their having considered the matter for five years? We find on the very next page, 542, the remarks made by the right hon. leader of this government in opposition to that motion. Here is his language:

SIR WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution.

We cannot agree to give money, we cannot agree to establish a naval defence, we cannot agree to do anything. The right hon. the Prime Minister stated the other day, as I have just read to you, that they reaffirmed the proposition in 1907 that they would establish a navy. Let me give you some more:

I am sorry to say that so far as Canada is concerned we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in that respect in our country before committing ourselves to a general claim. We have too much to do otherwise. . . . For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

Now there you have, in the year 1902, the Prime Minister of this country telling the British government that they were prepared to consider a system of naval defence, and after considering it for five years, he says, I am against a monetary contribution for the establishment of a naval system or any other service, and we do not propose to do any more than we have done.

In the face of that we had him in this House the other day saying:

This was in 1902, nearly eight years ago, and for eight years, this policy of the present government has been before the country. From this policy the present government has never deviated.

Was that a deviation from it in 1907 when the right hon. gentleman declared: No money, no battleships, no tin-pot navy even, no nothing? In the face of that he comes before this House on the 3rd day of February, 1910, and tells us that in the year 1907 at this conference he reaffirmed the proposition that was made in 1902:

This policy we affirmed again at the imperial conference of 1907. We affirmed it again last year in this House when the question came up for concrete and immediate action. This

policy is embodied in the Bill now before this House, and by this policy the present government stands or falls.

What did Dr. Smartt say to Sir Wilfrid Laurier after he made those observations, after he refused to give any money, after he refused to establish a naval force, after he refused to do anything, saying we have too much to do otherwise? Dr. Smartt said:

I thought the wording of this resolution would have specially met your views, because towards the up-keep of the navy it may take the form either of a grant of money or the establishment of a local defence force or other services.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

I have said all I have to say on the subject.

That settled it, we will do nothing, I won't even discuss it with you any further. Then the report proceeds:

Dr. SMARTT. I should like very much to hear the opinions of the representatives of the other portions of the empire.

Mr. DEAKIN. I have no hesitation in entering into the discussion if desired; but if we are not going to pass the resolution, is it worth while?

Dr. SMARTT. I think it is a great pity we do not pass something. We have done so much in the way of pious affirmation, that I am anxious we should do something of a practical character.

I should say so. Then the discussion continues:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It can be passed if there is a majority. For my part I must vote against it.

Sir JOSEPH WARD. To do any good we would require to be unaminous about it.

Dr. SMARTT. Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL. It is not much good to have a resolution at all if we cannot be unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we had better not proceed any further just now.

The motion was allowed to drop.

If you will pardon me for repeating for a moment, because I want to impress this thought upon your mind and upon the minds of my hon. friends who are in this House, and through this House upon the minds of the electors of this country, that we have had our Prime Minister in this House declaring that he confirmed in 1907 the proposition that he made in 1902, and I think I have proved to the hilt from the record that he did nothing of the kind. Instead of confirming the proposition in 1907, which had been made in 1902, he absolutely and positively refused to do anything. And this has another aspect: the statement that the Prime Minister made the other day is invoked as a reason why the people of this country should not be consulted before we enter upon this interminable expenditure of the construction of a Canadian navy. He has said to this House, his organs throughout the country, and his supporters in this House are repeating it, that this proposition has been before the country for eight years and has never been varied during that time, that he confirmed it in 1907. What are the facts? The facts are that the people of this country in 1904 paid no attention whatever to what had been done in 1902. We all know it was not a subject of discussion on the public hustings at all, but even if it were discussed what was done in that year was cancelled in the year 1907 and prior to the last election. The last announcement the people of this country had from the right hon. gentleman on the question of a navy was: We shall do absolutely nothing. That was in the year 1907. So I say that we have done nothing, we have never promised to do anything, we have absolutely refused to do anything, and we do not propose now to do anything to strengthen the royal navy. I overlooked something, the government did promise to do some little thing when they were over there in 1907. Sir Wilfrid Laurier left the matter of addressing the conference largely to Mr. Brodeur. At page 138 Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

Mr. Brodeur will speak for Canada.

And Mr. Brodeur proceeded to speak and to tell the people there how much we had expended in protecting our fisheries and in establishing a hydrographic survey, etc., but not one word that they would do anything to strengthen the British navy, except what we find on page 141:

We have taken over, or are going to take over, the Halifax and Esquimalt dockyards—in fact, we are in possession already, from the 1st of January, of the Halifax dockyards. I do not know exactly how much those dockyards were costing the British admiralty—or the one at Halifax, but I may say we have assumed all the obligations in connection with those dockyards, and we have provided specially that the amount which the British admiralty was to pay as an annual subscription to the graving dock at Halifax, would be paid by us instead of by the British admiralty. We have, as I have said, provided for the establishment of docks at Halifax and Esquimalt.

That was in the year 1907, nearly three years ago. The hon. the Postmaster General a few days ago quoted from an address delivered by Sir William White on the 17th day of November last, before the Royal Society of Arts in old London, and I shall quote a few words from the same author, which will be found at page 16. You will remember that in the year 1907, in the presence of the right hon. the leader of this government, Mr. Brodeur undertook to take over the Esquimalt and Halifax dockyards, and to assume all obligations in connection with them. Sir William

White last summer examined these dockyards, and I call him as a witness whose testimony will be accepted at once. On November 17, 1909, he says:

During the past summer I have visited the naval yard at Esquimalt, and obtained first—hand knowledge of its present condition. . . . The only naval base possessed by the royal navy on the western coast of the American continent. I found the fort unarmed, the guns lying on the ground at the foot of the hill in the open. The naval yard was without a staff capable of maintaining in good condition the expensive machinery left in the work shops, or the buildings, some of which were erected only a short time ago. The stores had been disposed of locally at ridiculously low prices and a naval base of importance had been virtually abandoned and was rapidly deteriorating.

From information received, I have reason to believe that the naval base at Halifax is also in an unsatisfactory condition.

So that we have the representative of this government at the imperial council in the year 1907 undertaking to take over the dockyard of Esquimalt and to maintain it and to assume all obligations in connection with it and, more than two years afterwards we find this report by Sir William White that they are allowing it to tumble to pieces. And still they tell us that the same policy that we adopted in the year 1902, we affirmed in 1907, and have been carrying it along ever since.

Mr. SPROULE. That was to do nothing.

Mr. CROTHERS. To do nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. And they sold the stores.

Mr. CROTHERS. And they sold the stores at ridiculously low prices as Sir William White says. So we have had the protection of the British navy for 150 years; and the government proposes to have it for the next twenty years at least, never having paid a dollar towards the construction or maintenance of that navy, never having promised to pay a dollar and not proposing to pay a dollar now. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a position which the people of Canada, English or French desire the government of Canada to take.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the duty of Canadians in these circumstances? What we should do, it seems to me, depends entirely upon the conception we have of the destiny of this country. What is our conception of the destiny of Canada? Is it that we shall remain in the empire, is it that we shall become independent, or is it that we shall become a mere annex of the United States? And, before we can properly and satisfactorily answer the question as to what we ought to do we should first determine what is our position. There never was a time in the history of this country before when Canada so earnestly called on every one of its sons to think and consider, and judge for himself what is best to do. It would seem to me, judging by the speeches we have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite, that they have never yet grasped the idea of empire, and I say that without any desire whatever to be offensive to any one Their speeches do not indicate that they have ever risen to the idea of empire. Let us read what some of these gentlemen opposite have said. The hon. the Minister of Militia in his speech (page 3388 of 'Hansard) referring to the leader of the opposition said:

To-day he wishes to tax the people of Canada $25,000,000 and to send it away out of sight where Canadians can have no possible interest in it.

Just weigh these words for a moment, Mr. Speaker: To send $25,000,000 to the British government to build two Dreadnoughts away out of sight of Canada where Canadians can have no possible interest in it. Did the man who uttered these words ever grasp the idea of empire?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CROTHERS. We had the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) saying in so many words in this House: We owe England nothing, we are indebted to England for nothing, why, because she does not pay us any more for our apples, or any more for our cheese, or any more for our bacon, or for our canned goods than she does for similar merchandise entering England from the United States, and therefore we owe her nothing. Narrow, selfish, picayune provincialism. As well might he say that the merchant of Montreal pays him no more for his eggs, and butter and cheese than he would to an American coming into the market of Montreal, and therefore, we are not indebted to Montreal at all, and if Montreal be attacked we shall not come to the rescue of that city. A gentleman from Nova Scotia (Mr. McKenzie)) told us that England has more money than we have, that she had facilities, for building ships, that she could build all the ships that were necessary to protect not only the British isles but to protect the remotest part of the British empire. And, he, a member of the House of Commons of Canada and a citizen of Canada was willing to allow the taxpayer of the United Kingdom alone to raise money to construct and maintain a navy to protect him in this country. Narrow, selfish, picayune provincialism. And, Sir, we have had similar remarks from member after member on the other side of the

House. Talk about defending our coasts, or protecting our trade routes, why Mr. Speaker, this empire of ours, as the 'Globe' truly said, is one and indissoluble; the British empire must stand or fall all together. We have had remarks made by the Prime Minister showing, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that even he has never grasped the idea of empire. Many of you have read the remarks he made on independence a few years ago. Now, I do not desire to be offensive; I want to say boldly that if there be any man in this country who believes honestly and sincerely that it is in the interest of the British empire that we should become independent he has a perfect right to that belief and he has a perfect right to advocate it if he pleases. But, the people of the country, if he be a public man, have the right to insist that he shall come out in the open and say so. We had the Prime Minister a few years ago stating, that he held out to his fellow countrymen the idea of independence. That is not the only time the right hon. gentleman has made some remarks he should not have made in my humble judgment; remarks, which coming from a man occupying the prominent position he does, have a disintegrating effect upon the affections which the people of this country should entertain towards the British empire. And, it is not away back in the year 1902 either that he made those remarks, for, in the year 1907, the right hon. gentleman said in the city of Toronto:

We have to realize that John Bull has not always done his duty to his Canadian son. If we take all the treaties from the treaty of 1783 up to the treaty of 1903, we Canadians do not feel particularly cheerful over the way we have been treated by the British plenipotentiaries.

And in Ottawa, in the same year, addressing the Manufacturers' Association, he said:—

We take the record of diplomacy in Great Britain in so far as Canada is concerned, and we find that it is a repetition of sacrifices of Canadian interests. We have suffered on the Atlantic, we have suffered on the Pacific, we have suffered on the lakes, we have suffered wherever there has been a question to be discussed between British diplomats.

Mr. Speaker, what would be thought of a son who would delight in parading before the world the shortcomings of his mother? Whatever else might be thought of him, no one would think of accusing him of having any affection for her. So seriously did the British Ambassador the Right Hon. Mr. Bryce, regard these observations made by the Prime Minister of this county, that in Toronto he referred to them, and said: —

I will ask you to suspend your judgment upon all those questions in which it is alleged that British diplomacy has not done its best for you. In those matters you have only heard one side of the case, and I feel it is my duty to my country, and to the government which I represent, to tell you this, and that I believe you are entirely mistaken if you think that British diplomacy has been indifferent to Canada or has not done the best it could for Canada.

When the right hon. premier of this country says that Canadians do not feel particularly cheerful over the way we have been treated by the British plenipotentiaries, I ask, who were the British plenipotentiaries? I asked you what would be thought of a son who would delight in parading before the world the shortcomings of his mother; but what would you think of a son who would parade before the world accusations against his mother of which she was not guilty? And I want to show you, Mr. Speaker, that these very plenipotentiaries to whom the right hon. gentleman refers were named by himself, every one of them. In speaking of the treaty of 1903 he referred of course to the Alaska boundary treaty. I have in my hand the correspondence touching the Alaska Boundary, and in it you will find at page 63 the following:

To the Earl of Minto, Ottawa, from the Secretary of State, March 7, 1903.—The ratifications of the Alaskan boundary treaty were exchanged on the 3rd instant. Time for the preparation of the case, article 2, has consequently begun to run against us, and it is important that composition of British half of court, also appointment of British agent, should be settled without delay. Hope, therefore, your responsible advisers will favour us with their views on these appointments as early as possible.

On the very same day the Governor General sent this message to the Colonial Secretary:

In view of the short time given for preparation of the case, my ministers desire to proceed immediately, and, therefore, suggest an early settlement of preliminaries. As to the composition of tribunal, my ministers suggest chief justice of England and two Canadian judges, names to be telegraphed hereafter. As to counsel, my ministers desire that Mr. Edward Blake, K.C., London, and Mr. Christopher Robinson, K.C., Toronto, be of counsel to uphold the British contention and junior counsel. Under that clause of the treaty which provides for the appointment of an agent to represent each party before the tribunal, my ministers desire that Mr. Clifford Sifton, Canadian Minister of the Interior, be appointed to fill such position.

On the 17th of March, 1903 the Governor General sent this message to the Secretary of State:

In addition to chief justice of England, my ministers propose Sir Louis Jetté, a retired

judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, and now Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, and Justice Armour, of the Supreme Court of Canada, as members of the Court of Imperial Jurists under treaty for settlement of boundary of Alaska.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the late Justice Armour died, and the present Minister of Justice was appointed to his place. This correspondence shows conclusively that the government of Canada named all three of the gentlemen who represented the British empire on that board of arbitration, and that the Chief Justice of England, named by the government of this country, agreed with the three gentlemen who represented the United States, and hence there were four to two against us on that question. And in face of the fact that Sir Wilfrid Laurier named the three gentlemen who represented Great Britain on that board, we find him at Toronto blaming the British government for the award that was given. Have I made it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. gentleman has taken delight not only in parading the shortcomings of his mother before the people, but in making accusations against his mother that are not borne out by the record? Only a few days ago the right hon. gentleman delivered another address in Toronto, and what did he say? It is very peculiar, Sir, that a gentleman occupying the prominent position that the right hon. leader of the government does, should make such remarks. I venture to say that no one ever knew or ever read of a British statesman speaking of the government of Canada as the Prime Minister of this country so glibly and so delightfully speaks of the British government. This is what he said, as reported in the Globe of the 5th of January:

The King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our own Canadian parliament.

Now, what was the necessity of making a remark of that kind? What is the object? Did you ever hear Sir John Macdonald talk that way? What are the facts? I have here some extracts from the British North American Act in these words:

Be it therefore enacted and declared by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as the British North America Act, 1867.

3. It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, to declare by proclamation that, on and after a day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this Act, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form and be one dominion under the name of Canada.

9. The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

Section 17. There shall be one parliament for Canada, consisting of the Queen and an Upper House, styled the Senate, and the House of Commons.

Yet in the face of these facts, we have the right hon. gentleman saying that the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our own Canadian parliament. Why, the sovereign of England, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons, created this parliament. The King himself is a part of this parliament. And in the face of that we have our Prime Minister saying that the King has nothing to do with us except as we allow him. But the parliament of Canada was created by the sovereign and the House of Lords and the House of Commons of England. Where did these get their rights? The King of England did not acquire his rights from the parliament of Canada. Why then are these observations made? We had the right hon. gentleman going out of his way the other day to say that he would not have allowed Canada to have taken part in the Crimean war, if he had anything to say about it. On page 3044 of this year's 'Hansard', I find the right hon. gentleman reported as saying:

There was another instance. England was at war in the Crimea with Russia. For myself I do not hesitate to say that if that war were to be undertaken by England under similar circumstances, I would hesitate very much before I would give my consent to our taking part in any such war, if conditions were the same now as they were then. But they are not, because at present we have British Columbia to look after; and if war were declared between Great Britain and Russia, our first duty would be to look after British Columbia, which might be attacked on the Pacific ocean.

Those are the ideas of our Prime Minister touching the Crimean war. Let me read in contrast what the Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald said about the same matter. He said:

Who can look back to the time when the Crimean war broke out and not remember with pride how Canada rose as one man to stand by the mother country and by France when the French Tricolor and the Union Jack were joined together fighting the battles of liberty against absolutism on the shores of the Crimea? There was a rush of Canadians to the battlefields, and I had great pleasure—

Notice the contrast.

—I had great pleasure, as a member of the government of Sir Allan McNab, to be instrumental in carrying a vote of $100,000, given unanimously out of the public treasury, in order to show that Canada made common cause with England and with France in the Crimean war.

There you had a man down into whose heart had sunken deeply the sentiment of loyalty and patriotism, and had become the inspiration of his life. Contrast that with the disposition of our Prime Minister whom we had saying that if he had been here then, he would not have so acted. Things, he said, are different now. We have British Columbia now, he said, and if British Columbia were attacked, he would fight like blazes. Sir, I choose to look upon the matter in this way. If Vancouver is attacked, the British empire is attacked. If the city of Quebec is attacked, the British empire is attacked. I look upon it in that large sense. I am proud of being a citizen of Canada, but prouder still that I am a British subject, and a citizen of the British empire. The instance I have cited is but another instance of the small ideas, the provincial ideas, that some people have. If British Columbia is attacked, why, we will run to the rescue. If Montreal is attacked, we will run to the rescue; but if some distant part of the empire is attacked, we will sit down in our comfortable chairs and consider whether we will go to the rescue or not. How satisfied would we be, were the British government to take a similar position with regard to us? If Quebec were attacked, would we not expect the British government to send a fleet over as fast as that fleet could get here? I think we would. The English statesmen whose words I have quoted said over and over again that Britain requires a fleet sufficently large to protect, not only the British isles, but the remotest part of the empire. If British Columbia is attacked, says the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) we will rush to the rescue. What narrow, selfish, picayune provincialism.

Our Minister of War (Sir Frederick Borden) is on the same line. He gave us a speech the other night in this House, and during it he was asked some questions. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) asked him:

> Will the hon. gentleman say whether or not he is in accord with the sentiments concerning independence expressed by the Prime Minister in 1892.

What was the answer of our brave Minister of War to that question? He said:

> I am generally in accord with the views of my honoured leader, and I have absolute confidence in his leadership.

That is, our Minister of War does not know whether he is in favour of independence or not, but when the Prime Minister says 'thumbs up', up go his thumbs.

I might quote from the speech delivered by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to prove that he showed just as narrow, selfish, and picayune provincialism as the other hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred and even more so. I think I might extend that discription to almost every one of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have delivered themselves during this debate. I think there was one exception, but I forget the name.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. McLean).

Mr. CROTHERS. To protect our coasts, to look after our trade routes—never rise to the idea of empire. Mr. Speaker, if there is to be any fight for supremacy on the seas, that fight will occur in the North sea. Sea fights are not like land fights. You may have a war on land for four or five years. But Togo destroyed the Russian fleet in the Sea of Japan in forty minutes; the fleet of Spain was destroyed in the harbour of Manilla in an hour and a half; the Spanish fleet at Santiago was sunk in a few hours; Nelson won the victory of Trafalgar in three hours. And if the British fleet is ever to be challenged by the German fleet, it will be challengd in the North sea, and the battle will be finished in not more than a few hours. We are interested in seeing to that, if the supremacy of Britain on the seas be challenged by Germany or any other power, our interest should be protected. And, if we have a feeling of loyalty towards the British empire, if we appreciate the advantages and privileges of living under British institutions, if we really desire the empire's success, if our conception of the destiny of Canada is that she should remain in that empire, we should be anxious to contribute to the strength of the only weapon that can protect the integrity of the empire

The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was in Toronto a short time ago and made a speech there before the Ontario Club, which is reported in the 'Globe' of Friday, February 18 last. Speaking of us poor sinners on this side, he said:

> They disregarded the resolution of last session, in which they had concurred, that a contribution of money would not be satisfactory.

And further—

> He did not believe that the people of Canada to-day were going to send tribute across the Atlantic to be expended by other men.

Now, knowing the hon. Minister of Justice as well as I do, I was unwilling to believe that he would misrepresent the position taken by the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I set myself to ascertain, if possible, whether he had any excuse for making that statement. And I think I discovered it. Our minister of war (Sir Frederick Borden) delivered a speech here on February 10, and if hon. gentlemen will look it up, they will see that the hon. minister declared that the resolution that

was presented by the Prime Minister last March was the one that was finally adopted by this House, and he puts it on 'Hansard' just as it appeared when first read by the Prime Minister. Let me read it to you:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

The House reaffirms the opinion repeatedly expressed by representatives of Canada, that under the present constitutional relation between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of any stated contribution to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be a satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

You will remember that that is the paragraph as it appeared in the resolution brought in by the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Militia has referred to that as the one finally adopted. But it was not so. The one that was finally adopted was changed to make that paragraph read 'the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury' would not be satisfactory. You catch the difference at once. The resolution as first brought in by the Prime Minister would prohibit us giving any monetary contribution under any circumstances. It was amended as I have said. The Minister of Militia, our minister of war, did not know then, and does not know now, that that amendment was made by the resolution. Not only the minister of war does not seem to have known of that amendment, but the Minister of Justice also. For I cannot believe that the Minister of Justice misrepresented the case. We studied law together, and I do not believe he would do such a thing; I choose to believe that he did not know that the resolution was amended so as to permit the giving of a monetary contribution. The Minister of Militia puts into this resolution a whole paragraph that was cut out:

The House has observed with satisfaction——

They actually wanted to put this in at first.

—the relief afforded in recent years to the taxpayers of the United Kingdom through the assumption by the Canadian people of considerable military expenditure formerly charged upon the imperial treasury.

It required a high degree of courage to propose to send that home to the old country when Sir William White had examined the dockyards at Esquimalt and Halifax, and had found that the government had allowed them to tumble to pieces. That paragraph is entirely cut out of the resolution as finally passed, but our war minister did not know it. There is no mistake about that, for I took the trouble to read his whole speech to see about it. Before reading the resolution, he said:

The hon. member for North Toronto introduced a resolution which was afterwards changed into the resolution which finally and unanimously passed this House. . . . Without detaining the House, I shall proceed to read that resolution.

Then he proceeds to read the resolution that the Prime Minister first brought in. I thought that perhaps he had made a slip, so I took the trouble to go to the Printing Bureau on the 21st of last month, to examine the proof-sheets, and I found that they had all been corrected, but the resolution was left there. And you will find it in the revised edition, as I have it here represented as having been finally passed, namely the one that the Prime Minister brought in first. So that accounts for the Minister of Justice making the statement he did in Toronto. He did not know that it had been amended—our minister of war did not know that it had been amended—he does not know now. He revised the proof-sheets and this is in the revised edition. It is going down to future generations of our people as the resolution passed by this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CROTHERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a laughing matter, it is really a very serious matter; because we may fairly assume that, not knowing when he delivered that speech on the 10th of February that that resolution had been amended, and not knowing three or four days afterwards when he revised the proof sheets, and not knowing it now, I think it is safe to assume that he carried over to England with him the original resolution. And what do we find him doing? On page 26 of the report of the Imperial Conference of 1909, we find the Canadian representatives explaining in what respect they desired the advice of the admiralty in regard to measures of naval defence.

They desired the advice of the admiralty in regard to the measures of naval defence, which might be considered consistent with the resolution adopted by the Canadian parliament on the 29th of March, 1909.

A scheme limited to torpedo craft would not in itself be a good means of gradually developing a self-contained fleet capable of both defence and offence.

Now, this was a private consultation, they dont give us the particulars. We can fancy what occurred. Sir Frederick had met the First Lord of the Admiralty before, and he introduced to him his hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and he told the First Lord of the Admiralty that this was the gentleman who was at the head of the department in Canada which the commission had found was lacking in

conscience, and he asked the First Lord of the Admiralty what they could do to help strengthen the British navy. The First Lord of the Admiralty told him what you will find on page 23:

> If the problem of imperial naval defence was considered merely as a problem of naval strategy it would be found that the greatest output of strength for a given expenditure is obtained by the maintenance of a single navy with the concomitant unity of training and unity of command. In furtherance, then, of the simple strategical ideal, the maximum of power will be gained if all parts of the empire contribute, according to their needs and resources, to the maintenance of the British navy.

So when our minister of war first introduces the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the First Lord of the Admiralty says to him: Why, you can best assist to strengthen the navy by giving us a monetary contribution. Oh, but our minister of war had to say to him, I have in my pocket a resolution that the House of Commons unanimously passed.—Let us see that resolution. The resolution is brought out,—a payment of any contribution to the imperial treasury would not be satisfactory. He read the resolution he had with him, the one the Prime Minister had brought into this House at first and evidently that is the only resolution he knew anything about. The people of Canada wont stand for a monetary contribution. Well, it is very peculiar, the First Lord of the Admiralty said; how do you account for that? Why, the Minister of Militia says, I will tell you a little secret. The Prime Minister of Canada suffers from what is known in Canada as the brain storm of autonomy, an insidious malady that soon possesses all the mental powers and consumes all the nobler parts thereof; and when it reaches that stage the victim has the hallucination that not only himself, but every body else is troubled with the brain storm of autonomy. And that, Sir, accounts for this resolution that they wont contribute anything. Now, I submit that in all probability the whole matter has been misrepresented to the British admiralty, that the resolution of this House unanimously passed has never been presented to the British admiralty, that we must begin de novo and ab initio the whole thing. Why, our minister of war did not know the resolution we passed. I can scarcely believe it; but when you look at the 'Hansard', and look at the revised edition, and look at the corrections of the whole thing revised down in the Printing Bureau, you will find that the man who is minister of war of this Dominion does not know the substance of a resolution that was passed in this House to change the whole relations of Canada with the British empire. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the brain storm of autonomy—we must have autonomy. Why, every one knows that it is absolutely impossible that we should have absolute autonomy and continue in the British empire. We hav'nt it now. We do not appoint the Governor General, he is appointed by the home government. We do not appoint the ambassadors to foreign courts to look after our business there. Talk about autonomy! What have we to do with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that decides the most important cases that arise in this country, interprovincial and between the Dominion and the different provinces and other important cases? We have nothing to say about the constitution of that court. So, Mr. Speaker, the only way we can get the autonomy from which the Prime Minister is suffering, is by separating from the British empire, that is absolutely certain. Talk about autonomy! Has the province of Ontario autonomy? Within a certain sphere she has autonomy; but when it comes to matters in which the whole Dominion of Canada is interested, then she has to submit to the people of the whole country. Has British Columbia to-day, sending a majority of Conservatives to this House, and Manitoba with a majority, and Ontario with a majority—have we autonomy, that is, have we a right to govern ourselves as we please? Not by any means. Why? Because we belong to the Dominion of Canada, we are part of the Dominion of Canada, and we have to submit to the majority of the people of Canada. And if we belong to the British empire, if we desire to enjoy the privileges and rights of British subjects, we cannot have perfect autonomy, it is utterly impossible. We have autonomy within a certain sphere, we have not absolute autonomy, and we cannot have it without absolute independence.

Then they talk about taxation. Why, I read to you a few moments ago that Sir John A. Macdonald made a motion that we should send to the British government at the time of the Crimean war $100,000. That was a greater sum to Canada then than $20,000,000 is now. How did it affect our autonomy? Have we had autonomy since, or have we been slaves of the British government ever since, because we voluntarily sent them $100,000? We sent $50,000 to France in aid of the flood sufferers; we sent $100,000 to San Francisco for the sufferers from the earthquake; we sent $100,000 to Sicily, without violating the great principle of autonomy; but we cannot send a dollar to assist the British navy without violating autonomy. England is contributing now $1,250,000 a year to assist Australia in building a large navy. British statesmen do not seem to understand anything about autonomy. They ought to come over here and get a few lessons from

the Prime Minister of this country. When I listen to our friends on the other side from the province of Quebec speaking on this subject, I do not understand much what they say, but I can catch the word 'autonomy'. Sir Wilfrid has an idea that there will be trouble over the question of autonomy. I noticed to-day one of these gentlemen talking about taxation without representation. There is another thing. Why, this amendment was put into this resolution for the very purpose of allowing us to make a contribution to the British navy.

I promised my hon. friends opposite that I would give them some more information from the 'Globe' and I want to keep that promise because I think it may have some influence upon their votes. Here is what the 'Globe' said on March 31, last:

While the British fleet is master of the channel no European fleet could be a serious menace to the shores of Canada. . . . In the day of trial the all-important aim would be to make the imperial fleet so strong that the issue of a combat would not be doubtful.

On the day the resolution was passed, March 29, last, the 'Globe' said:

There can be no resisting the conviction, in view of these facts, that the mother country will accept the aid of her colonies at this time of crisis with thankful enthusiasm. Nothing is so likely to bring the mad competition to a stop as a conviction on the part of Germany that it is hopeless. In such case the colonies will be conferring a boon on the German taxpayers as well as on the British. We are not of those who believe that an invasion of Britain just now is feasible. That is not the danger. The danger lies in the future, when the German fleet would have arrived at a pitch of strength when there would be no need for evasion. There would be a direct challenge to a trial of strength, and if the German admiral prevailed, the British empire, as now constituted, would be at an end. English, Scotch and Irish valour would be of little avail. The islands would be beleaguered, their food supplies cut off and a surrender at discretion forced on them. That is a consummation which cannot be paltered with or derided, and while it is even remotely possible that every part of the empire must stand shoulder to shoulder in rendering it impossible.

I have another quotation from the 'Globe' on March 26 last, that will please these hon. gentlemen better. I want them to pay particular attention to this:

The sort of vessel that should be built is fixed by the circumstances. The competition now raging between Great Britain and Germany is in the direction of first-class battleships. If Canada were to build a little fleet of wasps and hornets it would have no moral effect on the situation at all. What we would like Canada to do would be to manifest by a veritable act that in this competition of the fleets she ranges herself proudly and gladly by the side of the mother country.

They were not in favour in those days of a fleet of wasps and hornets such as the present government is proposing to build.

I have another little extract from the 'Globe' that may be of interest to some of my hon. friends opposite. It was written some little time after the resolution was passed, viz.: April 7th last.

A good deal has been said about protecting the shores of the Dominion.

That is what our friends across the way are talking about now, protecting our coasts, protecting the coasts of British Columbia. They have some imaginary enemy over there on the Pacific who is going to attack British Columbia and they are proposing to send these wasps and hornets to repel that enemy.

A good deal has been said about protecting the shores of the Dominion. The only way to make our shores invulnerable is to make sure that the fleets which surround the British Isles are the unquestionable masters of the ocean.

That is the kind of material we want.

The only way to make our shores invulnerable is to make sure that the fleets which surround the British Isles are the unquestionable masters of the ocean. The moment she is in doubt, that moment Canada is in a position of danger.

Never mind the little wasps and hornets, the moment that British fleet in the North sea is in danger, Canada is in danger, if she has any love for the British empire and desires to remain in it.

The moment that is in doubt, that moment Canada is in a position of danger, and any vessel or vessels that the Canadian people could provide for shore defence would be but a feeble barrier against the foreign fleet or fleets that gained the mastery. The question which the admiralty should be asked to answer is: What can Canada do within her means that will be of most assistance to you? and that thing we believe the government is prepared to do with the backing of the whole people of Canada.

Still one more quotation from the 'Globe,' March 23rd last:

The Canadian people do not indulge an exaggerated opinion of what they can do to augment the mighty naval instrument which guards the integrity of the King's possessions. But if any rival nation is disposed to dispute the capacity of Britain to hold her supremacy at sea we should make it clear that in such a competition Canada is prepared to fling the smug maxims of financial prudence to the winds and do more than her share in the game of turning Dreadnoughts from the stocks. If the 65,000,000 of Germans have concluded that they can build more monsters of the deep than the 42,000,000 of Britishers, it is time that it should be brought to their attention that there are more Britishers than those in the British Isles. Plucky little New Zea-

and has had the honour of uttering the first reminder. The Dominion of Canada ought not to leave New Zealand long alone in that respect. Within the next two years the colonies of Britain should be able to place three Dreadnoughts at the disposal of the motherland—and they should do it.

The British admiralty was consulted and they told them first that in order to strengthen the British navy the best thing they could do would be to give some money, but the British admiralty very generously, when they found they would not give any money, said:

The various circumstances of the overseas Dominions ought to be borne in mind.

Yes, the various circumstances.

Their geographical position has subjected them to internal and external strains, varying in kind and intensity. Their history and physical environment have given rise to individual national sentiment, for the expression of which room must be found.

5. In the opinion of the admiralty, a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war.

6. Under certain conditions the establishment of local defence flotillas, consisting of torpedo craft and submarines, might be of assistance in time of war to the operations of the fleet, but such flotillas cannot co-operate on the high seas in the wider duties of protection of trade and preventing attacks from hostile cruisers and squadrons.

A scheme limited to torpedo craft would not in itself be a good means of gradually developing a self-contained fleet capable of both defence and offence.

First they asked for money and if money was not forthcoming then a fleet unit. The representatives of Canada refused to give them either. And then, these gentlemen say that the British admiralty approve of what they are doing. The British admiralty is composed of gentlemen, and when they asked for money and were told they would not get it, and when they asked for a fleet unit and the representatives of the Canadian government said they would not provide it, then they said: how much money are you going to spend, and the reply was: we do not mind spending £200,000 or £300,000 a year; and we are told the British admiralty expressed their approval of that. Of course; they were gentlemanly enough to say: we are very glad you are doing that much.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under that resolution we have a perfect right to give this contribution. Let me say a word about that resolution. Every member of the House knows the circumstances under which that resolution was passed, and I do not think it is quite honest or fair for gentlemen opposite to go throughout the country and make statements that are not consistent with the circumstances. As the hon. member for Jacques Cartier said, it was no time for any man to express a dissenting voice in this House; it was considered in the interests of the empire that a united proposition should go across the ocean, and so it went. We all know that the hon. members on the other side, many of them, did not approve of that resolution. We all know, because we were intimate with some of them, that many of them on the other side of the House to-day do not approve of the Naval Defence Bill. We know that one of them said at the beginning of this session that the whole matter would be reopened if they were allowed to do it. Yes, if they were allowed to do it; but they are not allowed to do it. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, Canada has never contributed a dollar to strengthen the British navy; it has never promised to contribute a dollar to strengthen the British navy. In 1907 the Prime Minister of Canada absolutely refused to do anything to strengthen the British navy. In 1907 the Prime Minister of Canada absolutely refused to do anything to strengthen the British navy. What do they propose to do? They propose to build a little fleet of wasps and hornets, as the 'Globe' says. And what will the Prime Minister do should war occur. Why, he has already told us he would go out and stump the province of Quebec and try to persuade his compatriots to jump upon the wasps and hornets as they were sailing down the St. Lawrence, and run across the ocean to the rescue of the motherland. As well might he try to persuade his compatriots to jump into the river St. Lawrence and swim across as induce them to go into the little wasps and hornets that the 'Globe' has described here. Mr. Speaker, the position of the government is a proposition that means interminable expenditure. We know that the British navy costs about $165,000,000 a year. Do we want to enter upon a project of that kind without taking into our confidence the people of this country? I used to object to this government having entered into a contract to construct the Transcontinental railway without consulting the people of Canada, but the cost of building the Transcontinental railway is but a drop in the bucket compared with the cost of building and maintaining a navy for ten years. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that for the protection we have already had from England during the 150 years she has been protecting us, even if we determine to build a navy now, for the protection we will have to get from her during the next twenty years while our navy is being constructed, it would be the part of honour, the part of self-respect for us to say: Here is $20,000,000 to assist you in rebuilding the

British navy at a cost of $1,000,000,000. This country became a part of the British empire 150 years ago, and when the inscription by slow dissipation from the monument guarding the height, shall have worn, Wolfe shall live in the hearts of a new generation, a watchword of freedom to ages unborn.

Mr. J. O. DUBEAU (Joliette). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in continuation of this debate, I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House for any length of time. No doubt I could abstain from expressing my opinion otherwise than by my vote on the important Bill which is now before us, but I do not wish to allow any one to think that, by my silence I attempted to shirk the responsibility of the task entrusted to me by my electors.

For that reason I desire to define and explain the position that I intend to take.

In the first place allow me to say that the effect of this Canadian Naval Service Bill will not be to commit our country to an exaggerated and ruinous militarism, but that it will only enable us to depend upon a reasonable protection. Let me also add that if we feel to-day that it is our duty to undertake the creation of a navy, just as we saw fit, fifty years ago to organize our militia, it is certainly not for offensive purposes, but altogether for defensive purposes, for I feel quite certain that no one in this House or in the country has any warlike desire. We all want peace and quietness such as we have enjoyed for several years back.

But although we are animated by these sentiments, I hold that it would be foolhardiness on our part to fall asleep with the thought that our safety is complete judging from past experience and from the lessons of history, rather than from the declarations of optimists who go about loudly proclaiming everywhere that we have no need of defence. I contend, with no less conviction, that the time has come when Canada must begin the organization of a naval service such as provided for in the Bill.

I need not repeat here that Canada occupies in the world a position of which we may well be proud. We have a trade superior to that of several European countries. Providence has endowed us with water-ways which foreigners envy us. Before many years, our harbours will be able to compete with the best harbours in America. We have thousands of miles of railways running through the country from one end to the other. We have splendid cities, a fertile soil, a thriving agriculture, with a population of seven millions boldly marching onward in the path of progress. And having obtained from England the right of making our treaties, we are enjoying the fullest autonomy. This means that we have laid the solid foundation of a nation in whose destinies we have faith.

But, as it has been said, the extension of a country is not its protection.

It is enough for us to have developed our country as we have done; we are also bound to protect Canada from any danger which a conflict of interests might suddenly give rise to.

With this end in view, it is most desirable that we should gradually improve our means of defence both on land and on sea. For never could a nation exist and maintain itself, without possessing the necessary means to protect its own territory, and its commerce, as well as the means of safeguarding its material power and its moral prestige.

Engrossed as we are with the development of the wealth and of the natural resources of our country, we should not try to elude the responsibilities and the duties which devolve upon us as a nation, for the defence and the protection of the rich patrimony we are enjoying.

So far we have incurred comparatively heavy expenditures in order to place the country in a state of defence. We have started the organization of a permanent militia. We have taken over the garrisoning of Esquimalt and Halifax. We have built armouries and drill sheds which are most useful to our militia. We have in the province of Quebec a first class small arm factory. We are instructing in the military art many citizens of this country and more particularly the youth of our country.

Therefore I may say without any hesitation that, on land Canada has generously discharged her duty.

But a country like ours, bounded by two oceans and with a double sea-shore thousands of miles long, needs not only a land force but also a navy to protect her coasts, her sea-ports and her trade.

It is with this end in view that the government are now proposing to begin in a wise and cautious manner the organization of our naval forces.

This measure which is essentially within the realm of the representatives of the people is but the natural complement of a policy formulated several years ago.

In fact, the question of the desirability of organizing our naval defence is by no means new or novel.

It has been dealt with on more than one occasion. When our ministers went over to London to take part in the imperial conference of 1902, in order to examine the issues of concern to the empire, they declared that the government had the intention of undertaking the organization of a navy. The report of that conference came

before this House the following year, and the result of the conference, as well as the position taken by our delegates, seemed to give satisfaction to the House.

Last year, the House unanimously agreed to a resolution embodying the policy formulated at the conference in connection with our naval defence.

But scarcely had the session been closed when some members of the opposition began denouncing the policy unanimously agreed to by this House, on the 29th of March last. And now in this House they are still directing their criticism and their attacks against this Bill respecting the Canadian naval service, although that Bill only aims at carrying out a policy which they approved of last year and the fundamental principle of which is laid down in the British North America Act, as well as in the Militia Act revised in 1893, and included in our Revised Statutes of 1906.

Why this change of attitude, if not for this reason, that the opponents of the government, on this question as on many other issues, are loath to depart from their favourite tactics consisting in preaching a different policy in the several parts of the country.

So it is that in the province of Quebec, they oppose the Bill on naval defence, under the pretense that it leads us to imperialism; while in the west and in Ontario our opponents denounce this Bill as at variance with the suggestions of the British admiralty and with our duty to the empire.

In Toronto as in Winnipeg, they tell the people that the Laurier government is disloyal to the empire, while in the province of Quebec they denounce Sir Wilfrid Laurier as a traitor to his race and as ready to sacrifice that race in order to take part in the wars of the empire.

But in spite of those appeals to prejudice and to popular feelings, the electors of Canada know very well how to appreciate the attitude of both parties and they endorse the truly Canadian policy laid down by the government in that matter.

The organization of a Canadian naval service is a measure which is called for by the development of the country.

Fifty years ago, we laid down the foundations of our militia. Its beginnings were unpretending indeed; but it went on gradually developing itself and to-day its usefulness and efficaciousness are questioned by nobody.

Why should we not do for our navy what we did for our militia?

Other countries which are not considerable nor wealthier than Canada and whose population is not so large as ours, such as the South American republics, have their own navy. Why should we not also have a navy of our own?

In virtue of what law are we to be dispensed from taking the means resorted to by other countries for their protection on land and on sea?

Is it the Monroe doctrine which thus warrants us in derogating to the general rule?

Does that doctrine warrant us in relying upon an efficacious protection on the part of the United States? It would indeed be sheer nonsense or recklessness on our part to look exclusively for security and protection, in time of war, in that ill-defined and vague doctrine which might perhaps never apply to Canada.

But even were that doctrine to apply, national self-respect and our personal interest should warn us to beware of accepting that doctrine as our only protection, because that doctrine is incompatible with our national development and with our notions of autonomy.

In fact, not only would it be humiliating for Canada to have to appeal for aid to the United States, but the practical result might be still more disastrous.

At what cost to us would not the United States give us that protection, and might they not demand that we should abandon to them a portion of our territory or that we should concede to them certain exorbitant privileges.

If we cannot rely on the Munroe doctrine for the defence of our country, we cannot either rely solely upon the protection of England.

In many cases, England could not come to our assistance, were she anxious to do so; for, to give an instance, she might be called upon to meet an enemy attempting to attack her in the very heart of the empire. Besides, the great distance at which she is from Canada and the risks and perils of the sea are so many obstacles that England might be powerless to overcome, at a given moment.

Therefore, we cannot leave to England alone the task of protecting our territory, our sea ports, our trade, our institutions, our homes, in short, our country. We have to find, in a confederation like ours, the elements of our defence, on sea as well as on land.

Such was the opinion held by Sir George Etienne Cartier, at the time of confederation, and as early as 1864, he formulated his programme in these words:—

> Another consideration of the greatest importance is the defence of the country. As we are now, a province cannot ask another province for assistance, in case of attack; but with confederations, we shall have an army of 300,000 men and a navy of 60,000.

The words I have just quoted go to show that this project of a marine is by no means an innovation, as it was referred to

as early as the beginning of the era of confederation, and we find moreover that Cartier himself was in favour of the creation of such a navy, as he declares that it was one of the considerations which induced him to ask for the establishment of confederation.

Therefore, by contributing the policy of the government on that question and in repeating everywhere the statement made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier at Lachine, that Canada stands in no need of a navy, the opponents of the government in the province of Quebec abandon the traditions of that great statesman, Sir George Etienne Cartier, while professing on every occasion to be his disciples.

But while, in the province of Quebec, the opponents of the government attack the naval defence Bill as inopportune and contrary to our autonomy, in the other provinces, the policy of the government on that question is being denounced, because we keep the control of the fleet and refuse to place immediately at the disposal of England a sufficient sum for the purchase of two Dreadnoughts.

But all those so-called objections to the policy of the government are refuted by each other.

In fact, while in the province of Quebec, the adversaries of the government oppose the establishment of a naval service, because they pretend that we should not then have the control of our navy, which would be under the direction of the British Admiralty in the other provinces, they attack the Bill now under consideration, because it enables the Canadian government to prevent the naval forces of Canada from acting in concert with those of the empire, in time of war.

While in the province of Quebec, the adversaries of the government claim that we are in no need of naval defence, that there is no impending danger, in the other provinces, they pretend that war is on the eve of breaking out in England, and that we should immediately place at the disposal of the imperial authorities a sum of at least $20,000,000, for the purchase of two Dreadnoughts, in order to guarantee the supremacy of England.

In short, while the opponents of the government ask for a plebiscite and want the people to be consulted as to the expenditure of about $15,000,000 for the construction of a fleet they are disposed to pay immediately into the imperial exchequer, without any previous consultation of the people, a sum of from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000, and even a great deal more.

In face of the diametrically opposed attitude of the government and of the opposition, I need hardly adduce any further arguments to destroy that legend which they are endeavouring to spread throughout the province of Quebec, to the effect that this Bill is but the result of a compromise between the right hon. the prime minister and the hon. the leader of the opposition.

If both have approved, as did the whole House, the resolution of the 29th March, 1909, it is quite evident to-day that the hon. the leader of the opposition, is supporting to-day by the amendments he has submitted, a policy different from that of the government.

Having to make a choice under such circumstances, between the government's Naval Bill and the suggestions coming from the opposition, I have not the slightest hesitation in giving my support to the government measure. I feel satisfied that such a policy is an absolute safeguard to our autonomy, that it is in conformity with our national aspirations, and that it will be approved of entirely not only by the great majority of the people of the county which I have the honour to represent, but also by a majority of the voters in this country.

I may add and it is, I think, to the honour of the electors of the county of Joliette to whom I, as in duty bound, explained the principal points of the policy formulated in the resolution of the 29th March, 1909, which the government is now implementing, that these explanations were favourably received in the different parishes of the county where meetings were held.

In voting as I propose to do at the end of this debate, I feel secure in the continued confidence of my constituents and in the execution of a duty as a Canadian and a British citizen.

Mr. JAMES J. DONNELLY (South Bruce) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.33 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 3, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

SALE OF LAND TO W. F. CROSBIE.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

In reference to the cancelling of the sale of the northeast ¼ section of section 11, township 1, range 9, which W. F. Crosbie bought at the school lands sale held at Manitou on the 30th May, 1907, has the $208 Mr. Crosbie

paid on this land been refunded to him or any portion of the $208? If so, what amount and when?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

No, this money was not refunded. The sale was cancelled at Mr. Crosbie's own request as he did not wish to complete the purchase at the price paid; and under the regulations of the department the money could not be refunded.

TIMBER SALE, GIANT'S TOMB ISLAND.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR:

1. Were tenders called for the sale of the maple, beech, basswood, birch and hemlock timber of nine inches and upwards at the stump on Giant's Tomb island, Georgian bay, in the year 1908?

2. If so called, in what newspapers was the advertisement published?

3. What was the date of the issue of the advertisement, and what time was allowed for tendering?

4. Was an estimate of the above different kinds of timber on the said island made prior to sale? If so, what was the date of the report, and by whom was the same made?

5. If a report was made, what quantities of timber of the above different kinds respectively was it estimated there were on the said island, and the value per thousand of same?

6. How many tenders were received, if any, the names of tenderers, amounts tendered, and name of successful tenderer?

7. If sold under said sale, has any cutting yet been done thereunder or payments made therefor?

8. Is any time fixed under contract of sale for removal of timber?

9. Did any of the parties tendering receive reports from the department as to the estimate by the department of quantities of timber?

10. Did the Indians ask to have the sale effected? If so, when?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes.

2. The 'Globe,' Toronto, two insertions; the Collingwood 'Bulletin,' Collingwood, two insertions; the Hamilton 'Times,' Hamilton, two insertions; the Meaford 'Monitor,' Meaford, two insertions; the 'Free Press,' Midland, two insertions; the 'Era,' Newmarket, two insertions; the 'Sun,' Owen Sound, three insertions; the Penetanguishene 'Herald,' Penetanguishene, two insertions.

3. Date of advertisement, 4th September; tenders receivable up to 1st October, 1908, at noon.

4. Yes. The report was dated 1st of May, 1900, and was made by the timber inspector of the department.

5. Estimated quantities of timber, and value including dues—Beech, 2,457,000 feet board measure at $2, $4,915.20; Maple, 720,000 feet board measure at $3, $2,160; Basswood and birch, 259,200 feet board measure at $2, $518.40; Hemlock and other woods, 500,000 feet board measure at $2, $1,000. Total, $8,593.60.

6. Two tenders were received, namely—D. S. Pratt, $3,600 bonus; The C. Beck Manufacturing Company, $3,750 bonus. The tender of the Beck Company, being the higher, was accepted. In addition to the bonus of $3,750, the company is to pay dues on timber cut according to tariff, which, on estimated quantities referred to in answer No. 5, should amount to $6,014.30, making a total of $9,764.30.

7. The bonus was duly paid and the ground rent and renewal fee have been paid to 30th April, 1909, but no returns of cutting have been received. It is assumed that no cutting has been done.

8. No time has been fixed for the removal of the timber.

9. No.

10. The Indians surrendered this island, along with others, for sale, on the 5th of June, 1856.

EXPORTS OF PRODUCTS.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

In reference to the Weekly Report of February 28, 1910, in which it states that the agricultural products exported were as follows:

1906..	$57,586,509
1907..	45,298,791
1908..	43,217,374
1909..	44,908,119

What are the different products included in this, and the amount of each exported in the four years named?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The information as published in the Weekly Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce referred to, is misquoted in the question put by the hon. member for Lisgar. The figures given in the question are the exports of animal produce, and not of agricultural products. In any case the information is too voluminous to be given in the form of an answer; it should be asked for in a return.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. J. J. DONNELLY (South Bruce). Mr. Speaker, it is now one month since the First Minister moved the second reading of this Bill, and during a very considerable portion of that month the time of the House has been taken up by hon. members who have dwelt at great length upon subjects which had very little, if any connection with the question before the House.

Indeed, at times it appeared to descend to a contest between hon. members to see who could fill up the most space in 'Hansard'. There are 221 members in this House, and if each availed himself of the privilege of speaking at length upon every important subject submitted for our consideration, the result would be that little or no progress would be made in the transaction of public business. I quite realize that an hon. member who introduces a Bill, and perhaps three or four others who know something about it should go fully into the subject, but subsequent speakers might show some consideration for their fellow members and for the public. and make an effort to condense their remarks. If there is not some improvement in this respect, I believe, Sir, we will find it necessary to introduce a third chamber; a sort of hot air chamber where the two and three hour men may have an opportunity of giving vent to their pent up feelings without causing loss of time and great expense to the country. In order to be consistent I shall make my remarks very brief. If the Navy Bill that we are now considering, should become law it will entail an initial expenditure of some $15,000,000 for the purchase or construction of the proposed navy, and it will also entail an annual expenditure of some $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 for its upkeep and maintenance. We will also have a naval college and a Navy Department, which, while they add to the already long patronage list of the government, will also introduce a non-producing element in our population. I am not one of those who are at all times disposed to carp at every expenditure, but I believe that before entering into such an enormous project as this, which will require such a great outlay of public money we should carefully consider what results we are likely to obtain. As well as I can gather from the hon. members who have spoken in support of this Bill, when this proposed navy comes into existence we will have two vessels of the Bristol type and two destroyers on the Pacific ocean, and two vessels of the Bristol type and four destroyers and the 'Niobe' on the Atlantic ocean. The avowed object of these warships will be to give us some naval protection. Well, if the days of the buccaneers had not passed into history there might be some justification for such a navy to guard our shipping from the depredations of modern Captain Kidds, but as a fighting force intended to compete with any of the existing navies which may attack our merchantmen or ocean ports, these ships would be utterly useless. We are told by some of the leading Liberal organs that these vessels will be so constructed that they will have considerable speed and be capable of eluding pursuit. That is a very fortunate thing, because if the smoke of one hostile Dreadnought appeared on the horizon they would be obliged to exhibit their speed in beating a hasty retreat, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a run away navy of that kind is a poor return for our money and not much of a credit to Canada. We have heard a good deal about the 'Niobe' which we are told will head the Atlantic squadron, and perhaps it would be as well to let hon. gentlemen know what kind of ship the 'Niobe' is, as described in yesterday's Montreal 'Star' which says:

> H.M.S. 'Niobe' is Severely Criticised—Useless as a Fighting Ship, declares 'Pall Mall Gazette' To-day—Most of her class suffer badly from Boileritis, says same Authority.
>
> (By Special Cable from our own Correspondent.)
>
> London, March 2.—(Copyright.)—Some naval authorities speak with contempt of the cruiser 'Niobe,' which the Canadian government have purchased from the admiralty. The 'Pall Mall Gazette' says: 'The 'Niobe' is one of the Belleville-boilered protected cruisers of the Diadem class. As fighting ships they are useless, and always were, being inadequately armed and armoured. Most of these cruisers have suffered badly from boileritis at one time or another, and have cost much in repairs.
>
> She is now doing duty as the flagship of the third division of the home fleet at Devonport, but will shortly be sent to Canada, taking out with her officers and petty officers, who are to act as instructors to the Canadian navy.
>
> WINDERMERE.

We will, therefore, have at the head of our navy a vessel which on account of her defective boilers is unseaworthy, a vessel which was launched about eleven years ago and which is now of an obsolete type. Now, Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with those who feel that a proper consideration for the British taxpayer, as well as a proper sense of self-respect, should incite us to assist in some way in the maintenance and upkeep of the British navy. For the past 100 years our Canadian sea-borne commerce has depended for its protection entirely upon the British navy, and with all due respect to the proposed Canadian navy, I think Canadian shipping will, for many years to come, have to depend on the protection of the same historic navy. The argument is sometimes advanced that in the past our shipping has not required any protection; but, Mr. Speaker, the undoubted fact is that if no protection were needed, it is because the sea-going commerce of Canada had behind it at all times the support and prestige of British men-of-war. Canada is a comparatively young country, a country of vast undeveloped resources. If any hon. members of this House believe that without the security which we enjoy as part of the British empire, we would be permitted to go on and develop this young

country, I, for my part, do not share in that belief. For my part, I am most anxious that we should continue as part of the British empire. In this country all classes, all races, and I might say all creeds, enjoy a freedom and liberty such as they would not get under any other conditions. Our continuation as a part of the British empire, the continuation of the British empire itself, depends upon the supremacy of the British navy being maintained. Of the 400,000,000 people who make up the British empire only about 40,000,000 reside within the shores of the British Isles. The different portions of the empire are divided by vast stretches of ocean, and without the protection of the British navy, the ocean routes connecting the different parts of the British empire would be under the control of the enemy, and if the oversea supply of food were cut off from Great Britain, she would be brought under subjection in a very short time.

In advocating the giving of assistance to the British navy, I am not doing so with the expectation that that navy will be used on the offensive. I do it rather in the belief that we cannot have a better guarantee for general peace than the supremacy of the British navy. During this debate a good deal of reference has been made to the rapid manner in which the German people are increasing their naval power. I do not see that we have very much ground for complaint on that score. So long as the present conditions exist and until that happy day arrives when the differences between nations will be settled by arbitration, I believe the German people are quite justified in increasing the strength of their navy as rapidly as their resources permit. But our interest lies in the maintenance of Great Britain in her present position of supremacy so far as naval power is concerned. We seek no war with Germany. Many of the residents of this country, particularly in western Ontario, are of German origin; and for my part, as one who has had many opportunities of mingling and dealing with the German people, I must say frankly that whether, as farmers or manufacturers, or in any other occupation, they are very desirable citizens. As a class in this country, they have no superior. As residents of Canada, I believe them to be loyal British subjects; and should Britain be attacked, no matter whence that attack may come, I believe they would be ready to do their share in the defence of the empire. They are an industrious and progressive people, possessed of keen business instincts, and these instincts, as nearly as I can gather, cause them to object to the expenditure of the resources of this country in the creation of such a hide and go seek navy as is provided for by this Bill. Briefly speaking, I do not consider that our present resources would enable us to build an efficient navy, and in my opinion a weak navy is still worse than none at all. Our resources, however, are rapidly increasing, and the time will come when we shall be in a position to build an effective navy; but until that financial condition is reached, which will enable us to place a complete fleet unit on the Pacific and another on the Atlantic, such as we might look to, with some assurance, for naval defence, and such as would be capable of giving some assistance to Great Britain in time of stress, and further, until such time as the people of this country have had an opportunity to consider this question, and give the government of the day some mandate with regard to it, I think we should not undertake to build the navy.

I have always found it good doctrine to trust in the people and they will trust you. I think the government should consult the people in some way before imposing on them the heavy burden of a navy. In the meantime I believe we should give such voluntary assistance to the motherland as will show that we are British citizens, not in name only, but in fact, and that, so long as we enjoy the privileges of British citizenship, we are willing to accept the responsibility which attaches to that citizenship.

Mr. G. A. TURCOTTE (Nicolet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would not venture to take up at this moment the valuable time of the House, of which others might make a better use, were it not for the constant feeling that I owe to my constituents, to my political associates, and to the country in general, some explanation as to the vote I intend to give on the question now engrossing to such a degree the Canadian public mind.

Last year, when the government submitted their resolution of March 29, as regards the part Canada should take towards the defence of the empire, I was well aware of the responsibility incurred by those who would openly state their outspoken opinion under the circumstances. I knew that the whole Canadian people were awaiting with anxiety the verdict of their representatives on this question of the navy, one of the most burning and momentous in its consequences. And above all, I knew that in opening my mouth in this House to express conscientiously and openly an opinion adverse to the resolution, at any rate as a matter of expediency, I was running the risk of being made a target for the protests and sharp criticisms of those whose minds are overheated by imperialism. However, being anxious of fulfilling my duty and relying on the unalienable right of the man who under such solemn circumstances hies to the voice of his conscience, I stood up for the first time

in this Canadian parliament and stated that at the present juncture, in a young country such as ours, we should apply our energy to other purposes than the creation of a navy, that we had other struggles to enter into than those settled by means of powder and guns. For human activity, constantly developing, requires from civilized nations numerous and violent efforts towards higher destinies, great and further sacrifices towards attaining their full development.

Those statements have been construed as an expression of opinion adverse to the establishment of a war navy. Now, sir, I repudiate that charge, and I say that never have I expressed such an opinion, neither in my speech of March 29, neither in private conversation; I merely questioned the desirability of creating such a navy at a time when our national expansion was only in its incipient stage and when so many gigantic undertakings, which cannot be dispensed with, were awaiting for their carrying out strenuous efforts on the part of the Canadian people. I believed and still believe that the wave of feverish patriotism, swollen by chimerical fears within the empire, and which has swept over our peaceful country, would pass away and that very soon the minds of the people, having recovered their composure, we would be at liberty to resume the race towards progress and development, without the burden of militarism which is weighing so heavily on the nations of Europe, and I might say on the whole world.

The imperial conference has taken place, and two Canadian ministers, whose high ability and attainments I have pleasure in recognizing, represented our country and vindicated the rights of the Dominion with a talent and energy worthy of admiration under circumstances so difficult and ticklish. As a result of that conference it was decided that Canada would build a navy to help in the defence of our coasts and the protection of our fisheries, that such navy, while autonomous and exclusively Canadian in its creation, armament and object, would co-operate with the British fleet whenever the people of this country deemed it desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I am in no way receding from the position that it would have been of more advantage to the country, and, in my humble opinion, more in harmony with the great principles of the Liberal party, to defer for some time yet the building of such a navy. I say in all seriousness that I would have felt a patriotic joy at seeing the people's money used for some other purpose. I would have rejoiced at seeing the Liberal party continue favouring the marvellous power of expansion with which the Canadian nation is endowed, continue developing the immense resources of the country, continue guiding and helping on the people on the safe way to moral and material progress, and maintaining harmony, concord and peace, sure pledges of prosperity and happiness.

However, since the question is to-day on the point of taking a new turn, and the proposal of a navy on the point of being carried out, the issue assumes still greater importance, and it is incumbent on us, representatives of the people, to take a decided and firm attitude and give or refuse our consent to the measure. In certain quarters, and from motives of despicable party interests, it is loudly proclaimed that the province of Quebec is altogether opposed to the establishment of a navy, and our accusers even go so far as to charge us with disloyalty. I am bound to protest and to protest energetically against such vile and unfounded aspersions cast upon the French people of Canada. Do those who launch such charges ignore how deeply is rooted in the French heart those feelings of honour which manifest themselves when occasion requires by deeds of uprightness, bravery and loyalty? The loyalty of the French Canadians to the British Crown needs no further proof, and the heroic deeds which they accomplished in the service of the foster motherland fill the pages of our history. These words, I rest assured, will find an echo in the hearts of my fellow-citizens who occupy seats around me in this House, and those unfair and foolish clamours, intended as an insult to the French Canadian name, will be met with universal scorn.

I have then no hesitation in saying that the French Canadians are primarily loyal to the country they live in, to the land of their birth, and wherein they labour and earn their families' livelihood. More than anything else, they have at heart the interests and greatness of their country; and I believe I am the faithful interpreter of the feelings of my fellow-citizens at this juncture, and that I am stating an actual fact when I say that this question of the navy interests them almost wholly from the view-point of Canada's interests and future. In agreeing to the proposal now before the House, they are desirous of protecting their own homes, safeguarding our rights, and the honour of the Canadian flag. Who will say that is criminal? In loving and defending Canada, is it not a part of the empire that they are loving and defending?

I intend supporting the present policy of the government, because the more, in my humbe opinion, we assert our national existence, the more we approach the state of national perfection and the closer we get to the status of independence. And I trust that such a status will be conceded to us while we continue to enjoy the present

political system, the most perfect to my mind.

Timorous or narrow-minded men, blinded by an unconquerable fanatacism will possibly take exception to such an expression of opinion; but to set their mind at ease, I beg of them to listen to a few words of explanation, and, in the first place, to remember that a rather small group of English-speaking people settled on this American continent one day wished to be free, gloriously shook off her yoke and broke by the force of arms the ties which united them to the mother country, England.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in one of his outpours of sarcasm, taunted the right hon. leader of the Liberal party for having in bygone days advocated independence for Canada. I fail to see there anything objectionable, anything which could justify the taunts of the deputy leader of the opposition. Is it not proper and fair to acknowledge that the Canadian people gravitates towards and aspires after a state of perfect development, complete maturity, which cannot be, after all, anything but independence, if not annexation. Has not that Dominion of Canada, with her great natural resources, her railways, her canals, her numerous manufactures and her traffic, her fine merchant navy, her intelligent population, sprung from the two finest races in the world, has not that Dominion, I say, enough reliance in the vitality, the energy of her people, in their intelligence and morality, in the strength of her judicial and parliamentary institutions, in her leaders to wish for and obtain a political status more perfect and more in harmony with the aspirations of her citizens?

Do we not read in the annals of the world that colonies of great nations, after attaining their perfect development have separated from the mother country, and become independent nations? Do we not see the same thing going on in the family, which is a complete social organism by itself. Nay, does not nature itself make it the law of being deprived of reason? The people of the United States, in an outburst of admirable philanthropy—a fact worthy of being inscribed in golden letters on the tablets of history—have given proof of their greatness and loftiness of mind, of their moral and intellectual progress, by conceding to the Spanish colonies their independence, thereby proclaming to the civilized world that independence is the supreme privilege of a nation.

Let me quote as regards that question of the independence of Canada, the opinion of men whose ability and experience in political matters compare favourably with those of the fiery tribune of the opposition, the hon. member or North Toronto:

The Montreal 'Post' on independence.—There is no use in disguising the matter. The time has come, if not for Canadian independence, at least for full and free discussion on a subject fraught with so much that is important to Canada. It cannot be frowned down; its advocates must be heard, and heard with the same amount of attention bestowed on the statesmen, who, in their generation, were instrumental in bringing about such changes as those involved in the abolition of the seigniorial tenure, secularization of the clergy reserves, confederation and the national policy.

If leading journals such as the 'London Times,' 'Daily News,' 'Standard,' and 'Pall Mall Gazette,' thought fit to discuss the question of Canadian independence, why should Canadian organs of public opinion who are much more interested in the matter—who are vitally interested in the matter—be debarred from following their example? And here may be the proper place to remark that while not one public man in Canad that we know of, and certainly not of any newspaper of any influence, has suggested the advisability of annexation to the United States—a great many of them favour independence. The late hon. Mr. Howe, of Nova Scotia, Sir A. T. Galt, the hon. Mr. Huntington, the hon. Wm. McDougall and many others of our most distinguished men have at different times pronounced themselves in favour of Canadian independence, but none of them ventured to pronounce the word annexation.

Canadian Emancipation 1880.

We know that Mr. Gladstone, in 1870, advocated the separation of the colonies from the empire, and at the same time the right hon. W. E. Foster said: 'The common belief is that Canada must some day become independent. This common idea will become one of those which realize themselves.' Now we do not believe that those men changed their sentiments since then.

Leading British statesmen favour Canadian independence.—Mr. Huskisson, colonial secretary, said: 'He thought the time had come for the separation of Canada from the mother country, and an assumption of an independent state.'

Lord Howick said: 'There could be no doubt that in time all our foreign colonies would become independent of the mother country. Such an event was certain, and we ought in time to prepare for the separation not by fortifying Canada, but by preparing her to become independent.'

Mr. Cobden said: 'There will be no repetition on our part of the policy of 1776 to prevent our North American colonies from pursuing interests in their own way. The Earl of Ellenborough said: 'He hoped the government would communicate with the North American colonies with the view to separation.'

Lord Brougham: 'He was one of those who desired a separation of Canada from the mother country. The idea was not novel; it had been entertained and pressed by many eminent men. It was an opinion shared in by Lord Ashburton and Lord St. Vincent.

A member of the House of Commons on a recent occasion declared: 'that the relation between Canada and Britain was rotten and

mutually deceptive.' A cabinet minister said: 'He looked forward without apprehension and without regret to the separation of Canada from England.' In 1864 Lord Derby, a former leader of the great Conservative party in England, said: 'In British North America there is a strong movement in progress in favour of federation, or, rather, union of some shape. We know that these countries must before long, be independent states.'

Mr. Gladstone, when leader of the British government, in 1870, in advocating the separation of these colonies from the empire said that: 'The present government do not claim the credit of adopting or introducing any new policy, and persons of authority of every shade of politics have adopted it.'

Mr. Lowe in a recent speech in parliament said: 'We should represent to Canada that it is perfectly open to her to establish herself as an independent republic; it is our duty, too, to represent to her that if, after well-weighed consideration, she thinks it more to her interests to join the great American republic itself, it is the duty of Canada to deliberate for her own interests and happiness.

Lord Grey in the House of Lords in 1870, said: 'The principles laid down by succesive colonial secretaries must necessarily lead to a dissolution of the British empire.'

Lord Russell said: 'If the North American colonies felt themselves able to stand alone, and showed their anxiety either to form themselves into an independent country, or even to amalgamate with the United States, he did not think it would be wise to resist that desire.'

Hon. Joseph Howe, when in England, heard a noble marquis say: 'Those British Americans may go and set up for themselves to the United States, and no power will be used to prevent them.' 'Not a man rose to contradict this statement.'

Lord Monck, our late Governor General, said, from his place in the House of Lords: 'It is in the interests of the mother country that Canada should be taught to look forward to independence. He believed that the policy of the government tended towards such independence, and it was on that account that he gave the government his support.' He alleged that the tie which connects Canada with Britain was a mere sentimental one, that the connection had ceased its uses, and that the colonial relations to Britain were dissolved when the confederation was consummated, and that the true mission of Canada was to proclaim its independence.

Sir George Campbell said: 'Canada has grown to maturity. I would let it go free without more delay, and would relieve this country of the many embarrassments to which the connection may give rise. Canada, I believe to be, under present arrangements, a burden and a risk to us.'

The Right Hon. W. E. Foster said: 'The common belief is that Canada must some day become independent, and this common idea will become one of those which realize themselves.'

Surely, these are weighty opinions and quite favourable to the idea of independence; they were given expression to by Englishmen occuying positions of responsibility in the social and political world, and whose testimony should forestall the extravagant and flighty utterances of our fiery loyalists. The right hon. Prime Minister is, as a matter of fact, in complete harmony with representative and prominent men in the British empire, and that circumstance, to my mind, should make up for the great sorrow he might feel at finding himself differing on that question from the hon. member for North Toronto. The latter hid his face for shame in the course of his speech, and cried for scandal at thinking that a Canadian had been so bold as to express the hope that his country might some day become independent. He should now show a face reddening with anger, he should shrivel up with indignation at hearing or mediating over the propositions quoted above in connection with independence, and which have been advocated by the best men and the most brilliant statesmen of Great Britain.

Independence seems to be, in some quarters, a scarecrow, the nightmare of those in whose eyes the interests of Canada are of little account and who reserve their love and loyalty for the empire. But, I put the question to these hon. gentlemen: Will not Canada sooner or later have to choose between annexation and independence? Are we destined to remain a colony forever, and should not the true Canadian, who really loves his country above all, have the rightful ambition of seeing it one day free and independent? It ill becomes politicians of many years experience, who have witnessed the succession of great events and political changes which are today consigned in the annals of the country, who have seen the nation grow, and are cognizant of its vigour and immense resources, it is not patriotic nor loyal, I say, on the part of these men to set obstacles in the way of the full development of our political organization, and to contend that we must remain forever under the protection of the British flag. But, thank God, I am satisfied it will not be so, and the establishment of a war navy will in my humble opinion, be the last step towards independence.

That is the view I take more particularly, and I might say exclusively, when giving my support to the Liberal policy at this juncture. I speak from the Canadian point of view, and I think that my viewpoint is also that of the greater number of electors in my constituency, and I would even say of the majority of electors in the province of Quebec.

I mentioned a moment ago opinions which have been given expression to by representative Britishers, and it would be an easy matter to quote others in the same strain. Are these men all traitors to their country? They would be in the estimation

of the hon. deputy chief of the opposition, who, in a spirit of excessive and noisy loyalism, has in sharp and even insulting words taunted the Prime Minister of this country for being so bold as to wish independence for his country.

Young as we are as a people, we Canadians have a part, and a most important part, to play on this continent of America. We have as neighbours a people who under the folds of the flag of independence has made giant strides towards the topmost goal of modern civilization, and we should, following in their footsteps, direct our activity and our national energies towards attaining the same object, and accordingly be ready to meet any emergency.

Fortunately, we shall not be confronted with such obstacles as slavery and the terrible conflict between the North and the South which confronted them on the way to the full development of their civilization. Besides, there are in this country only two strong races, whose great moral, religious and intellectual characteristics have admirably prepared them for reaping the benefits of civilization. While in the United States various ethnical groups are to be found whose conflicting interests cannot be easily conciliated, with the result that progress is impeded through lack of unity in matters language, religious beliefs, customs, manners and ideals.

My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) in his eloquent and truly masterful speech which the whole House has admired and applauded, seems to think that independence is autopy, a dream never to be realized, and even more, making for a political status which would be directly inimical to the interests of the province of Quebec. I very much regret differing from my hon. friend on that point. He contended that independence was a danger for the province of Quebec, inasmuch as it might imperil the educational and religious previleges of its people. Now, has independence brought about such results in the United States? Is there a country in the world where religion and education are freer? Have ever any complaints in that respect been voiced by our co-religionists living there? A rather restricted French community settled in the south of the United States, have succeeded in maintaining their form of speech their manners and their religious beliefs though living under social and political conditions quite different from ours. The same may be said of the French Canadians in the eastern States. We French Canadians, compose a homogeneous and extensive provincial group, showing great zeal for and attachment to their church and institutions.

Besides, my hon. friend's contention might be taken as impugning the spirit of tolerance of our English speaking fellow-citizens, and that I cannot agree to. That status of independence which its opponents always consider as necessarily linked with violent separation from England, could to my mind be brought about in altogether different fashion, that is in a peaceable way and with the consent of the British authorities. There has existed in the mother country for several years past, a strong movement for the abandonment of Canada. The measure of independence which we have acquired up to date, we have secured without any clash or measures of violence, and I think we might succeed in attaining complete independence very peacefully and without any friction. Indeed, do we require much more than we have at present to be perfectly independent. All that is required is the consent of Great Britain. We are allowed to negotiate our own treaties, and the powers of the Governor General nowadays amount to very little. I shall quote from page 121 of a book entitled 'Canadian Emancipation,' wherein Sir A. Galt is made to speak as follows:

> Sir Alexander states that the relations of Canada to the empire have been put on a new basis of semi-independency; that we have entered on a new departure. The Governor General is no more a connecting link between Great Britain and the Dominion, he is simply the administrator of the confederation. Sir A. T. Galt has assumed, in his place, all the higher duties of representing the interests of Canada at the Court of St. James, of negotiating all arrangements between the two countries. In fact, our High Commissioner is the only person now authorized to address the imperial government, as well as to enter into relations with foreign nations, as the appointed representative of the Dominion of Canada. Our High Commissioner assumes at once the rank and duties of a diplomatic envoy, while the Governor General remains a simple employee of the colonial office, the official head of the government of Canada.

The various phases through which our political status has passed, leading providentially to independence, are, if I am not mistaken, as follows: The union of upper and lower Canada, confederation, the Militia Bill, the appointment of a high commissioner in London, the granting of the treaty-making privilege, and finally the Navy Bill.

The prospect of independence, is a matter of great rejoicing to me, as I perceive it will be for the happiness of my country, and I trust that in the near future England, whose generosity will expand with the progress of civilization and who will realize the desirability of lightening the task of watching over her immense dominions, will grant us our independence. The history of all great empires will repeat itself. Independence sums up the highest aspirations of a people who wishes to assert himself, to act

untrammelled and take its place under the sun in company with its fellow people.

There are any number of cases which go to prove that independence is the natural destiny of colonies of great empire and powers ruling over great dominions outside the realm proper. At the close of the last century, the United States of America set the example of emancipation and proclaimed themselves independent on July 4, 1776. Then we have the emancipation of the Spanish colonies. Spain having been weakened through her wars with France, her colonies took occasion of it to proclaim themselves independent, Argentina in 1810, Bolivia in 1825, Chili in 1810, Columbia and Venezuela in 1819, Mexico and Peru in 1821, Uruguay in 1820. In the meantime, the small republics of Central America were constituting themselvss and the last emancipation was that of Cuba on December 10, 1898.

Turkey has lost the greater number of her dominions in Europe, and among others Greece in 1821, and Bulgaria in 1909, not to speak of the other Balkan states. Crete has broken away and joined Greece; Egypt has become a British protectorate. At the time of the revolution, France lost the island of Hayti, which now comprises two republics very badly governed. The great republic of Brazil was once a Portuguese colony, but it was constituted into an empire in the interest of a branch of the royal family of Portugal. About ten years ago, the last Emperor, Pedro II, was dethroned and the republic proclaimed.

In ancient times Greece had a great number of colonies which the downfall of Athens caused to dwindle. Some of those colonies were powerful, and notably Carthage, a Phoenician colony which defied the Roman power. Rome in its turn had numerous colonies, and at the time of the great invasions, these colonies became independent. Even Great Britain was at one time nothing but a Roman colony. True the populations of those ancient colonies did not speak the same language as the inhabitants of the metropolis. An exception should be made for Gaul. In America, the settlers which have drifted away from their mother country still speak the language of the European countries whence they are sprung.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the question is sufficiently important and interesting just now to warrant at least one member of the House to speak favourably of it, and I may assure my fellow members, and especially our staunch loyalists, that it is not through disrespect for or suspicions towards the English nation or its illustrious Sovereign, who plays such a brilliant part in the working out of its destinies, that I take this stand; it is solely through love of country and loyalty to Canada.

The fears haunting the minds of the opponents of independence were in evidence at the time confederation was being discussed, and the influence of statesmen, particularly that wielded by Sir George Etienne Cartier, had to be exerted in order to dispel those fears. The latter expressed himself in the following terms:

> As to the objection that we cannot form a great nation, because Lower Canada is mainly French and Catholic, while Upper Canada is English and Protestant, and the maritime provinces made up of both elements, it is to my mind most trifling. Then again: Let us take for example the United Kingdom peopled by three great races...
>
> (Speech of Sir George Etienne Cartier on the Confederation bill, page 422.)

All that Sir George Etienne Cartier may have said on that chapter in favour of confederation, is applicable to independence bound with the same federal system which we are enjoying. It is not only because we are a colony within a kingdom ruled by a constitutional monarchy that our privileges are safeguarded; these privileges are linked with our very institutions, and these would be done away with under a status of independence.

Cartier in a speech to the people of Ottawa on May 25, 1867, spoke as follows:

> People in England are satisfied that, being acquainted with our needs better than any others, we should be left at liberty to govern ourselves and that the sanction of the British parliament should be a mere matter of form.

I was proud and happy to hear my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Wilson) though not entertaining the same views as myself in regard to independence, quote the remarkable utterances of his Grace Bishop Farthing, of Montreal, who solemnly asserts, and in no uncertain terms, the independence of the Anglican church of Canada. That illustrious prelate, speaking in the name of the churchmen of Canada stated that the Anglican church is and will remain independent of that of the United Kingdom. We are, he said, a daughter of the Church of England, but a daughter who wishes to be free in this Dominion and lead a separate existence; we are not to remain forever under the control and authority of the mother whose house we have left and for whom, nevertheless, we still have the greatest attachment. We are a national church, perfectly independent, and in the same way that the parliament of Canada speaks in the name of the nation, the general Synod of Canada speaks in the name and for the Anglican church of Canada, and I proclaim that church the most democratic in Christendom.

That statement has a great meaning in the mouth of an Englishman, endowed with a sacred mission. The inference is

clearly that, if independence has become a matter of necessity in religious matters, it is or will soon be a necessity in matters of less exalted though just as important order, politics.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of being called a nationalist, after my speech of last year in reference to the navy. Well, I am a nationalist, though not in the narrow sense ascribed to that word even in connection with politics. I intend working in the interests of the whole Canadian people without distinction of nationality. It does not behove a good and loyal citizen, under circumstances as momentous as these, to stump one particular province, with the view of boosting certain exclusive views, of working on the prejudices of the people, and of appealing to their racial feelings. That is doing most dangerous work, which is of a nature to mislead the people and set up race against race. All good citizens must know that the intimate union of the various races inhabiting the country, the maintenance of the best of feelings between them, constitute one of the surest pledges of the greatness and prosperity in any nation. I may mention boundaries diverse races live in harmony, in close union, and wherein such absurd and revolutionary teachings as we sometimes hear are never given expression to. Belgium especially should be mentioned; it presents to the world the remarkable, I was going to say, unique case of a nation weak in numbers, but strong, and great through constant and intelligent labour, through its vitality and the high order of intelligence of its leaders, who in all channels of human activity safely direct national energy.

Before letting the heart dictate what we are to do, we should let reason and intelligence have their say. We owe love and devotion to our fine province, but above all we should be loyal to our country, Canada. Let us meet our English-speaking fellow-citizens on every ground, and let us work hand in hand with them, in all things which duty dictates and circumstances require.

If there ever was a time when we who belong to the fine French race should show ourselves in our true light, that is generous and conscious of the duties incumbent on us as citizens of this country, it is just now. I am quite willing to be a nationalist, that is, to champion the rights and privileges of our race at all times and in all places, if those rights are imperilled or denied; but I do not intend being narrow and mean in my views, and thereby detract from the dignity of the French name, especially under circumstances such as these. One of the most sacred of those duties is surely to defend efficiently the country which is dear to us, since the nation's vitality and the state of our finances inspire us with sufficient confidence in our own resources. I may add that from an exclusively Canadian standpoint the providing of a war navy has become of absolute necessity if we wish to give some evidence of our aptness for a status of independence. At this stage of national expansion and vigour which we have reached, provided with a merchant navy of great importance, I might say one of the largest in the world, and navigating all seas, we should take the means to protect that fleet. For, being a nation within the empire, a title which we are proud to claim, it is incumbent on us to take the responsibility and assume the burden of safeguarding the integrity and liberty of our trade, by having a sufficient number of warships.

I am of opinion that every Canadian who takes an interest in the welfare and future of his country, whatever his nationality may be, should support the government in the present juncture, and should endeavour to spread the idea that having reached maturity as a people, we should have a navy of battleships which will indirectly help the empire while defending Canada. It must be admitted that so long as we remain a British colony the most vital interest of our country as well as the most brilliant prospect in days to come, will, as it were, be dependent on the success, the greatness and the glory of the British empire. But the day will come, and my most earnest desire is to see it reached when relying solely on our own strength, our own energy and our own resources, we will be at liberty, like the sister nations of free America, to proudly fulfil our destiny under the flag of independence.

The deputy leader of the Conservative party, who has undertaken the burdensome task of taking his friends out of the cold shades of the oposition in to the Eldorado of power, has endeavoured to throw as much discredit as he possibly could on the province of Quebec, through insinuations, reservations, false and malignant imputations. In long and impetuous sentences, wherein sarcasm and irony oftentimes were substitutes for weighty reasons; he made a mighty endeavour to minimize the effect of the speech of the right hon. the Prime Minister, and palliate the prestige of his opinion and his name. He even tried to represent as a traitor to the British Crown the leader of this House, whose name is uttered with respect and admiration throughout the whole world, and whose talents, I might say, whose genius has impressed the most eminent men of Europe with its power of conception and its soundness of judgment.

The great warhorse of our friends on the other side is loyalty, and one after the other these gentlemen get on their feet, and more or less openly charge the Canadians

of French origin with lacking more or less in loyalty. One might think that they are, forsooth, the vestals of that sacred fire, loyalty, devotion to the mother country. But when have the French Canadians ever shown disloyalty? Is it when my fellow-countrymen willingly and through pure zeal for the British cause went over to fight on the battlefields of Africa? I say pure zeal, and I have reason to say so, because in their French Canadian hearts, these soldiers had sympathy, to say the least, for that people of heroes, the Boers, who, like themselves in 1837-38, sacrificed the purest of their blood to vindicate their rights, their liberty and defend their homes and their families. History, in her finest pages, will have to judge these men, and I am satisfied that future generations will recall with enthusiasm and pride their dignity, their greatness and their heroic virtues. Inquire from the courageous Deputy Minister of Militia, that young French Canadian who has done honour not only to the French name, but to English citizenship, inquire from him how his fellow-countrymen behaved in the bloody battles of the Boer war.

Loyalty, which you extol so forcefully, is indeed a fine and noble disposition of the soul and of the heart, but whoever grasps the meaning and purport of the word is capable of being moved by it; that is not your exclusive privilege. On the contrary, you associate and confuse to such a degree, and on so many occasions, that noble sentiment with the low machinations of a mean political purpose, that you deprive it of its lustre and its beauty. We should, to begin with, be loyal to Canada by showing fairness and respect for the man whom the sovereign people of this country have placed at the head of the government, and who represents supreme authority in this parliament. You convert loyalty into a vile election machine, and when the elections come on you will be heard proclaiming loudly your love and your devotedness to your mother country in certain provinces, while in others you will make fun of your exaggerations. Without any definite policy or principles, you will then give the country an exhibition which you seem to have a taste for, that of a divided party preaching to-day some kind of policy which to-morrow will be discarded and replaced by one exactly of opposite aims, as you have done on that question of the navy. Continue to do as you have been doing. We are the calm and amused witnesses of your vain outpours of verbosity, we are greatly amused on this side of the House at your unsuccessful endeavours, at your differences and sudden changes of opinion. And above all, we admire your blind submission to the real leader of the opposition for the time being, the hon. Mr. Roblin, who under cover pulls the wires which command every move.

Alas, what would Macdonald and Cartier say if they could only be witnesses of what is going on to-day in the ranks of their erstwhile party? They had clear and clean cut principles of policy, and with a firm hand lead the ship confided to their care. The people of this country, with their characteristic keen and thorough insight into matters, will soon have sized up your policy and detected its narrow and shifting tendencies, in contrast to that of our party, which is broad, resolute, openly favourable to national autonomy, and at the same time safeguarding the rights and interests of the people.

I shall now bring my speech to a close, Mr. Speaker, but before doing so, I wish to thank my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clarke) for his flattering words of reference to the French Canadians in the course of the remarkable speech he delivered last week on this question. The sarcastic deputy leader of the opposition called him, in ironical and unfair fashion, a little Englander. The hon. member from Red Deer possesses a sound judgment, absolutely free from unworthy prejudices, and a soul noble enough and great enough to be fair towards his fellow countrymen of different origin, and it is with the help of men such as he that a country like ours may hope to succeed in attaining the high destiny of nations. Mean and uncompromising fanaticism is no longer tolerated.

The stand I am taking on this question, I realize it fully obliges me to sacrifice ideas which I have vindicated in all sincerity for almost forty years past, and that sacrifice I make for the sake of my country and not for the sake of my party, I say so with absolute frankness. I have perfect and implicit trust in the new stand taken by my party, and since circumstances and political exigencies have induced our leaders to adopt the present policy in regard to the establishment of a war navy, I bow willingly to their greater experience and wisdom and will vote for the measure. In public life, as in private life, if necessary at times to sacrifice personal opinions of long standing towards forwarding the general good.

(Rien n'est plus dur que le devoir en concurrence avec ce que l'on affectionne.) (Lacordaire.)

(Faites votre devoir, et laissez faire aux dieux.) (Corneille.)

I heard our great leader a few days ago, in a speech vibrating with eloquence and rich in great and noble thoughts, assert that our autonomy would be safeguarded, and indeed it is safeguarded by this Bill, as far as possible under the circumstances. I have implicit confidence in the utter-

ances of my chief. And why not? Have not hon. gentlemen opposite the same trust in the utterances of their leader? The Militia Bill can be compared to this, and in spite of ill feeling, I might even say the terror it inspired to the French Canadian people, it became law. Its promoter, Sir G. E. Cartier, appealed at the time to his fellow-citizens of the province of Quebec, showed the absolute necessity of having an armed force and explained the tenor of that Bill, thus restoring confidence in regard to that policy of militarism. Yes, I repeat it, I have confidence in the policy of my leader.

One word more, besides a few quotations which I would like to make with a view to throwing some cold water on the sacred fire of overdone loyalism which is consuming the heart of my hon. friends opposite. I take the liberty of quoting some distinctly British views on Canada and its value from the British viewpoint.

The following is an extract from 'Canadian Emancipation,' vol. 2, page 39:

WOULD GREAT BRITAIN ATTEMPT TO DEFEND CANADA?

We are told that, being a dependency of Great Britain, in case of war, we would be supported by the army and navy of the British enpire. No sane man will entertain that proposition. Some time previous to confederation, Colonel Jarvis, an imperial officer, made a report on the defence of Canada. He recommended the construction of important military works in the province of Quebec, and said: unless these works are constructed it is more than useless to continue any British force in Canada.' The works recommended have not been constructed, and England has withdrawn her forces.

What are the sentiments of leading British statesmen on the question? 'Britain's annual expenditure in defence of Canada, 'said Mr. Gladstone,' is a very heavy charge, and it is our duty in every way to get rid of it.' Sir Chas. Adderley said: 'I believe the Canadians are much more likely to involve us in a war than we are to inflict one upon them, and that Great Britain cannot undertake to defend the colonies for the sake of the Canadians.' The Duke of Newcastle said: 'The cost of all war should be borne by those for whose benefit it is carried on.'

John Bright asserted, in his place in parliament, that 'there is no statesman in England who will venture to bring about the shedding of one drop of blood in defence of British North America.'

Mr. Aytoun said: 'He never had met with any man, not a member of the government, who considered that it was possible to defend Canada against an attack in force by the United States.'

Sir C. W. Dilke says: 'We defend the colonies only during peace; in war time they are ever left to shift for themselves.' Mr. Cardwell: 'it is an almost universally accepted principle of English policy that it is no longer desirable to maintain a standing army to defend our distant colonies.'

The 'London Times' says: 'We are quite aware that, in the event of war, we should not be able to render effectual aid to our Canadian Dominion, and that our fellow subjects out there would either have to fight at a terrible disadvantage, or mortify our pride by anticipating defeat and yielding to terms. In a national point of view that would be no loss to this country.'

Before closing this speech, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to refer to some utterances of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), who, in the course of an address very agressive in tone as regards my fellow countrymen, committed a grievous mistake by qualifying as rebels the patriots of 1837. Lord Strathcona is far from being of the same opinion, and here is what he says (I am quoting from the 'Memories of Robert Bouchette,' a book annotated by our learned and congenial librarian, Mr. A. D. Decelles, page 8):

The rebellion of 1837, directed not against England, but against colonial maladministration, was perfectly justifiable. (Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal).

These noble words fully avenge us, we of the French race in this country; they are a well deserved rebuke for the hon. member. While listening to the insults he deliberately flung at the French Canadian people when he characterized the patriots of 1837 as cowards and traitors, I was moved by a feeling, not so much of indignation as of pity, and I said to myself: the hon. member, though a soldier, does not know of the awful horrors of a battlefield; no, he is only a parade officer utterly ignorant of the grandeur, the beauty, the nobleness and the heroism implied in the deed of the brave soldier who falls under the enemy's bullets, martyr to the love of country, victim of his convictions. In order to cover, Mr. Speaker, if possible, the sound of those words of insult and obloquy aimed at the Canadian people, I wish I could impart to my voice a power which it does not possess, and cry out: Chénier, the great Chénier, and that phalanx of brave men who have fallen under the bullets of bureaucracy, were heroes, and history will speak of them as men of courage, who have died for a great principle and for a noble cause.

In concluding, I wish to state the reason which induces me to vote in favour of this measure. They are, in the first place, the great confidence I have in the policy so well defined by my right hon. leader; in the second place, the political status and relationship of our country to Great Britain; and in the third place and above all, the interest I take in my country and the conviction I have that the establishment of a war navy will be the last step towards a higher political status, and one in greater harmony with national aspirations, independence. However, that independence, I

wish for it only inasmuch as it could be obtained through the good will of Great Britain and with her full agreement; for I am free to acknowledge that to Great Britain we owe all that we are to-day, and I am proud to proclaim myself her loyal and devoted subject.

Let us provide armaments, it is the duty of the hour, but I wish most ardently to see the day when the people will loudly call out to militarism: Stop, it is time to disarm. Long enough has our blood been spilt and our flesh been tortured to satisfy the ambitions and hatred of the governing classes and war mongers. The general trend of opinion is even now, though unperceived, working towards that goal, and when democratic ideas will have prevailed through universal sufferage, and organized labour will act in co-operation with those who have freed themselves of the fetters of plutocracy, then shall we see peace triumph, and then also will militarism be a thing of the past.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I regret that my knowledge of the French language is so imperfect that I have not been able to follow with exactness the remarks of the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. G. A. Turcotte), still I hope I may be allowed to pay him the compliment of saying that his speech was very musical if nothing else. I was able to extract from his remarks sufficient to understand that he is, qualifiedly, in favour of the doctrine or principle of independence. In support of his advocacy of that principle, he was pleased to cite some authority, and with that and with his remarks I can only say that, while it is true that in Canada there are some men who advocate and believe in the doctrine of independence, I can say, thank God, that their numbers are few. It is not very encouraging to the hon. member for Nicolet to find that, whereas when he began his remarks on this most important question—important not only to Canada but to the empire—he had a pretty full house on the government side, yet his remarks have been so interesting and have been received so favourably by the members of that side that he has succeeded, in the hour during which he has addressed this House, in pretty nearly emptying the benches. In undertaking a discussion of the Bill now before the House, known as 'A Bill respecting the Naval Service of Canada', one is met at the very outset with the difficulty that the measure is clothed in such uncertain and indefinite language and is so imperfect in its arrangement that one is at a loss to understand just exactly what the intent and scope of the Bill is. And when one comes to compare the provisions of the Bill with the remarks upon it by hon. members on the government side of the House, he finds the maze all the more difficult, because these speeches differ in themselves and differ very materially from the provisions set forth in the Bill. And, Sir, the fact that the position of one undertaking to discuss this Bill is difficult is not at all remarkable when we recall the fact that, when the measure was introduced by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), he felt compelled to admit that he knew very little about it himself. With the exception of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is the only minister who has seen fit to deliver a speech in this House on the Bill. And, in regard to the speech delivered by the hon. the Minister of Militia it is noteworthy that, like the premier, he was not able to speak, as is said in sporting parlance, off his own bat, but was forced to admit that he too was speaking from details and memoranda furnished by somebody else. So, it is not to be wondered at that one attempting to discuss this Bill finds himself in the difficulty to which I have made reference. But, disguised as the Bill is in its language and arrangement, I think that a careful consideration of its provisions will enable one to discover sufficient of its scope and intent to determine that there is something behind the Bill more than is expressed in it. I do not suppose that I shall be able to convince hon. members on the government side that there is a sinister motive behind it or that the Bill is not what it really professes to be, because from the speeches that have been made by these hon. gentlemen I should have to class them with those who

> —convinced against their will,
> Are of the same opinion still.

I would direct your attention first to section 4 of the Bill which reads as follows:

> The Command in Chief of the Naval Forces is vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty, or by the Governor General as his representative.

It will be observed that in the first part of this section the command in chief of the forces to be established under this Bill is declared to be in His Majesty the King. To that part of the provision I have no objection and with it I have no quarrel. The second part declares that this command shall be 'exercised and administered by His Majesty'. With that clause also, I have no quarrel. But to the concluding words, I do offer objection —that this command shall be administered by His Majesty 'or by the Governor General as his representative'. In enacting that clause it occurs to me that the

government have made a disclosure, to a partial extent at least, of what the real object and intent of this Bill is. It would not have done to stop with the words 'be administered by His Majesty or by the Governor General', because that would have made a joint command, so to speak, it would have contradicted the very best authority and understanding of the whole British people in regard to the command of the naval forces. But they saw fit to add, 'as his representative'. In other words, it is provided that in the administration of the naval forces of this country, the Governor would be acting, as it were, under power of attorney from the King. I object, I say, to the addition of these words, for the reason that has already been very well and ably stated by the hon. member for Vancouver city (Mr. Cowan). He took occasion to show, and I I think succeeded in showing, that the clause as it is drafted and presented in this Bill, is ultra vires of this parliament, and is unconstitutional, inasmuch as it seeks to detract or take from His Majesty the King a portion of his authority in connection with the naval forces. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) was pleased to cite a section of the British North America Act which proved the contention he was making, that is section 15. And let me remark here that the British North America Act is the constitution of the Dominion of Canada, and within the limits of that Act the parliament of Canada must confine itself and confine its powers. Section 15 provides:

The command in chief of the land and naval militia, and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue to be vested in the Queen (or King).

Then the hon. gentleman cited the British statute of 13 Charles II, which provides that the sole command of the naval forces is vested in the King; and for that reason, by virtue of these two statutes, he concluded his argument that there was no power and no authority granted to this parliament or possessed by this parliament by which they could in any manner take from or detract from the King's authority over the naval forces. I think that not only is that the case, not only is no authority granted to this parliament, but I think the hon. gentleman could have carried his argument still further, and have shown that there is an absolute prohibition to this parliament from taking any such powers as they assume to take by this Bill. Had reference been made to section 18 of the British North America Act, where the powers of this parliament are defined, it would have been found to read as follows:

The privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed and exercised by the Senate and by the House of Commons and by the members thereof, respectively, shall be such as are from time to time defined by Act of the parliament of Canada——

Now, these are the important words:

—but so that the same shall never exceed those at the passing of this Act held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the members thereof.

Now, Sir, having read that section, the inquiry must be continued further to determine what the powers and authorities of the House of Commons of Great Britain were over that subject at the time of the passing of the British North America Act. The statute to which my hon. friend from Vancouver referred, 13 Charles II, has been carried down from that time in the different revisions of the statute until the reign of her late Majesty, when the last revision was passed, and the exact wording of that statute, giving the sole command and direction of the naval forces of the empire to the King, was preserved, and to-day the power is the same as it was at that time. It is only a recognition by statute of what the prerogative of the King always was under the common law of England. That being the authority and power of the King at that time, the House of Commons of Great Britain had no power or authority to detract or take from that power in any way whatever. But you will see, that being the position at common law, and having recognized that common law by statute, having declared by parliament that such should be the case, the only possible way in which the parliament of Great Britain could have any authority whatever over the matter would be by repealing that statute which recognized the King's prerogative, and passing a new Act of parliament which would have curtailed it or lessened it in some respect. But the parliament of Great Britain has never seen fit to do that; it remains to-day as it did at the time referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver.

But, Sir, the argument can be carried further. Admitting for the sake of argument that the parliament of Great Britain had, since the passing of the British North America Act, passed an Act of parliament giving them the right to curtail the powers of command of the King, granting that, I say that would not affect in any manner the position Canada occupies to-day upon that matter; because you will see that the statute I have already referred to, the British North America Act, declares that the power of this parliament, so far as this subject is concerned, is limited to the powers that were possessed by the House of Commons of England at the time this Act was passed in 1867. So you see that even if the House of Commons of Great

Britain did pass an Act such as I have mentioned, it would not be an Act in force at the time the British North America Act was passed; and the only way in which this parliament could be possessed of the power to interfere with this command would be, either to repeal the British North America Act, or to amend that section I have referred to.

But, Sir, that objection is not the only one to which I wish to make reference in discussing this Bill. I desire to call attention to sections 17, 18 and 19 of the Bill, sections showing what is the real intention of this Bill, although it has been attempted to disguise it. Section 17 declares:

The Governor in Council may——

Mark you, not 'shall':

—may place the naval forces or any part thereof on active service during any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of an emergency.

You will observe that in section 4 of the Act the command is declared to be in the King to be administered by him or by the Governor General. In this section 17 the power and authority of the King are left out altogether. Section 17 says that:

The Governor in Council may place the naval forces——

And so on. The King has no authority whatever in regard to that.

—at any time that it appears advisable so to do.

In connection with that clause the right hon. leader of the government, when introducing this Bill, was pleased to refer frequently to the Militia Act, and to declare that this Bill had been framed as far as possible upon the lines of that Act. But a very important omission has been made in this section of the Naval Bill, when compared with the Militia Act. The Militia Act declares that:

The militia of Canada may be put on active service in Canada——

The provision is the same as contained in this Bill so far.

—or elsewhere.

The omission in this Bill, when compared with the Militia Act, is that the naval force may be placed on active service in Canada, whereas, under the Militia Act, the militia may be placed on active service either in Canada or outside of Canada. The words actually used are:

Anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada.

There is another mistake, or another misinterpretation, of the language used in the Militia Act. It is perfectly plain and evident where, under the authority of that Act, the militia of Canada may be put into service, but this Bill is entirely different in regard to the navy.

The Governor in Council may place the naval forces, or any part thereof, on active service at any time.

It does not declare, as in the Militia Act, where. That is a very important omission and, I think, goes a long way to show the real object and intent of this Bill. Had these words in the Militia Act been inserted in this Bill, there would not have been any doubt about it. But, as the Bill is framed, it leaves it open to two constructions. First, it may be said by the government in one part of Canada that, according to the declaration of section 17 of this Bill, the naval force shall not be sent out of Canada. In another portion of Canada they may be able to declare that there is nothing in section 17 that limits the place or places to which the naval forces may be sent, and therefore, they may be sent on active service in Canada or anywhere else. It is left in such an uncertain position that it is possible for the government to argue in one portion of the Dominion that they may be only used in Canada, and to argue in another portion of the Dominion that they may be used anywhere the same as the militia forces. It might prove to be of very great advantage to the government, but it might likewise prove to be a very great detriment, and disadvantage to Canada and the empire. Some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have taken occasion to remark upon the use of the word 'may' in that section.

The Governor in Council may place——

And they have seemed to question the good faith of the government in always placing the force at the disposal of the empire when they should. The only answer that has been offered to that criticism from the other side of the House is: Well, there is no danger of that. You can trust the right hon. premier and his government that they will do the right thing at the right time. If that is so why use the word 'may' at all? Why not make it perfectly plain to every one? Why use a word that needs some particular construction or interpretation rather than a word that is perfectly plain, and can be understood by any one? Why not use the word 'shall' instead of the word 'may'? It would appear that that word is used in that section by the government, because they have not sufficient faith in His Majesty to believe that he would only place the forces on active service, when they ought to be placed on active service, and that the government are more to be trusted to deal with that matter than His Majesty himself. For my

part I can only say I have more confidence in His Majesty refusing to place the forces of Canada when and where they ought not to be on active service than in the government always placing the forces when and where they ought to be. I think the people of Canada would be more willing in that respect to trust His Majesty as having absolute command of the forces than to put their trust in the government of the right hon. gentleman. But, Sir, there is still another objection that I wish to take to this Bill. I have called attention to clause 18 where it is recited that

> In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

That clause declares that they may, in case of emergency, place the forces at the disposal of His Majesty, and that must also necessarily carry with it the right to refuse. Therefore, two positions arise under that section. First, the Governor in Council may send them, and, by reservation, may refuse to place them at the disposal of His Majesty. If the Governor in Council sees fit to place the forces at the disposal of His Majesty what follows? Section 19 declares that if parliament is not then sitting or will not sit within ten days it shall be called together, and shall continue to sit, &c., as the section requires. That is all right. That provides for the case wherein the Governor in Council puts the force at the disposal of His Majesty. But, suppose the other position is taken by the Governor in Council, and he refuses to place the force at the disposal of His Majesty?

What provision is made in this Bill for a case of that kind? Parliament will not meet, there is no power to assemble parliament and, therefore, the people of the country cannot speak through their representatives in parliament. The people cannot themselves put the force at the disposal of His Majesty. Absolutely no provision is made for a case of refusal by the Governor in Council to place the naval force established by this Bill at the disposal of His Majesty, and before the people of this country, or their representatives, could make their wishes known, or the naval force of Canada, no matter how efficient it might be, could, under such circumstances, be placed at the disposal of His Majesty, the crisis might have arrived, in fact the British empire might be ruined and destroyed before Canada could render aid. That, to my mind, is a most serious matter. The naval force is to be placed at the disposal of His Majesty only after parliament has so decided. If parliament should refuse to send the naval force to the assistance of Great Britain, there should be a provision just as strong to enable the people to pronounce upon the question as to whether that refusal was right or wrong, but we find absolutely nothing in this section in regard to it. Another equally strong objection to the Bill is that section 4 and section 18 are inconsistent. The government declare, by section 4, that in all their acts in connection with the command of the naval forces of Canada, they will be acting, and undertake to act, as the representatives of His Majesty. The representatives of what? They must be the representatives of his authority, of his desire, of his instruction—in fact, willing at all times to carry out what the King would wish or desire, and if they are not so willing, they cannot be his representatives, they cannot act as his representatives. It is a well understood and unquestioned principle, that any person or corporation acting as the representative of another, of a principal is bound to conform to the instructions and to the wishes of the principal by whom he is authorized. If a breach should be made by an attorney or representative so employed, what would be the natural consequence? He would merit instant dismissal. In what position do the government place themselves by assuming the powers conferred on them under this Bill? They say, in clause 4, that they are acting as the representatives of His Majesty, with all the obligations that that term carries with it; then, in section 18, they declare that in case of emergency 'they may place at the disposal of His Majesty for service,' and so on, which carries with it the right, as I have already argued, to refuse to place the navy at the service of His Majesty—and there we have the two contradictory positions. In section 4 they declare that they are acting as the representatives of the King, and so are bound to carry out his instructions, and under section 18, if His Majesty should request that the forces of Canada be placed at his disposal in any part of the empire, or engage in any contest that Great Britain might be engaged in, it is within the power of the Governor in Council, of this government, to say: No. That is what they declare: No, we shall not place the forces at your disposal. If an attorney, or a representative bound by the instruction of his principal, were to say that he would do or not do that which he was instructed to do, according to his own judgment, in direct opposition to his instructions, such action would be the grossest possible breach of faith and confidence. A man or a government committing such a breach of instructions, a breach of confidence, an attorney or representative acting in his own interests rather than in the interests of his

principal, as might well be done under this section, would deserve instant dismissal.

It may be that all has been said that can be said for and against this Bill and the amendment proposed by the opposition. There has been, it is true, a great variety of expression in dealing with the principles and the policies of the two parties, but the principles and the doctrines to which the two respective parties adhere have been made perfectly plain. I shall not repeat any of those arguments. I have endeavoured to extract from the speeches delivered in this House what I deemed to be the important and essential points of difference between the two parties upon this important question. I am sorry to say that an element has been introduced into the discussion of this question which I think it would have been better to have avoided, but the offence began with the right hon. gentleman himself and it has been followed up by a number of his supporters. It could not be expected that the opposition would allow the observations made by these gentlemen to go unchallenged or unanswered, and I can only say that if the hon. gentlemen opposite have been paid off in their own coin and with interest on their investment, the government have only themselves to blame for being placed in that position. I think it is unfortunate that any question of party politics should have been introduced into the discussion of this important subject. However, it has been done and it cannot be undone.

I propose to offer to the House what I conceive to be the differences existing between the two parties upon this all-important question.

The first difference to which I would call attention is that the government, by the introduction of this Bill at the present time and the provisions contained in it, tacitly admit the existence of an emergency and of danger to the empire, and the duty of Canada to assist in meeting it; yet, the Prime Minister and others of his following declare that there is no emergency or danger, and, therefore, no necessity of providing for it, totally ignoring expert opinion, and occupying that wholly inconsistent position. Now, in answer to that the opposition take this position: They are prepared to accept the opinions of the best naval experts and of the ablest statesmen of Great Britain, and of independent men of the highest excellence, who have given the subject the most profound thought, that the emergency and real danger to the empire does exist. The opposition are willing to accede to the wishes of the people of Canada and furnish immediate and effective aid to the empire's navy in meeting such a danger. A great deal of discussion has taken place upon that branch of the question, and many references have been made to show that a real danger does threaten the empire. I wish to add just one more reference in connection with that point. In 'Everybody's Magazine' for November, an article is published by Alexander Powell, F.R.G.S., who was specially commissioned to make an investigation in Germany as to the naval preparations that were being made in that country. I quote from the report which he made when he had finished that investigation:

> Everything considered, I think that England has good cause to lie awake o' nights. Twice has the Kaiser declared that the future of Germany lies upon the seas. Repeatedly has Germany refused to discuss her vast armaments or to give any reason for the frantic haste with which they are being increased; the whole of her ship-building yards are engaged in an unparalleled scheme of naval construction; scores of her leading writers make no secret of her intentions; history has shown that on previous occasions she has made unprovoked and sudden attacks on other nations, and, most significant of all, the coal-carying capacity of the ships she is building so hurriedly and which, she insists, are designed solely for the protection of her trade routes, limits their radius of action to the North Sea. There is the disquieting fact. To-day the ambitions of the Kaiser are boundless. He seeks to dominate the continent as the first step towards dominating the world. Look at it any way you will, there can be but one end to a race which is impoverishing both nations, and that end is war. If England wins, she will have secured herself for half a century to come. If Germany triumphs, her victory will give her the position that England holds now, it will make free trade in England one of the terms of peace; it will give her a free hand in the Balkans, in Mesopotamia and in Persia; will give her the pick of England's colonies oversea, and a billion dollars indemnity with which to build a navy to overawe the world.

That is an independent opinion, and one which seems to me to be enitled to the fullest consideration. The second difference that I have noted between the policy of the two parties is this: That the government declares that Canada now requires a navy of her own for her own defence, independent of the empire, and the opposition say: That Canada, independent of the empire, is not threatened from any source now, nor is she likely to be; her coast line and fisheries are now sufficiently protected, and that protection can be greatly increased as occasion arises, without burdensome expenditure. The opposition say further, that Canada's sea-going commerce is better safeguarded by the empire's navy than it could be by an independent navy; that Canada is threatened whenever Great Britain is threatened, that Canada does not now require an independent navy, but that our best interests lie in strengthening the empire's navy. Difference No. 3 between the policy of the government and the policy of

the opposition is this: The government assumes it has the right to lay down and to engage in a permanent naval policy for Canada independent of its entire connection, and to make an initial expenditure varying from $15,000,000 to $18,000,000 for ships, and an annual outlay varying from $3,000,000 to $7,000,000 for maintenance—no one seems to be able to tell just exactly what either one or the other would cost—realizing that it must be a constantly increasing expenditure annually for ships not designed or intended to meet the emergency or strengthen the empire's defence on the sea, or capable or offering any substantial defence to Canada in the event of attack. Now, the position of the opposition as declared by them, I find to be: That whilst the government would have the right to meet the existing emergency and danger, it has not the right to enter upon a permanent policy of establishing an independent Canadian navy with the ever increasing expenditure and burden such a policy carries with it, without a mandate from the Canadian people; and that at all events any effort made in establishing a navy should be in conjunction and co-operation with the empire's navy. I find this further distinction between the policies of the two parties: That while the policy of the government ignores the recommendations of the admiralty as to the best means to be employed by Canada for strengthening the empire's navy and maintaining the supremacy and security of the nation, the opposition policy is to recognize the great value of the advice and recommendations of the admiralty in matters of naval defence, for which experience and special training have eminently qualified them, at the same time realizing our want of such experience and training, and our common interest in the safety of the empire, and that whilst the aid offered by the amendment to the Bill exceeds the best recommendation of the admiralty as to the share to be contributed by Canada, it does not exceed the duty, the obligation, or the willingness of Canada to maintain the unity of the empire and her security against the world. I find further that by the government Bill, an armed force—and what it declares for—is created in Canada an integral part of the empire, wearing the King's uniform, armed with the King's weapons, loyal men who would be willing to fight for the King and his empire, yet the clause of the Bill to which I have referred declares that such force shall not fight for the King and the empire until Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his cabinet (that is the Governor in Council) order they shall. The opposition reply that such a declaration makes for independence and separation from the empire, that it smacks of sedition, and, if not unconstitutional, is a gross breach of confidence and abuse of power. They also pretend that such an armed force should, in the event of war, pass automatically, if needed, under the King's command to the defence of the empire, and there should be no power to prevent that being done. That point of difference between the two parties in politics is one which, it seems to me, should be accentuated. Shall we, as Canadians, be soldiers of the King? Or shall we be soldiers of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government? Evidently the goal which the Prime Minister desires to reach is independence. Independence has frequently been his declared ambition, and the Bill before us carefully avoids any provision which might serve to link Canada more closely to the empire and thus disappoint the premier's ambition, but on the contrary makes strongly in the opposite direction, although an attempt has been made to disguise its tendency. On the other hand, the policy of the opposition does not require any disguise or deception. It is clear cut. It makes straight for the solidarity and unification or federation of the empire, the security of Canada, and the sovereignty of the nation. That difference between the two policies, let me again point out, ought to be emphasized. Shall we continue to live under the old emblem of liberty, the Union Jack, shall we hoist it for ever and claim its protection, or shall we declare our independence and hoist a flag in accordance with that policy? I venture to think that the great majority of our people will have no hesitation whatever in declaring for the old Union Jack.

The scheme of the government, if carried out, will not afford immediate or any assistance to the empire's navy or the defence of the nation, because the crisis will have long passed before such a navy as is proposed in this government measure could be placed in the fighting line, if it could ever be so placed, and consequently would not discharge any part of the acknowledged obligation of Canada to the empire. Thus it is an absolute denial of the affirmations contained in the resolution of this House, adopted unanimously in March last, to defend the empire in time of peril. On the other hand, the resolution and the policy of the opposition, if adopted, will afford immediate and effective strength to the empire's navy, will meet the emergency and discharge Canada's obligation and duty to contribute to the defence of the empire and the peace of the world.

The professions of loyalty and willingness to assist in the defence of the empire, so loudly made by the government and its followers, are wholly inconsistent with and opposed to the policy laid down in this Bill. That is evidenced by the provision of this measure, whereby assistance to the mother country, if any be made, is to depend on the will of the government. Such provision

is but another step towards independence. Contrast that with the policy of the opposition, who supplement their declarations of loyalty by offering immediately to provide two Dreadnoughts, or the equivalent, without any reservation whatever.

There is another important distinction between the policies of the two parties. The government is inclined to offer fightnoughts which dread everything, while the opposition desire to offer Dreadnoughts which are prepared to fight anything.

The government has failed to show that the adoption of its policy will have any moral effect on Briton's enemies or the world in general such as the immediate and effective offer advocated by the opposition could not fail to have. Such an offer would tend to lessen the possibilities of conflict and thus spare us the horrors of war.

The policy of the government largely consists in vain glorious boasting deception, useless and extravagant expenditure of public moneys, and cannot fail to provide exceptional opportunities for graft. Whereas, the policy of the opposition is one of action, prompt, generous and effective, by which many dollars will be saved for every dollar expended. The refusal of the government and its representatives to adopt or act upon any of the proposals of the several imperial conferences regarding naval defence compared with the promptness and generosity displayed by our sister dominions, Australia and New Zealand, in accepting such proposals and bearing their share of the burden, has placed Canada in a humiliating and unenviable position in the eyes of the empire and the rest of the world. The opposition feel that, considering the importance of Canada, considering her vast resources, considering her growing population and the loyalty of her people, considering the immensity of her growing commercial interests and the protection she has enjoyed under the British flag, she should be placed in the first rank of the overseas dominions instead of being put in the position of a voluntary outcast and laggard, as is done by the policy of the government.

The policy which the government submits to the House, is, by its nature, a permanent one, and yet is being entered upon without the authority of the people who have not had an opportunity of expressing their will and have not sufficient knowledge as to details as to enable them to judge as to its advisability or efficiency. This policy, once entered upon, cannot be discontinued, but must impose an ever increasing burden on the people, and that without giving any sufficient assurance that it will prove adequate even for the defence of Canada. On the other hand, the policy of the opposition is intended to afford immediate temporary relief in an emergency and discharge the immediate obligations of Canada to the empire, it is fixed in amount, certain in details, sufficient for the purpose intended, creates no continuous or increasing burden, secures a greater measure of security for Canada by strengthening the defence of the empire than could be secured by the creation of a Canadian navy. And, being an emergency policy, does not require to be submitted to the people.

We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that our policy is an attack upon responsible government, an encroachment upon Canadian autonomy, and would impose taxation without representation, which is subversive of Canadian ideas. But it must be evident that the offer we advocate, being a voluntary contribution, has none of the elements of taxation which involve force, and in no sense can be called taxation without representation. And as responsible government means loyalty to the crown and respect for the will of the people and the right to control our own local affairs, while at the same time observing allegiance to the Crown, voluntary contribution to the defence of the empire to which we owe allegiance as well as the defence of Canada, is a declaration of the principles of responsible government and autonomy in their highest and noblest form. The government declares that the Canadian navy should be built now in Canada by Canadian workmen and with Canadian material as far as possible. The opposition agree that, when the time arrives and the Canadian people declare that Canada should have an independent navy, then it should be built by Canadian workmen in Canada with Canadian material as far as possible. But we cherish the hope that the day is far distant when Canada shall require an independent navy, but that her interest and determination will always be to maintain her position in the empire.

These appear to be the principal points of difference between the policies of the two parties in the House upon this question. Stripped of all political bias or party consideration, and viewed solely from the standpoint of loyal support of the empire, it occurs to me little difficulty will be experienced by the people of this country in choosing between the policies that I have endeavoured to outline in these fifteen articles. Occasion has been taken during the course of this debate to charge that Canadian interests have always suffered when those interests were dealt with by British diplomacy. That is a statement that has been made on many occasions before. It is made upon this occasion, no doubt, for the purpose of leading the House and the country to believe that in

the matter of naval defence the people of Canada can better trust the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier than that they can trust the ablest experts of Great Britain. On one occasion in Ottawa, in 1907, the right hon. prime minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said:

If we take all the treaties from the treaty of 1783 up to the treaty of 1903, we Canadians do not feel particularly cheerful over the way we have been treated by the British plenipotentaries. We have to realize that John Bull has not always done his duty to his Canadian sons.

Also, in September of the same year, at the manufacturers' banquet, the Prime Minister spoke as follows:

We take the record of the diplomacy of Great Britain in so far as Canada is concerned, and we find it is a repetition of sacrifice of Canadian interests. We have suffered on the Atlantic, we have suffered on the Pacific, we have suffered on the lakes, we have suffered wherever there has been a question to be discussed with British diplomats. We have come to the conclusion that we would do better by attending to the business ourselves rather than have it trusted to the best men that can be found in Great Britain.

Again, in Toronto, on another occasion, the Prime Minister said:

British diplomacy, in so far as Canadian interests are concerned, has been a succession of blunders.

This fault-finding with the British government in its dealing with Canadian affairs is perfectly consistent with the action of the government in preparing such a Bill as they now have before this House, and to some clauses of which I have made special reference. But, I venture to say, there is just as little evidence to prove the assertions made by the right hon. gentleman on the occasions of which I have spoken, as there is for the position they take now in regard to this Bill, that, so far as the naval force of Canada is concerned, it should be controlled by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues, rather than as the British navy itself is controlled. I think that these references to a want of interest in Canada on the part of British diplomats, and to the interests of Canada having been sacrificed on these various occasions is entirely unwarranted and has resulted more from the desire of some gentlemen to have such a position brought about, and to increase the powers of Canada in that respect or to detract from the authority of Great Britain, than from what has actually taken place under British diplomatic treatment of Canadian affairs. I think these references are made from want of knowledge, or a refusal to acknowledge the real facts in connection with these matters. As this Bill is being viewed from almost every point of view, it perhaps would not be amiss—reference having been made to the effect of British diplomacy in sacrificing Canadian interests, and the necessary deduction from that having been made that Canadian interests would suffer if its necessary naval defence was left in the hands of Great Britain—if I were to ask the attention of the House for a short time to a consideration of some of these matters, and to the comparison I have suggested. The Prime Minister, in the remarks to which I have referred, went on to say that we had lost upon the Atlantic, we had lost upon the Pacific, we had lost upon the great lakes. I propose, during the short time that I shall occupy the attention of the House, to compare the treaties that have been negotiated and concluded by Great Britain with regard to what the Prime Minister has said is our loss upon the Atlantic, our loss upon the Pacific, with certain treaties that the right hon. gentlemen and his colleagues have been able to secure during the time they have occupied the treasury benches.

The first instance to which the Prime Minister referred was the one arising under the Ashburton treaty of 1842. The opinion that was expressed in regard to that matter, and that has been perpetuated in certain quarters, is, I feel sure, the result of want of knowledge of the true facts in connection with the matter. The general contention of those who make similar assertions to those made by the Prime Minister is that in this treaty Canada lost the states of Maine and New Hampshire, by reason of Webster, who negotiated the treaty on behalf of the United States, exhibiting a map to Lord Ashburton which showed the line between Canada and the United States to be very much further west than, as a matter of fact, it was, and that by showing this map to Lord Ashburton, Webster had fooled him into agreeing to the United States getting more territory than they were actually entitled to.

The story goes on to the effect that Webster, the negotiator for the United States, exhibited this map to the Senate of the United States, and thereby induced the Senate, which was previously opposed altogether to the treaty, to agree to it in the form in which it was afterwards assented to. Now, if it were a fact that Webster had in this manner tricked, if I may use the expression. Lord Ashburton, and obtained an advantage in that way, dishonourable as it would be upon the part of Webster, yet it would be a most unfortunate thing for Canada, and a matter upon which perhaps Lord Ashburton might be charged with dereliction of duty, or with not having sufficiently guarded the interests of Canada. But after these long years since 1842 and down to the last year, this story has been current, and it has been given credence to by the right hon. the

Premier and many others. But only last year were the real facts in connection with the matter discovered by an officer of one of the departments of this government, Mr. White, who published an article in reference to his discovery, and giving the evidence, in the 'University Magazine'. It appears that the real facts are these: When the treaty of Paris was made, the line between Canada and the territory subsequently the United States, was definitely fixed and established. That line was fixed, according to the records, by a line known as the Oswald line, and that line was laid down and defined upon a map known as the King's map, in the possession of King George III. The map was marked with the King's own handwriting beneath, a broad red line, indicating 'This is Oswald's line', and at the time of the passing of the treaty of Paris, and on different occasions in the House of Commons, reference was made to this King's map, and to the settlement of the line by that treaty according to what is known as Oswald's line. Now, then, at the time of the Ashburton treaty, Webster procured from the archives in Paris a map which had been obtained from Franklin, and he produced this map. There is no evidence of any kind to show where it came from except a letter which was supposed to accompany this map, declaring that Franklin had himself made the red line that appeared upon this map. So that what Webster got was not the official map at all, nor was it a map that had been used in defining the boundary with Canada at the time of the treaty of Paris. But he used that map for the purpose of deceiving the Senate of the United States into the belief that they were getting a larger portion of territory than, according to the real line, they were entitled to. And the discovery of Mr. White proves that although at the time of the passing of this Ashburton treaty this map known as the King's map, having Oswald's line marked upon it and authenticated by the King's own handwriting, had been discovered, it turned out that under that line, what the United States got by the Ashburton treaty in regard to the boundary between the United States and New Brunswick, was exactly what the King's map, and what Oswald's line that was used in the treaty of Paris, gave to Great Britain; nothing more and nothing else to a certain point, that is, from the Atlantic ocean north to what is called the Northwest angle. But from that point the boundary line between the United States and Canada was deflected, and instead of following the Oswald line, which it would have been bound to follow had that map been produced, it was deflected to the west, so as to save to Canada, and it actually did save to Canada, a considerable portion of New Brunswick and of the province of Quebec; in fact the very land that today the Grand Trunk Pacific passes through was saved to Canada. There would have been no land there for Canada, only for the advantages that Canada gained by the deflection of that eastern line by this treaty. But that is not the most important point. Had the Oswald line been followed, as the United States had a right to insist upon, and had that map been produced at the time of the Ashburton treaty, but which evidently was not produced, or at any rate was ignored, the line limiting or defining the boundary line between the United States and Canada, east and west, would not have been deflected from the northwest angle south and west, which enabled Canada to secure, and by which she did secure, a valuable portion of the province of Quebec which would otherwise have gone to the United States. Now, I do not want to go through all the details of that transaction, but there are two other instances where Canada saved most valuable territory by reason of this Ashburton treaty which the right hon. premier is so ready to condemn.

Now let me refer briefly to the loss which he says we made upon the Pacific coast, with reference to that portion of the state of Oregon, which now belongs to the United States, and which I presume the Prime Minister would say ought rightly to belong to Canada. That treaty was made in 1846. Now the treaty was not in respect of what is now known as the state of Oregon by any means, but the negotiations covered an extent of territory of about 400,000 square miles, including not only the state of Oregon, but what is now our very valuable province of British Columbia. Discoveries had been made upon the Pacific coast by different nations, by Spain, by Russia, by the United States, and by France, and not one of these countries, excepting the United States, claimed to have absolute jurisdiction over that territory. The greatest claim that Great Britain ever made to that territory was that she had the right of joint occupation with the other nations that were interested in it. The United States, on the other hand, set up the contention, that, Spain having discovered that territory, and having given up her rights by treaty to the United States, the United States also having acquired the right of France by purchase, and having made discoveries by Cook and others they were entitled to the ownership of the territory. The strongest claim of all they made was that of the greatest possession, because it is a well recognized principle of international law that although discovery gives a right it is not the highest form of title, but that possession is the thing that determines the right of any nation to the ownership of the country.

The United States at this time had not only its own right of discovery, but it had the right which it had acquired from Spain, the right which it had acquired from France, and it also had the right of possession, because at this time, Great Britain only had in that country about 400 people, whereas the United States had nearly 8,000. That was the element that must determine which of these nations this country should belong to. Mark this important feature; Great Britain did not claim at any time to be the absolute owner of it, and the United States did. What was the position under these circumstances? The slave war was on in the United States at that time, and this territory offered the most favourable place that could possibly be discovered for the emigration of Americans, and they were filling up this territory very rapidly. Great Britain, on the other hand, was making no progress in the way of occupation. Had matters been allowed to drift along in that condition for a few years longer the result must necessarily have been that the population from the United States would overrun the greater portion of this territory, and the United States would therefore acquire it by occupation. The master stroke of British diplomacy was to see that at that time the only hope of Great Britain was to secure as much of the territory as she could absolutely rather than to occupy the position a few years later of losing it all. What did she do? Negotiations were undertaken, and these various claims were put forward. It cannot be contended that either one of two countries that enter into a controversy or discussion of this kind would make adverse claims without there being some merit in the claims of each. It cannot be said that Great Britain was all right, and that the United States was all wrong, that Great Britain was entitled to the whole of that country, because she only claimed a part of it, or that the United States was entitled to it all. So, they had to sit down, and make the best bargain they could. What was the result? Under this treaty Great Britain gave up seven degrees of territory that she only claimed the right to joint occupation of, and she acquired an absolute and indefeasible title to six degrees of territory that could never afterwards be in question. I would like to know, in view of these facts, how it could be said that in the negotiation of this treaty the interests of Canada were sacrificed. This fact must be remembered too, that at that time that territory was no part of the Dominion of Canada. That was a matter in which Great Britain alone was interested, and it does seem to me that in concluding that treaty Great Britain displayed, just as she did, in concluding the Ashburton treaty, the very highest elements of diplomacy, and the very greatest interest in safe-guarding what afterwards turned out to be the interest of the Dominion of Canada, because she secured, through Lord Ashburton, in the east, a large tract of territory that had been denied to Great Britain by another arbitrator. In connection with that it is well to remember that before the Ashburton treaty was concluded the matter had been referred to the King of the Netherlands, and what did he do? After investigating the whole matter he gave Great Britain 900 square miles less than she got under the Ashburton treaty. The United States was not pleased with that award, and it was on an appeal from the United States that Great Britain, through the Ashburton treaty, obtained far more territory than she did under the award that was given by the King of the Netherlands. So, in regard to the treaty of Oregon, Great Britain, by her diplomacy, secured for future Canada a greater extent of territory by absolute title than she actually made claim to before the treaty was undertaken. What she lost was that part of the territory lying between the Columbia river, and the Pacific ocean that she absolutely had to admit she had not the title to, that she did not discover, that she did not occupy, except in a very desultory way, and in regard to which the claim of the United States was absolutely unanswerable. Everything that Great Britain claimed under that treaty she got, and as one writer in connection with that matter has very well put it, Great Britain got, under that treaty, all she wanted, while many of the claims of the United States were left for future consideration. They never have been considered, and never will be.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PORTER. Before six o'clock I had been dealing with the disparaging remarks made by the premier and others in regard to British diplomacy in connection with Canadian interests, and I had shown that by the Ashburton treaty and the Oregon treaty, Canada had really gained enormously. By the Oregon treaty we gained the absolute title over a very large and valuable province, British Columbia. Although the line between the United States and Canada west as far as the Rocky mountains had been fixed at the 49th parallel, and Great Britain had offered on different occasions to fix the line west of the Rocky mountains upon the basis of the 49th parallel, yet the United States refused to accept that offer and contended that their territory extended up to 54·40; their slogan was 'fifty four forty or fight'. Great Bri-

tain at that time, even when she entered into this treaty, had not forsaken or abandoned the rights she had in that part of North America, but had been making very great preparations for war, and at the time the Oregon treaty was entered into it was apparent that something of this kind must be done or war would inevitably result. I may repeat that it was a master stroke of British diplomacy to secure so valuable a territory upon so slim a claim as she had at that time. She obtained more than she had ever claimed up to that time.

Let me compare British diplomacy in obtaining those two treaties with the diplomacy of this government as displayed in obtaining two other treaties in behalf of Canada since they have been in power. Let us take, if you will, the Japanese treaty. Treaties between Japan and Great Britain and Japan and the United States were made the same year. The Pacific coast had become a very desirable place for Japanese immigration, and the Japanese were immigrating to that country in considerable numbers. In the treaty made between the United States and Japan the Americans recognized this feature and provided that it should not in any way:

> Affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade immigration of labourers' peace and public security which are in force or may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries.

In that manner the United States preserved complete control over the immigration of those people to the Pacific coast. In the treaty made between Great Britain and Japan no such clause was inserted. It will be apparent to any one why that was not done. Great Britain did not afford any field for Japanese immigration, and there was therefore no necessity for such a clause being inserted in regard to that country. But, notwithstanding that, the British government took care to provide for the interests of Canada, and by section 19 of the treaty between Japan and Great Britain it was declared that the treaty was not binding upon the self-governing colonies until they acceded to it, they could take the benefit and responsibilities of it whenever they chose, they could when agreeing to it impose such other terms as to them might seem to be necessary or pertinent. Thus the matter stood in the year 1895 when the treaty was submitted to the Canadian government, at that time a Conservative government. An order in council was passed and transmitted to the proper authorities refusing to accede to the treaty unless it contained a stipulation similar to that to which I have referred between the United States and Japan. This was submitted to the Japanese government through the British ambassador, and shortly afterwards the Japanese government acceded to the request contained in the order in council that had been forwarded from the then Canadian government, and that assent was notified to the Canadian government, and subsequently this addition was made to apply to all the colonies as well as to Canada. In July, 1896, when the Conservative government had gone out of power, the Secretary of State for Great Britain made inquiry from Canada as to whether she would accept the treaty that had been made between Japan and Great Britain.

This government passed an order in council refusing to accede to the treaty, not upon the ground of control of immigration, but upon the ground that it might interfere with Canadian trade relations. The trade question, it will be observed, was not at all involved; that was reserved for action by the Canadian government. Two months after this, Great Britain warned Canada upon this question respecting immigration by advising that Queensland, Australia, had refused the treaty unless they retained control over the immigration into that country. Less than a month after the British ambassador reported that Japan had acceded to the request of Canada as made in regard to the immigration of workmen, including artisans. When the Conservative government passed their order in council, besides asking for control over immigration, they asked that the word 'workmen' be defined so as to include artisans. The Japanese government finally assented to that, and here was presented an opportunity of having the treaty between Great Britain and Japan apply to Canada with the full power to Canada to control her immigration affairs. The matter came before this government again in 1897, but they simply refused to accept the treaty, and they gave as their reason the same reason they had given before, namely, that it might interfere with trade relations. In the latter part of 1896, and early in 1897 the Japanese immigration into British Columbia began to increase very rapidly, and it became a very serious question with the people of that country; so much so that they made representations to this government, and in fact very largely signed petitions were sent in asking this government to move in the direction of staying the immigration of Japanese in such large numbers into British Columbia. These representations were repeated at different times. Then, the Minister of Agriculture paid a visit to Japan, and according to his own report as given to this House nothing was accomplished there by him. He reported simply that there was no danger of an excessive immigration from Japan, and that he had assurance from the Japanese government that immigration would be so restricted that it would not trouble Canadian interests to any extent. Then the matter stood in that way until 1905,

when this government passed an order in council by which it was declared that all objections to the treaty heretofore made had been removed and Canada was willing to accept the treaty as it was originally proposed. By that order in council it will be seen that notwithstanding the interests of Canada were so paramount in the matter of retaining control over immigration into this country, yet this government as a master stroke of diplomacy, by that order in council removed the objection entirely and allowed immigrants to proceed to Canada from Japan just as rapidly as they pleased. The Colonial Secretary, however, when the order in council of this government was placed before him, had before him at the same time the order in council that had been passed by the Conservative government in 1895, and consequently he had before him the objection that was raised upon this question of immigration, and before he acted upon the order in council passed by this government he again gave notice to the Canadian government particularly calling their attention to this question of immigration, and he desired to know whether the Canadian government was willing to forego the right they had in that respect. A reply was made simply confirming the order in council that had been passed, but the Colonial Secretary refused to act upon that even; his answer was that he had sent a specific message, and had asked a specific question as to Canada retaining control of her immigration policy, and he desired an answer to that. After having their attention again called in that direct manner to the question, this government replied that they were willing to accept the Japanese treaty as it then stood absolutely without any reservation. Under those conditions a treaty was entered into. In addition to the warning, and the notice by the Colonial Secretary, as late as in 1903, the Consul General of Japan notified the Prime Minister of Canada by a letter that the Japanese government was willing to enter into an agreement to bind themselves to restrict Japanese immigration into Canada. So that it cannot be said or argued from any standpoint that this government did not have full notice of the willingness of the Japanese government to enter into a treaty allowing Canada to retain full control of immigration, and, in face of that notice, and that knowledge, this government, to the detriment of the province of British Columbia in particular, and to Canada as a whole, handed over as it were the control of our immigration policy to the Japanese government instead of retaining it in their own hands. The result of this was that as soon as that treaty was passed, as might naturally be expected, the immigration of Japanese into British Columbia again began, and increased very rapidly. The question became such an important one to the people of British Columbia that representations were again made, and repeated to this government, and it was urged upon the floor of this House that some action should be taken. Finally the Postmaster General was sent to Japan, and he came back with a great flourish of trumphets, and announced that he had righted the great mistake that his government had formerly made. He announced that assurances had been obtained from the Japanese government that objectionable immigration would not be allowed from that country to Canada. But, it appears, if reports are correct, that when the Postmaster General went to Japan he was received no doubt very courteously by the Japanese minister, but when the subject was mentioned the Foreign Minister recognizing the position that Japan had obtained by the treaty simply handed the Postmaster General over to a clerk in the office to do what he could, the Foreign Minister not having either time or the disposition to treat further on the matter with the Postmaster General. Well, Sir, things went on in that way for a little time, and the Postmaster General saw that he was not able to make any headway with the clerk of the department, and he again sought the attention of the Foreign Minister and what was he obliged to do? He was obliged to call in the British ambassador, and, if anything was accomplished at all, in the matter of Japanese immigration, it was through the British ambassador, and not through the efforts of the Postmaster General. And yet he comes back to Canada, and his party press, and friends, proclaiming that his efforts were a master stroke of diplomacy, and outshone entirely the diplomacy of Great Britain in any matter in which Canadian interests were concerned.

If you will take another comparison, let us compare the diplomatic action of Canada with regard to the Belgian and German treaties, with the diplomatic action of Great Britain in the other matters to which I have referred. When this government came into power, it declared that it would obtain preferential trade within the empire. That was one of the planks of its platform, and one of the things the party opposite promised to obtain within a very short time after they secured office. At that time, and for many years before, there had existed a commercial treaty between Great Britain and Belgium, and between Great Britain and Germany. Article 15 of the Belgian treaty provided:

> Articles the produce or manufacture of Belgium shall not be subject in the British colonies to other or higher duty than those which are or may be imposed upon similar articles of British origin.

And in the German treaty, article 2 provided:

That no other or higher duties shall be levied in the Zolverin on the exportation of any goods to the Dominion and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, nor in the dominions and the possessions of Her Britannic Majesty in the exportation of any goods to the Zolverin than are or may be levied on the exportation of the like goods to any third country the most favoured in that respect.

Article 5 of the German treaty provides:

That in favour, privilege or reduction in the tariff of duties of importation or exportation which either of the contracting parties may concede to any third power shall be extended immediately and unconditionally to the other.

And article 7 provides:

That the stipulations of the preceding articles 1 to 6 shall also be applied to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty. In those colonies and possessions the produce of the states of the Zolverin shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland or of any other country of a like kind, nor shall the exportation from the colonies or the possessions of the Zolverin be subject to any higher or other duties than the exportation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

One would have thought that that language was so explicit there could not be any doubt as to its meaning. One would have thought that it clearly enough provided that no preference could be given by either of these countries to any other without that same preference being extended to the other contracting party. Such a meaning had in fact for a long time been attached to those treaties, and had been recognized on various occasions by the government preceding this one, notably in the joint address passed asking for denunciation of these treaties in 1891 in order that preferential trade within the empire might be obtained; also when the French treaty of 1894 was adopted, and again in 1895, when the Act respecting commerical treaties was passed. With these before this government, one would have thought it would have been wholly impossible for them to have misconstrued or misunderstood the full effect or meaning of those treaty provisions. But in the first year this government was in power, they placed Canada apparently in total ignorance of these restrictions, in a very peculiar position. By a resolution introduced in connection with the tariff, they attempted first to grant to Great Britain a preference that would not apply to Germany or Belgium. But when that resolution was discussed, the full intent and scope of those two treaties was pointed out. So forcibly was the matter brought to their attention at that time, that they finally brought in another resolution which I think it would be well to read:

Clause 16. When the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada in terms which on the whole are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country when imported direct thereform, may then be entered for duty or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada at the reduced rate of duty provided for in the reciprocal tariff set forth in schedule D.

(a) That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff shall be decided by the collector of customs subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

(b) That the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such reciprocal tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

In order to get over the difficulty that no power existed in this government to extend such a privilege as they were prepared to extend to Great Britain without extending the same privilege to Belgium and Germany, they introduced this resolution. It was again pointed out that this resolution did not remove the objection made to the original one, but was every whit as objectionable. Notwithstanding that objection, however, they went on and passed that resolution. To be as brief as possible in the history of this matter, when that resolution was passed it granted to Great Britain a preference ranging, during the course of time, from 12½ to 33⅓ per cent. As soon as that preference was granted, Germany claimed an equal preference, and Canada denied that she was entitled to it. Canada then either had to get into trouble with Great Britain, to whom she had granted the preference, or Great Britain had to get into trouble with Germany, who was entitled to the same advantages. The difficulties increased, matters kept getting worse, and until finally to help this government out, Great Britain denounced the German and Belgian treaties, so far as Canada was concerned. What then was the position? Canada was outside the treaty, and having closed the custom house door in the face of Germany at a time when she should not have done so, naturally enough the German people retaliated and imposed the heaviest duties possible upon their imports from Canada. Then, that matter pressed so heavily upon Canadian interests that this government thought they would cure it in some other way, and, to meet the adverse taxation imposed upon them by Germany, they put on what is known as the surtax. The result of that was that Canadian trade was being reduced all the

time, Canada was losing enormous sums, her interests were being more adversely affected every day. It became absolutely necessary, in order to correct the mistake they had made and to put the country on a fair basis of trade with Germany, to undo the wrong they had done. So they withdrew the surtax, and they have now entered into a temporary commercial arrangement with Germany. Now, in the face of the facts, if any hon. gentleman will say that the diplomacy exhibited by this government in the arrangement of the Japanese treaty, and in the dealings with Germany will compare favourably with the diplomacy exercised by Great Britain in the Ashburton treaty and in the Oregon treaty, I can only say that I believe he fails altogether to apprehend the action of either party in connection with these matters. The comparison, instead of being disparaging to Great Britain, shows, on the contrary, that Great Britain exercised the very greatest care and much greater diplomacy in guarding the interests of Canada than has been shown by the gentlemen now in power.

I might go on and refer to many other cases—there are others. But let me give one illustration—one which contrasts the action of the two authorities in relation to one matter. In 1854, the reciprocity treaty with the United States was negotiated by Lord Elgin on behalf of Canada. The effort was a successful one to obtain what Canada desired in regard to trade relations. I need not enter into the manner in which it was obtained; that, perhaps, is pretty well known. The fact is that the reciprocity treaty was obtained by British diplomacy for the benefit of Canada. And that it was for the practical benefit of Canada is shown by the trade returns of the eleven years during which the treaty was in force. The trade grew from $20,000,000 up to $80,000,000 in that period of eleven years. That treaty was revoked. And, although these gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches had promised that one of their first acts upon attaining to power would be to negotiate another reciprocity treaty with the United States, and though they have made attempt after attempt, though, time and again, they have journeyed to Washington on this mission, they have always come back empty-handed. At last they declared that there should be no more journeys to Washington, no more attempts to obtain a reciprocity treaty with the United States —they have abandoned the whole project which they once promised to carry into effect. Here we have, in this one instance, the diplomacy of Britain succeeding and succeeding admirably in the interests of Canada, yet the efforts of these hon. gentlemen in the same direction absolutely and entirely failing. I ask if, in view of this, one can, make a favourable comparison for Canada in diplomacy with that which has been exercised by the British government on behalf of Canada. I might also refer to the French treaty and to the Alaskan boundary. In each and every one of these cases, I venture to say, one cannot view the facts fairly without coming to the conclusion—however unwilling he may be as a Canadian to do so—that Great Brithas, on all occasions, shown the greatest concern for Canada and has secured the interest of Canada to a larger extent than have those who now control our affairs.

In conclusion, I am unalterably opposed to the Bill now under consideration for the establishment of a naval defence. I think I have shown—at any rate, I have satisfied myself from my investigation—that the Bill is not one in the interest of the Canadian people or in the interest of the empire as a whole. I have tried to show, and I think I have succeeded, that an attempt is being made in this Bill to wrest from His Majesty a part of his command and control over the armed forces of this empire. I think I have shown that the government, wrongfully, improperly, have endeavoured to secure the power to deny to His Majesty the assistance and benefit, even in time of necessity, of the forces that this Bill undertakes to raise. In fact, the right hon. Prime Minister in introducing this Bill, or subsequently, stated that there might be occasions when he would feel it his duty to withhold the services of this navy from Great Britain. Surely, in this day and age, such a condition of affairs will not be allowed to prevail in this Canada of ours. I think I have succeeded in showing that the government in supporting this Bill, or in leading hon. gentlemen in this House to support it, have not the information or data or knowledge concerning it which should convince this House, or any one, that it can ever be of material service to the empire, or to assure this House that it will be of real service to Canada. On the contrary, they have said enough to satisfy this House and the people, I think, that the efforts they are making will cost this country an enormous amount of money—they do not even know the amount—and that this expenditure will keep on increasing until it may become such a burden that the people of Canada can ill afford to bear it. I think I have shown that the reason put forth by the right hon. Prime Minister for retaining this control and for establishing the navy in this way—that interests having been sacrificed heretofore by British diplomacy—is a fallacy, there is no foundation in fact for it. And, for these many reasons, I shall feel it my duty, not only to my constituents, but to myself and to my country as a whole, to oppose this measure. I am

a Canadian—I think I am a better Canadian because I am a British subject.

I represent a riding containing men who are as loyal as any man who ever wore a hat, men who are not only willing to pay, but are willing to fight for the maintenance of the British empire, men who are just as anxious as any one can be to retain Canada in the position she now occupies as part of the British empire, and who cherish the hope that she will always occupy the proud position she now holds as the brightest gem in the British crown.

Mr. ERNEST ROY (Dorchester) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the discusion on the Bill now submitted to the consideration of the House, it is rather a difficult matter to bring forth further arguments and even to find new forms for the expression of arguments already submitted. So, I shall be content with presenting a few considerations without entering into a thorough discussion of this measure.

I intend making only a brief reference to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) who has just taken his seat. Let me, however, congratulate him on that part of his speech in which he pointed out the main difference between the policy of the government and that of the opposition in connection with this matter. Of course, I cannot agree that he has correctly pointed out what these differences are in every respect; but that part of his speech will help, I hope, in correcting the false impression which the friends of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, the leader of His Majesty's opposition No. 2, are trying to create in the province of Quebec. As a matter of fact, the friends of the latter's, hon. member for Jacques Cartier, without eliciting a single protest on his part, are creating the impression outside of parliament that it is a farce which is going on within the precincts of this House. I find that idea expressed in a resolution passed by the members of a farmers' club in one of the parishes of the county of Dorchester, and which reads as follows:

Considering that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of Canada, has made an agreement with Mr. Borden leader of the Opposition with a view to putting through the Naval Bill No. 95, introduced on January 12 1910.

That idea is also given expression to in the petitions forwarded to this House from the province of Quebec against the passing of this Bill. The hon. member for Hastings, by pointing out to the House in what respects the policy of the Liberal party and that of the Conservatives who follow the lead of the hon. member for Halifax, differ essentially from one another, will have helped to correct the false notion to which I have just called attention.

Mr. PORTER.

It is to be regretted, Mr. Speaker, that there should be in Canada people having so little concern for our parliamentary institutions, and such a short-sighted view of patriotism, as to spread among the Canadian people the impression that their representatives in this House, are only comedians in disguise. It is to be hoped that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and his followers will realize that it is incumbent on them to set the public right by means of a public statement. The first duty of a member of parliament is to ensure public respect to the institution of which he forms part.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding any further, I wish to correct as regards a misunderstanding in regard to the meaning of some remarks I made in this House last year concerning the resolution of March 29, 1909, a misunderstanding resulting from the erroneous construction put on those remarks by some hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman for Marquette, among others, contended a short time ago that, on March 29 last, I had condemned the proposal for the building of a Canadian navy. It will be sufficient for me to quote short extracts from the 'Hansard' of last year to set the House right in regard to the position I actually took at the time. Following on some general remarks as to the reasons which might be urged in favour of the immediate building of a Canadian navy, I spoke as follows:

(Hansard 1909, page 3550). What I have said does not imply that Canada should not adopt military measures for the defence of her coast and of her territory... Canada being a nation surrounded by other nations whose interests may conflict with her own, is bound to provide means of defence.

Page 3551. Let Canada organize a naval force to protect her coast line and her seaports both on the Atlantic and the Pacific; no one objects.

And I summed up my remarks in the following terms:

The House is no doubt unanimous in its opinion that Canada should get up a naval force which will enable her to make first among the nations, and thus command that respect which otherwise she would not command from those nations having hostile intentions against her.

The above extracts clearly show that last year I was in favour of the establishment of a Canadian navy, and that I then considered that undertaking an essentially patriotic one. I have not changed my mind in the meantime.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Saint Ann's, on February 24 last, delivered a speech which the opposition generously applauded. The hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) gave expression to the admiration and enthusiasm which that

speech stirred up in the minds of his colleagues by challenging hon. members on the government side to find in their ranks any one who would dare analyse that speech not to say to attempt answering it. At the risk of being thought presumptuous. I intend taking up that challenge and answering briefly the few, though long winded arguments, set forth by the hon. member for St. Ann's. I shall do so with the same calmness of mind as when in the ordinary course of my professional practice. I appeal to a higher tribunal from the judgment of an inferior court which does not seem satisfactory.

The arguments brought forward by the hon. member for St. Ann's may be summed up as follows, and I shall take up first that which comes last in his speech. Canada, he says, without breaking the constitution is at liberty to grant to Great Britain a sum of money towards helping the mother country in maintaining her supremacy over the other nations of the world, or else towards relieving her of part of the burden which she has to bear in order to keep the world at peace, by having an argument superior to that of any other nation. I recognize the soundness of that proposition. The rightful owner is entitled to transfer his property rights to whomsoever he wishes. That legal proposition cannot be gainsaid, and Canada has the right to donate the people's money to England. So the Dominion can legally do what is provided for in the latter part of the amendment submitted by the hon. leader of the opposition.

The hon. member for St. Ann's, on the other hand, admits that Canada would be justified in granting such a gift to Great Britain only in case the latter was in such a position that the money would be needed to stave off an attack on the part of Germany. He admits that, if it were not for Germany, there would be no occasion for a gift of Dreadnoughts or money. That is a question of fact, and after going into the matter, he draws the conclusion that there actually exists a German danger, and that it is desirable that Canada should make a contribution to Great Britain either in money or in Dreadnoughts.

I have also on my own account gone into that question of fact. My authority is the English people, British opinion. I find it is divided on that point. Even in England, some contend that danger exists, while others deny it. However, I am assured that those who deny the existence of any danger, are not impelled by any feeling of disloyalty, are not lacking in patriotism. I must then come to the conclusion that the people most interested in finding out, discovering, detecting any danger, deny its existence. Will Canada and particularly will this House claim that we have a better insight into the matter than the British people and the British parliament themselves. I think it would be bad form on our part to assume that we are in a position to enlighten the British people and British parliament in matters of patriotism and political foresight.

Therefore I say that so long as the English people have not themselves clearly recognized that the danger exists, we should keep our money, and direct our efforts towards helping the mother country in another way, in the way that was recognized to be the best at the colonial conference of 1909, where all interested parties were represented.

The hon. member for St. Ann's contends in another proposition that the passing of the Bill would result in a restriction of Canada's autonomy, inasmuch as she would divest herself of all national sentiment. He further contends that a proposal entailing such consequences should be submitted to the people previous to its being adopted by this House.

Since the debate originated, I was always expecting from hon. gentlemen opposite some evidence that logic had been respected in the amendment submitted by their leader. Speeches ran their course and there was nothing forthcoming. Of course reference was made to the 'tin pot navy,' to the German scare, to the loyalty of the Canadian Prime Minister, to the disloyalty of French Canadians, to the lack of patriotism of the Liberals, but no satisfaction was given to the public mind, very naturally puzzled by this chaotic assemblage of disconnected ideas. The hon. member for St. Ann's, with his judicial mind, had observed that gap, and for three hours and a half applied himself to filling it.

It is no wonder that the opposition which until then had fought in a haphazard way, without any plan of campaign, with the sole idea of fighting the government, and could not find its way out of a debate wherein they had engaged without the help of logic, it is no wonder, I say, that the opposition should have greeted with utmost pleasure the member for St. Ann's who, they thought, had found a means of solving the difficulty. They applauded him, thinking that once more out of chaos light had come. But that way out which the hon. member for St. Ann was supposed to have discovered, did not exist in reality, it was an effect of mirage, a delusion of the senses, originating from a keen thirst for logic, which the hon. gentleman has been unable to satisfy.

The Bill now under consideration, would be a restriction on our national autonomy were it to become law, says the hon. member for St. Ann's. And why? Because, he says, a war navy is always destined for attack, and he states in support of that contention an utterance of the British admiralty at the colonial conference of 1907.

Since, he goes on to say, a war navy is a means of attack, Canada having no right to declare war, that means would be entirely for the use of Great Britain, who alone has authority to lead an attack on a foreign nation and declare war. If that be the case, the Canadian navy will necessarily be under the control of the only power within the empire in a position to make use of it. Now, he adds, as any declaration on the part of Great Britain can only be the outcome of her foreign policy, and as Canada has nothing to do with that, it will happen that the British authorities will declare war and utilize Canada's naval force, without Canada having been consulted as to the desirability or the fairness of such a decision. Thus, Canada sacrifices in part her national conscience.

That is a fallacy couched in pretty language, but which cannot be defended on any grounds. The whole force of this argument is dependent on the truth of the contention that a war navy is necessarily a means of attack, and cannot be looked upon as a means of defence. That is the statement the falsity of which I intend to show first.

At the colonial conference of 1907 the proposal was made to provide a single imperial navy under the immediate and exclusive control of the British admiralty. It was stated at the time that the British navy could not be considered a means of defence, and that was true in the case of Great Britain, seeing that her supremacy in that respect cannot for the time being be denied. Great Britain is a sovereign state having the power to declare war. She cannot let other nations whose strength is inferior provide themselves with navies to protect themselves one against the other; but as soon as any power tried to go further and build a navy which not only would ensure its superiority over neighbouring powers, but would put it on a par with Great Britain, that departure would be looked upon as an agression, since such an armament could be aimed only at the only power superior to it at the time. In that case, it would be a matter of elementary wisdom on the part of England not to wait until the enemy had completed his means of attack. She should take the lead and cripple the power thus threatening the world's peace.

Canada is not a sovereign country, and while enjoying complete liberty as regards her domestic administration, she is, as regards her foreign relations, under certain restrictions due to her status of dependency. Canada is free to repulse whomsoever invades her territory; but she has not the right of declaring war against a foreign country. Her militia is for purposes of defence, but she could not of her own accord lead an attack, because whenever Canada took such a step, she would be asserting her independence.

As a result, Great Britain's relative position among the nations of the world, her naval forces are destined to take the offensive, while Canada's political status requires that all our forces should be for purposes of defence. That statement cannot be contradicted. The forces of Canada can be used for purposes of attack only in co-operation with Great Britain should the latter engage in war.

It may be inquired when Canada is likely to be attacked. I am not a prophet, but Canada might be attacked as the outcome of a declaration of war on the part of several allied powers desirous of wrenching from England her supremacy. It might also occur as a diversion by the forces of a power attempting to repel an attack on the part of Great Britain by striking at her colonies. Canada might also be the object of an attack through a desire for conquest on the part of a foreign nation suffering from over-population, and which, not having at home sufficient resources to draw on, might deem itself justified in laying hands on a country such as Canada, provided with the very things that power would be in need of. Would the property rights held by Canada, her desire to reserve for her children the wealth within her borders, her repugnance to allow the introduction in the country of a civilization foreign to hers, would all that suffice to keep out those hungry foes? Certainly not.

Under all such conditions the Canadian war navy would undeniably have its usefulness. But the building of the navy will have its immediate and more certain usefulness in helping to maintain the supremacy of the British empire throughout the world, and thus ensuring for many years to come peace to Great Britain and her colonies.

When these colonies will, each and every one of them, have war navies severally owned by them, and will see to their own protection without any expense to the mother country, any power anxious to attack Great Britain or one of its colonies, will have to have at her command forces superior to those of Great Britain and her colonies. The expenditure which such an undertaking would necessitate and which that power would have to bear single-handed, would probably be considered too heavy. Its only recourse would then be in contracting alliance, and here it would be met with the wiles of British diplomacy, which would leave very little chance of success.

Alliances have always been the most efficient means for ensuring the world's peace. Very few countries are powerful enough to command respect by themselves, but an alliance may often result in securing the co-operation of three or four other powers, which altogether may be in a position to command respect for the rights of each and every one of them.

When England will be surrounded by colonies all provided with war navies, she will

offer to the world the spectacle of an alliance of many nations, an alliance founded on interest and on sentiment, that is, on the most potent influences in human life. So then I say that the hon. member for St. Ann's has no grounds for saying that the navy which is to be provided under this Bill cannot possibly be for purposes of defence, and must necessarily be for purposes of attack.

Our constitution contained in the British North America Act allows us in clause 7 of section 91, to provide means of defence on land and on sea; it grants us the power to create a land force and a war navy for the defence of Canada. That navy, of course, remains under the control of the Dominion as well as the militia.

I say that the Canadian navy will remain under the control of Canada. However, that is questioned by the wing of the opposition which has the hon. member for Jacques Cartier as its leader. That section of the opposition party, together with those in the province of Quebec who are their exponents, contend that the control of the navy must ultimately rest with Great Britain, and that thereby our national autonomy will be restricted. Both the government and that wing of the Conservative party which follows the lead of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), contend that the control of the Canadian navy will continue to be with the Dominion. The government and their followers take credit to themselves on that account, while the opposition taunts the government with having, under the Bill, retained that control for Canada. Of the 221 members making up the House, there are only seven or eight, under the guidance of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who fail to construe the law in that manner. But as every one knows, the worst cases of blindness are those of people who refuse to open their eyes.

After thus disposing of the fallacy which the hon. member for St. Ann's has invoked in support of his contention, I am justified in saying that the Canadian navy will be a means of defence for staving off any attack directed against Canada. That navy will remain under our control. In building it, we are merely exercising a power which is granted to us by the constitution; in keeping it under our control, we are also exercising a power granted by the constitution, and the mere fact of exercising a power cannot logically restrict that power; on the contrary, it causes it to pass from the domain of theory into that of reality.

Will it be contended that by section 18, Canada relinquishes part of her autonomy? How is that section worded? It says that in a case of emergency the Canadian government will have the power to place the Canadian navy at the disposal of the British admiralty, which should be effected with the consent of the Canadian parliament, if it is in session; and should it be during recess, parliament will have to be summoned to meet within a fortnight of the action thus taken by the government.

The right of Canada to donate to Great Britain a sum of money in the shape of a contribution and without in any way restricting her autonomy, cannot be denied by any one. On the contrary, such action would go to show that Canada has the right to dispose of her property in the same way as any private owner. If instead of giving money to Great Britain, Canada were to give guns or rifles, she would still be acting within her powers and would not be relinquishing or restricting any of her powers. If instead of donating rifles or guns, Canada preferred loaning them, it would merely be depriving itself of certain of the privileges of ownership, usufruct, and such action would not in any way affect her powers. Then again, if instead of donating money or loaning rifles or guns, Canada, in a case of emergency, loaned to Great Britain another war machine, its navy, the same principle would apply, and Canada would not be losing anything of its autonomy. The right to give has never been restricted through its being exercised. Let me demonstrate that fact by means of a comparison. The interdict is deprived of the right of making any transaction in regard to his holdings. He is not permitted to sell, loan or give his property without being authorised to do so by some other person. Even should the interdict be a millionaire, he would not be allowed to dispose of his property any more than if he was a pauper. It is autonomy, it is liberty that is lacking. But, whoever retains his full rights and is left with a free hand in the administration of his property even, should he have only a few cents, would in giving them, be giving proof of the actual possession of his autonomy, of his liberty. To my mind, Canada would not be losing its autonomy if, in a case of emergency or which would be considered such as regards Great Britain, or herself she put the Canadian navy at the disposal of the British admiralty, any more than she lost her autonomy when she voted a grant for the sufferers in the Paris floods, or the sufferers in the earthquakes of San Francisco or Messina.

If Canada has the right, without impairing her autonomy to loan her navy to Great Britain whenever she thinks proper, she has the right to delegate that power to her trustees, the government, under definite circumstances, and the fact that in delegating that power she requires that her trustees, after fulfilling their trust, should give an account of their management does not

in any way alter the principle. It is a mere matter of policy.

I think I have shown that Canada is free to exercise the power conferred by the constitution in regard to providing a war navy and loaning it as well to England, without losing anything of her power, liberty and autonomy.

The next question to be considered is whether it is desirable that we should exercise that power. The right of ownership implies that of safeguarding property rights; and whoever recognizes the right of ownership, must also recognize the right of the owner to defend his property and to take the necessary means to that effect. The right of defence is thereby recognized.

Nature is a great teacher in that regard. All living beings are provided with means of defence enabling them to protect their life against any attack. Man, she has endowed with intelligence and with the power to take hold of things and adapt them to his own usage, either for the preservation of life, or of property, or for purposes of defence.

Canada is a large holder; she has the right of utilizing her possessions, but she has also the duty, in order to maintain her property rights, to provide means for their defence against all comers. In the natural world, only those being who are destined to be food for other are unprovided with adequate means of defence, and have no thought of providing themselves with such means. In the realm of intelligent beings, the incapable, the improvident and the cowardly alone neglect providing themselves with means of defence However, incapables, that is to say, children and sick persons, are not always exposed to suffer on that account, for in the human heart there has been instilled a feeling, motherly love, filial love, friendship or humanity, feelings which lead the strong to protect and defend under certain circumstances those who are weak. Even nations have shown that they were endowed with feelings of humanity, since Great Britain is known to have provided out of her own resources for the defence of her colonies still too young to protect themselves, just as the father of a family looks after, protects and defends his child so long as the latter has not reached a sufficient age, or has not acquired sufficient strength to render that protection superfluous. The child should not wait until his parents give him to understand that he is in a position to look after himself or to provide part of his sustenance; he should realize what his parents have done for him, and without hesitation look out for himself as soon as he is capable of doing so.

British colonies have enjoyed heretofore and for the last century or more, in the case of Canada, a condition of perfect peace, whereby they have been enabled to make marvellous progress. And that era of peace, they owe to England, who, by making the required sacrifices towards acquiring supremacy among the nations, has rendered her colonies secure against any danger of attack. That era of peace will be maintained only inasmuch as England's power is upheld. Now that the colonies are in a position to lighten the burden of the mother country, they should do so willingly. They should do so, in the first place, by endeavouring to provide for their own wants, in the same way that the child should relieve his parents of part of the burden of becoming self-sustaining.

The measure which is now under consideration, does not provide from the start a defence service for Canada, but aims merely at completing the system already in existence, and there is nothing exceptional about it. It simply provides for a need in the ordinary course of things.

Is there a single Canadian engrossed with the welfare of his country who would have expected Canada to increase in national wealth, to treble in the space of a few years the volume of her trade, to increase her population in marvellous fashion, to make a reputation for her products in the greatest markets of the world, to reveal to all nations her resources, her great possibilities, and to develop in every way her assets, and that this same Canada would remain indifferent as regards any steps to be taken for the defence of her possessions.

Cities increase the police force and take fuller measures of safety as the value of property increases within their limits. The banker will spend more to protect his hundreds of thousands of dollars against the attacks of robbers than the common labourer will do to protect the small sums he keeps at home. Means taken for the safeguarding of wealth should bear a certain proportion to the value of that wealth. Property should be protected in due proportion to the volume of that wealth. Property should be protected in due proportion to its value for greed keeps pace with the value of the coveted objects.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that we have not the right to complete the means of defence of the country without consulting the people. If I understand aright the theory of our constitution, Canada is governed by an executive council composed of ministers, presided over by the Governor General who represents the King. It is the duty of the government to see to the enforcement of the laws, and to provide means that will enable Canada to fulfil her destiny. It is incumbent on them to prepare the legislation under which the country will develop and its citizens be allowed

to enjoy full liberty, exercise their rights, and hold property.

That government is responsible to parliament for its stewardship; the representatives of the people are its judges. On the other hand, these representatives are responsible to the people for the carrying out of their mandate. They should be courageous enough to realize fully what duties are incumbent upon them and live up to those duties. The mandate which we as members of parliament have received from the people is not specific but general. We are here to consider the questions which are submitted to us; we should look into them and not play the part of a shyster lawyer. The advocate who is anxious to fulfil his duty advises his client, studies his case and takes the responsibility of the opinion he gives, realizing that since his client has come to him, it is because he relies on his honesty and his special knowledge of the subject. The lawyer who is indifferent to the dictates of his conscience, who may be a smart practitioner with a difficult case, rather than probe it to the bottom, will confer with his client, present the matter to him in a more or less satisfactory light, and endeavour to get from him a clue, so that should he fail later on in winning the case, he may fall back on his client and say: I have done as you diretced me to do. Such an excuse is not valid.

Mr. Speaker, I love Canada as warmly as any Canadian. My ancestry in this land of Canada can be retraced as far back as 1663, and if the grim reaper spares my home, I shall leave a numerous progeny to continue the family name on this land of Canada. I love Canada and I love the Canadian people of whatever origin. I wish for my country a happy future, a future of greatness which will cause its name to be inscribed in golden letters in the annals of history. I am willing to work all my life, and put at its disposal the activity, the intelligence and the enthusiasm which I have inherited for promoting its intellectual, social and material progress. I am willing to work and accumulate for ourselves and for those who will come after us great riches of all kinds; but I wish also that after thus amassing wealth we should be far-seeing enough to conserve it; and on behalf of the hon. gentlemen occupying seats in this House, if they have the power of developing the resources of Canada, without having to consult the people in regard to each and every measure submitted for that purpose; if they have the power to modify the constitution of the country as they have done so, at the time of confederation, without first consulting the people; if they have the power to ensure the greatness, happiness and prosperity of Canada, in that way, I claim for them the right of conserving the benefits accruing from their labour without being obliged to consult the people. Not, Mr. Speaker, that I intend disparaging or showing disrespect for public opinion, or ignoring the sovereignty of the people; no, but in so doing, I would fear lest my constituents told me, and rightly so, that when they sent me here to get acquainted with the history of my country, study its resources, imbibe its ideals and aspirations, they expected that I would do my duty valiantly, conscientiously and patriotically. I would fear lest they told me, and rightly so, that it is useless to elect representatives, if as regards every measure of some importance, the farmer must leave the plough to make a study of politics, the merchant, the manufacturer, and banker turn away from their business, from their undertakings, to unravel the intricacies of constitutional law, or carry on an investigation regarding the general business of the country from the political standpoint, so as to be in a position to direct the government as to the course it should follow. In the meantime, members of parliament would be taking a rest.

No, let us take a serious view of the question. What the Canadian electorate wish for is a body of representatives who are capable of study and reflection, of appreciating and judging things. What the people want is a body of representatives showing patriotism, good will, activity and self reliance. What the people want is the maintenance of our constitution and our parliamentary traditions. What the people want is a body of men capable of developing Canada, of putting in store the results of each successive advance; not dreamers who live in the clouds, not firebrands of loyalism who would fain counteract the natural course of things, who would have water flow up hill, and the child play the part of the mother. What the people want, it is a body of representatives who take lessons from the past to prepare the future, but who are always mindful that man is master only of the present and that the true patriots are those who do things, and not those who are content with dreaming.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, my first thought is to congratulate my congenial and eloquent friend the member for Dorchester (Mr. Roy), on his success, on the ability and zeal with which he has acquitted himself. I shall endeavour to do my best towards answering him in the course of the few remarks I am about to make.

The Bill relative to the building of a war navy is, to my mind, the most momentous of all those that have been brought to the

attention of the government of parliament and of the Canadian people, since the day of confederation. I intend considering that social, economical and political problem from the standpoint of national interests, from the standpoint of the constitution, and lastly, from the standpoint of the rights of the electorate.

In considering that important subject, I intend taking as guide a principle inscribed in the works of the fathers of confederation: 'Canada for the Canadians, under the folds of the British flag.' I intend looking into that problem with a mind unbiased by party interest. I was elected after stating to the electors of the county of l'Islet that, on all national issues, I would place myself above party considerations. I have not as long a parliamentary experience as most of my colleagues of the province of Quebec who occupy seats on your right, Mr. Speaker. Accordingly, at this late stage of a memorable debate, the representative of the county of l'Islet craves the indulgence and courtesy which have always been extended to him when addressing the House to defend his opinions or expound his views.

Fortunately, we are not called upon just now to deal with a question of race or religion; we are endeavouring to find out a means of settlement of a social problem which is of interest to all the provinces. I am not going to consider that question from the standpoint of race, religion or language; but entirely from the national standpoint, the Canadian standpoint, and I am glad to be in sympathy with the workingmen and a large number of English speaking farmers, who are of opinion that the government should not decide to build a war navy before consulting the people.

Previous speakers have thought proper to question the loyalty of some distinguished men of my nationality.

I am not called upon to defend these gentlemen here; but I have suffered so much from these appeals to race prejudices at the hands of my opponents that I must repudiate with all the energy that is in me those malignant attacks, directed against the Conservative and the Liberal leaders of French Canadian origin.

This Bill is of the greatest moment from a financial standpoint, and I cannot undertake to vote such large sums without first consulting my constitutents. On the same grounds, I am bound to refuse to acquiesce in the policy of the leader of the Conservative party. Without a mandate from the people, I should think I was failing in my duty and betraying the interests of my constituents in denying my cordial support to the policy advocated by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. J. TURCOTTE (Quebec). My hon. friend is in favour of an appeal to the people. Should the people pronounce in favour of the building of a navy, would the hon. gentleman support such a measure?

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Should the people, as my hon. friend suggests, pronounce in favour of the building of that navy, let me tell him that I have too much respect for the will of the people not to bow to it, once it has spoken out. I would obey the people, or else I should respect my own convictions to the point of bidding adieu to public life and going back to my professional labours.

Besides, in the course of the remarks I am going to make, I shall have the opportunity of replying more fully to the questions he has just asked me. However, I wish it to be well understood that I have such a respect for the will of the Canadian people that I would not hesitate to bow to their decision, and as I said, to withdraw from public life, should it be necessary.

The Bill introduced by the government on the 12th of January provides for the creation of a naval force to be composed of a permanent corps, a reserve force and a volunteer force. Let us review the variations of the naval programme of the government.

The yearly cost, from $3,000,000 rises to $7,157,000, even before we have started building our navy.

In introducing his Bill on the 12th of January, the Prime Minister laid down the naval programme and stated that Canada was going to establish a navy which might cost $15,000,000 and which was to be composed of four Bristols, six destroyers and one Boadicea.

This involves an expenditure of $3,000,000 a year for maintenance.

On the 3rd of February, Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated that the expenditure involved in the maintenance of this new fleet would be $4,253,000 a year.

Still another variation. On the 10th of February, Sir Frederick Borden also addresses the House The scheme is extending; a naval college is now wanted.

Here is the third plan: Four Bristols, six destroyers, one Boadicea, one Niobe or Rainbow, one naval college.

Henceforth, we are going to have 12 ships, and according to Sir Frederick Borden the estimated cost is $11,730,000, or a little less than the cost of the seven ships first mentioned. In return the cost of the upkeep, according to Sir Frederick Borden, is only $3,680,000 now, or $600,000 less than the estimated cost of maintenance of the 11 ships of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

This 'Niobe' which hooks on the last scheme, is a vessel thirteen years old, and out of date, which we have bought from the British Admiralty for the sum of $1,075,000.

Mr. Monk, the member for Jacques Cartier, prevailed upon Sir Frederick Borden to

place on 'Hansard' a memorandum prepared by Admiral Kingsmill, who is in charge of our new navy, and this memorandum, which the minister tried to conceal from the House, shows the following figures, prepared by Admiral Kingsmill:—

1. Cost of ships.

(In England.)

4 Bristols at $1,885,000 each	$ 7,540,000
1 Boadicea	1,750,000
6 destroyers at $400,000	2,400,000
1 Niobe	1,075,000
	$12,765,000

Everybody admits that 25 per cent must be added for the additional cost of construction in Canada, except for the Niobe, which is already built:—

4 Bristols at $2,350,000	$ 9,400,000
1 Boadicea	2,180,000
6 destroyers at $500,000	3,000,000
1 Nibe	1,075,000
Total cost	$15,655,000

The interest at 3 per cent on that expenditure is $468,000 a year. The life or term of service of those ships is but ten years; one-tenth of their cost must be set aside yearly, to provide for their replacement. That sum amounts to $1,500,000.

Admiral Kingsmill, in his memorandum, gives the following approximate cost of the college, battery, barracks, dry docks, &c.:

1 naval college	$150,000
Furnishing same and workshops	50,000
Two houses, captain of college and director of studies	15,000
Barracks	200,000
Battery for heavy and light guns	20,000
Arming same	110,000
Admiralty house for officers of barracks	70,000
Dockyards	100,000
	$715,000

Just think of it. Building a college for $150,000 and constructing a dry dock for $100,000. Who ever heard the like?

Let us take those figures, $715,000, and add them to the total cost of the fleet, and that gives us a total of $16,405,000 for construction and maintenance.

COST OF MAINTENANCE ON LAND.

The following are the details given for the yearly maintenance of our naval establishment on land:

Upkeep of naval college	$ 80,000
" of barracks	75,000
" of dockyards	350,000
Headquarter staffs	80,000
Reserve stores	100,000
Ordnance stores	200,000
Contingencies	150,000
Total	$1,030,000

MAINTENANCE OF THE FLEET.

First, as to the annual cost of the training ships 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' according to the estimate of Admiral Kingsmill:

Cost of nucleous crew and training personal	$ 282,000
Victualling and medicines, &c.	60,000
Clothing gratuity	15,000
Upkeep of 'Niobe'	150,000
" of 'Rainbow'	115,000
Recruits: Pay, victualling and medicines	550,000
Clothing	70,000
Recruiting expenses	2,000
Total	$1,244,000

Let us now take the upkeep of the fleet, and here are the figures given by Admiral Kingsmill:

4 Bristols.

Pay, allowances and victualling	$ 886,000
Upkeep	530,000

1 Boadicea.

Pay, allowances and victualling, &c.	226,000
Upkeep	150,000

6 Destroyers.

Pay, allowances, victualling	335,000
Upkeep	428,000

Recruits.

Expenditure	200,000
Contingencies	100,000
Total	$2,855,000

It is worth noting down here that there is no estimate given for coal, repairs, &c.

Total cost of the navy, according to the latter plan.

General recapitulation.

Total cost of the navy, according to the latter plan	$ 715,000
College, barracks, &c.	715,000
Total	$16,370,000

Annual cost, from the estimate of Admiral Kingsmill himself.

Interest on the cost of the fleet	$ 468,000
10 per cent on the cost of the fleet, to provide for replacement, &c.	1,560,000
Upkeep of college, barracks, &c	1,030,000
Maintenance of training-ships	1,244,000
Upkeep of Bristols and destroyers	2,855,000
Total annual cost	$7,157,000

And mark that we are spending about $1,500,000 for agriculture. Is it to be wondered at that the people are clamouring for a plebiscite, in order to put a stop to such an extravagance.

But wait till next year and you will see worse things than that.

They talk of fifteen million dollars for the building of our navy. But those who examine closely the cost of our national public works know that a much heavier expenditure must be anticipated.

Let us now read carefully sections 5 and 6 of the Bill:

The minister shall have the control and management of all naval affairs, including the perchase, maintenance and repair of the ordnance, ammunition, arms, armouries, stores, munitions and habiliments of war intended for the use of the naval service.

The minister shall have the control and management, including the construction, purchase, maintenance and repair of naval establishments and of ships and other vessels for the naval service.

We cannot conceive to-day, how many million dollars will be spent for the purchase of the maintenance and repairs of the ordnance, ammunition, arms, armouries, munitions and stores.

I invite all those who are responsible to the taxpayers of Canada and are accountable for the taxes imposed on them, to read carefully the following extract from the report of the conference (page 27):

In any consideration of the question of providing new docking facilities the Admiralty suggested that the docks should be designed of sufficient size to accommodate the largest ships whether for war or commerce, as apart from the mercantile advantage such docks might be used in case of an emergency by armoured cruisers and battleships. Docks of this kind might be placed on the Pacific, the Atlantic and the River St. Lawrence.

The providing of such docking facilities if designed of sufficient size, would involve a very large expenditure. Try to figure out the cost of the fortifications necessary to insure the protection of our naval yards and of our dry docks; just figure out the cost of pensions and of the training schools. No money is to be found now for the construction of a dry dock at Lévis, to meet a long felt want of maritime commerce and accommodate sea-going ships.

It is impossible to forecast the enormous expenditure which will be saddled upon this country, and it is the ratepayers, the humble workingman, and the poor farmer who will have to foot the bill. And that expenditure will go on increasing by leaps and bounds, from year to year. The South African war did cost us $2,000,000; how much then is the ratepayer going to pay, when our brothers are called upon to shed their blood in a war carried on by England against a European power?

How much are we going to spend, when our navy will be drawn into some great war for the defence of England?

How much shall we spend, perhaps to drown the voice of, and defeat just claims? How much will it cost us, should that navy be destroyed?

To-morrow the government will be called upon or will think that they are called upon to adopt a more strenuous attitude. Our naval expenditure will not be estimated according to our population, our wealth and our commerce, but from the risks we shall incur. That navy which you are going to build, those fighting ships which you propose to construct will demand life, strength and power. Before the general elections are on, the government will perhaps crown their present policy, by having Dreadnoughts built.

Open our public accounts under the heading of our Canadian militia, and you will find that that expenditure has gone on increasing by leaps and bounds, since 1890.

In 1890, our expenditure on militia was, $1,287,000; in 1896, $2,136.54; in 1909, $6,115,-150.

The government is asking for a vote of $6,898,000 for the fiscal year 1910-1911. Let us speak honestly: our naval expenditure will increase in the same ratio and with the same rapidity.

Let us hearken to the words of Sir William White, who was for a long time director of the shipyards of the British government:

There is no find stand in the designing of new models of warships, and as the Dreadnought type has not received the approval of a great number of experts, it may safely be said that this class of ships will not long remain in vogue and will not be in use so long as claimed by its advocates.

Will not our history be a repetition of the history of those people thrown into the vortex of militarism formerly denounced by the right hon. Prime Minister? When our fleet is built, we shall inevitably be carried away and led into naval ventures. We shall have to increase our public debt which will soon reach $500,000,000, and do without public works and improvements of great urgency in the interest of the progress of agriculture and industry. Let us listen to the words fallen from the lips of one of the most distinguished members on the government side. Let us impress on our minds the words uttered on March 29, 1900, by the hon. member for the Yukon:

But if we start at present into any vast naval or military outlay, we shall so impede our growth that in the course of a very short time we shall be of much less assistance to the empire than if we permitted our country to advance and prosper as she is doing now.

Let us cast a glance at the ascensional progression of the military and naval outlay of some nations. After the wars of the French revolution and of the empire, the cost of the British army was 220,000,000 francs. The following statistics give us a slight insight into the future in store for us:

	Francs.
Outlay of England for her militia in 1828..	220,000,000
Outlay of England for her militia in 1870..	540,000,000
Naval outlay of England in 1828..	150,000,000
Naval outlay of England in 1870..	240,000,000

During the last decade, the yearly outlay of England for her navy was 820,000,000 francs.

Mr. J. TURCOTTE (Quebec). (Translation.) Francs, you say?

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). Yes, francs.

Mr. BLONDIN. (Translation.) Would you rather have pounds sterling instead of francs?

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation). Is it 820,000,000 francs?

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). Yes, we find in the other countries the same progression in the expenditure.

	Francs.
1899	649,496,036
1900	663,369,671
1909	798,327,606

Naval Expenditure in France.

	Francs.
1899	303,600,510
1903	332,902,510

Naval Expenditure in the United States.

1900	$ 55,000,000
1909	121,000,000

Let us glance at the yearly naval outlay in some European countries and in the United States:

Great Britain	$164,000,000
Germany	60,424,000
United States	99,102,210
France	63,665,916
Italy	26,585,699
Russia	53,519,842

Is it not a fact that the largest portion of the revenues of those countries is swallowed up by extraordinary armaments? I do not wish to frighten and alarm the Canadian people with these statistics, but I know that similar causes will produce here similar effects. The people will wake up, when they feel on their shoulders the crushing weight of militarism with its heavy yoke of taxation.

Canada has not yet reached a sufficient stage of development to allow her to embark into such a ruinous venture. On the 15th of April, 1902, the right hon. the Prime Minister said:

> The principal items in the budget of Canada are what? Public works, the development of the country, the construction of railways and harbours, the opening up of ways of transportation. This is the work to which we have to devote our energies, and I would look upon it as a crime to divert any part of that necessary expenditure to the supply of guns, cannons and military armaments generally.

In 1910, as in 1902, we should spend our energies, display our patriotism and our loyalty in creating and improving our means of transportation, in building the Georgian Bay canal, in developing and promoting agriculture, commerce and industry.

One duty is to develop the natural resources of this land of ours, an inheritance entrusted to our care by a kind Providence. This great task calls for our whole strength and for our energies. We should impede the growth of Canada by saddling our people with a ruinous war budget. Every year, the government asks parliament for a vote of one million dollars, in order to insure the efficaciousness of our immigration policy. Owing to the fertility of our lands, to the productive work of our intelligent and energetic people, to the superior qualities and the variety of our products, thanks also to the peace and privileges which we enjoy, we have succeeded in bringing about a very material change in the minds of the European peoples and now we are yearly welcoming to our shores thousands of immigrants, formerly crushed down under the burden of militarism.

We invite a sound immigration from Europe and the United States, to assist us in the development of our country. At a moment when our fondest hopes are being realized, at a moment when the stream of immigration we are in need of is pouring into the country, is it fair, is it proper, without consulting these new settlers, to adopt a policy which might result in leading the flower of our youth into naval battles on all the seas of the world? Are we then, Canadians, to be used as targets on the waves of the North sea and upon the billows of the different oceans?

Mr. BELAND. (Translation). My hon. friend has just referred to naval battles in which our youth might be decimated. Would he kindly tell us how many naval battles England has fought in the last hundred years?

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). That is a matter of history, about which my hon. friend may enlighten himself. But let me tell him that the past is no guarantee of the future.

Mr. BELAND. (Translation). Then my friend agrees that England has not fought a single naval battle, for the last hundred years?

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). I shall return to that subject later on, and then my hon. friend will get an answer to his question.

Mr. BELAND. (Translation). Does the hon. gentleman deny that England has not fought a single naval battle, for the last hundred years. He has just referred to the dangers which we shall have to face, if we take part in the naval battle of England.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). Does my hon. friend affirm that, for a century, England has not fought a single naval battle? Does he affirm that she has had no naval engagement since 1800? Does he forget the Crimean war?

Mr. BELAND. (Translation). It was in 1805 that the battle of Trafalgar took place.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). The battle of Trafalgar took place in the course of the nineteenth century.

Mr. BELAND. (Translation). That is over a hundred years ago.

Mr. BLONDIN. (Translation). A few years more or less is immaterial.

Mr. BELAND. (Transation). That battle took place a hundred and five years ago.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). As I said, I shall return to that subject later on, and I hope I may now be permitted to go on with my speech.

Mr. BELAND. (Translation). My hon. friend knows very well that in asking that question, I had not the least intention of being discourteous to him.

It is then taken for granted that England has not had a single naval battle to fight, for over a hundred years.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). The hon. gentlemen who do not share my views, who advocate an imperial policy, those who are in favour of building a navy in order to take part in the wars of the empire, those who want to place at the disposal of the imperial authorities contributions to the navy, should read carefully the following extract from the report of the last imperial conference:

> A simple contribution of money or material may be to one Dominion the most acceptable form in which to assist the imperial defence. Another, while ready to provide local naval forces, and to place them at the disposal of the Crown in the event of war, may wish to lay the foundations upon which the future navy of its own could be raised. A third may think the best manner in which it can assist in promoting the interests of the empire is in undertaking certain local services not directly of a naval character, but which may relieve the imperial government from expenses which would otherwise fall on the British exchequer.

I share the views expressed in the latter part of this quotation. From the very inception of confederation, we have given our adhesion to the suggestions of the admiralty. I wish to be understood when giving my opinion on the defence of Canada. Proud as I am of our autonomous institutions and of the privilegs which flow therefrom, I agree that certain duties and responsibilities devolve upon me, from a national standpoint. Let me review the question in the light of our national traditions. Our military tradition goes back not merely to the battles of Montmorency and Carillon, but it goes beyond the heroic period of Frontenac. This military tradition, like the 'Canadian soul' is traced back to the days of Champlain.

Under the shadow of the British flag as under the French flag, the Canadian people knew how to defend their territory at the cost of the greatest sacrifices. My most earnest wish is that the Canadian people should in the future show the same spirit of abnegation and the same devotedness to this land of ours.

I say, consult the Canadian people and I will submit to the verdict of that sovereign body. If the members of parliament are bound or deem themselves bound by the resolution of the 29th of March. The people remain absolutely free. The hon. gentlemen on the other side, in endeavouring to commit the people to a policy which, in my humble opinion, distorts the national soul, point out the sacrifices made by New Zealand and Australia in favour of England. The public knows very well that owing to their isolation in the Pacific ocean, these colonies are bound to make great sacrifices for their naval defence. Our position is altogether different from theirs and I cannot endorse a legislation which in defiance of our traditions, drags us into the world policy of England.

Alone, among all the governments of the American continent, the Canadian government is about to entangle itself in the foreign policy of the United Kingdom. Still, I am not opposed to any assistance that might be given to England in an emergency. No. But this policy problem involves the most serious consequences and the Canadian people, enlightened by their representatives, should have a voice in the discussion of such a momentous matter.

During the conference of 1907, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries showed that Canada had relieved England of important naval expenditures which she formerly bore. I am sorry I cannot but regret that certain causes should keep the hon. minister away from this House and I sympathize with his friends in their trial.

On the 29th of March, 1909, the hon. minister said: After the denunciation of the treaty of Washington, from 1886 until to-day Canada has assumed all the responsibility of protecting her fisheries, not only on the Atlantic coast, but also on the Pacific coast, and since that time, we have spent no less a sum than $5,186,700.16.

By taking over the stations of Esquimalt and Halifax, Canada is doing a very great service to the empire at large. Canada has been spending considerable sums for

the aid of navigation in general and the maritime commerce of England has greatly benefited thereby. If our fishery protection service is not what is desired, if it is incomplete, let us vote the necessary sums to secure an efficacious service.

As stated by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on the 29th of March. "If we had some of these small boats in order to protect our coasts, it is to be presumed that in a short time large warships could come to our rescue, and in the meantime our coasts could be defended by these destroyers and torpedo boats.' I concur in these words. I could even go further. I am in favour of taking the necessary means for the defence of our coasts for the protection of our fisheries, and for our national defence. But the vessels used for those purposes should be absolutely Canadian ships, employed for the defence of Canada. There would be no cause to bear militarism.

Why should we not act in accordance with our national traditions? The Canadian people has fully discharged its duty towards the British Crown. Let us listen to the noble words fallen from the lips of Sir Charles Tupper in 1892:—

For my part, I believe that no contribution to the maintenance of the British army and navy on the part of Canada would have done more for the defence of the empire than the means by which public expenditure has been carried on for that purpose, in Canada.

On the 11th of March, 1898, Sir Charles Tupper showed that Canada had discharged her duty. Here are his very words:

I for one believe that no contribution on the part of Canada to the maintenance of the British army and navy would have done any more for the defence of the empire than the manner in which public money has been applied for that purpose, in Canada.

On the 11th of March, 1898, Sir Charles Tupper showed that Canada had done her duty. These are his words:—

In 1863, there went over to England a delegation of Canadian statesmen composed of Mr. George Brown, Sir John Macdonald, Sir George E. Cartier and Sir Alexander Galt. These gentlemen were going to settle with the imperial government the measure of our mutual condition to the imperial service and upon that occasion, the British government solved the difficulty by writing. This despatch though it was considered that it should remain confidential, was published at full length. It mentioned that were Canada willing to agree to make a yearly expenditure of one million dollars in connection with her militia, England was ready on all occasions to put her power at the service of Canada for the maintenance of her interest and her security. Not only has Canada discharged the obligations assigned to her by that document, but she has done immensely more. After having created a militia for the maintenance of which she provides herself, she has built, without a single cent of contribution from the imperial funds, the Canadian Pacific Railway.

And what does Mr. Chamberlain say to you? He tells you that the construction of that great interoceanic road, by means of which England may equip her fleets on the Pacific, has enormously increased the importance of the mother country and that it is invaluable to her.

Yes, Canada has discharged her duty to the empire!

We are bound to provide for our own defence, in order to show to the world that we are a spirited people. In the future, as in the past, Canada shall discharge her duty and do what she owes to herself and to the empire. But I do not wish to commit myself, by legislation, to participate in the wars of the empire. Let us try to realize the dreadful position we should find ourselves in by taking part in all the wars of England. Let us hear the admiralty on the matter:

It has been recognized by the colonial government that in time of war the local naval forces should come under the general direction of the admiralty.

It is impossible to forecast the enormous expenditure which Canada will incur. The South African war has cost us two million dollars. The United Kingdom, with a population of 40 million people, was waging war against a population of 350,000 souls. Is it possible to foresee the enormous sacrifices that we shall be called upon to make should England go to war with one of the great powers?

From 1850 to 1900, England has carried on or been mixed up in twenty or twenty-five wars. Since 1814, in spite of the numerous wars of the British empire, never has the integrity of the Canadian territory been threatened. In the future, owing to a legislation diametrically opposed to all our national and constitutional traditions; in the future, I say owing to a legislation placed upon our statute-books, without the people having had a voice in the matter, we shall have only to defend our own territory, but to shed our blood upon all the battlefields of the empire.

As remarked by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier on the 3rd February:

We become parties to all British guarantees to foreign nations. Great Britain has undertaken very serious responsibilities, involving possibly very extensive wars, towards those foreign nations. I say that we in Canada, under pain of being branded as unfaithful to this agreement and worse than that, as cowards, should have to take part in those wars and in those terrific conflicts which may be occasioned by her guarantees.

This new policy might involve us in the troubles of militarism; it might deprive us of great public works and one day, we

might send over to England those ships which will perhaps be destroyed. Are you not afraid of rousing the indignation of those thousands of immigrants who, in leaving Europe have shaken off the shackles of militarism? Would not England be represented with the features of the oppressor.

Let us now study this problem in the light of the constitution. Let us read sections 17 and 18.

The question then is not to create a fleet for the sole defence of Canada. In case of an emergency, the government may place that navy on active service, when it appears advisable to do so, for the defence of England and of the empire.

We become responsible for the foreign policy of England, without having a voice in her counsels as to the framing of that policy. This legislation changes our relations with the mother country and imposes a policy which is baneful to our best interests. This doctrine of participating in the wars of the empire is not a new doctrine; it is an imperialistic doctrine advocated in the interest of England.

Mr. J. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) This is not a new doctrine either.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) I shall later on revert to this subject, and I may tell my hon. friend that I shall give him an irrefutable answer. But can it be said that the proposal to create a new navy, to be incorporated into the royal, is a Canadian doctrine?

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) It is a doctrine which exists in our statutes.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) It is a doctrine advocated quite recently by the great imperialist, Chamberlain. It is not grounded on the expression of feelings voiced by the most enlightened portion of the Canadian people. The sons of the loyalists in Ontario and in the western provinces, deeply attached as they are to the land of their forefathers, devoted to agricultural and industrial progress, ever ready to defend the integrity of the territory, are anxious to form on this American continent a great nation, and they do not aspire to play a part in the imperial wars. The principle embodied in this legislation, our participation in the wars of the empire, is the sad offspring of an imperialistic doctrine, and it does not offer a national ideal to the Canadian people, anxious as it is to develop freely identifying itself more and more with the native land and reserving to that land the loftiest manifestations of its devotion.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) Still it exists.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Mr. Chamberlain, the great British imperialist, turning towards the colonies, asked them to become the feeders of the British fleet. In his opinion, the colonies were to become a reservoir of men necessary to the empire in order to maintain its supremacy.

Mr. Achille Viallate, a professor in the School of Political Sciences, Paris, in a work on the 'British Crisis,' published in 1908, says:

> Can there be found any where else than in those autonomous dominions offering a shelter to a numerous rural population, the necessary sums to the defence of the empire, the military raw material needed to hold its own against the rival empires, a raw material which the metropolis no longer finds at home in sufficient quantity or quality.

We are on the way of imperialism. And should the hopes of imperialists materialize there will be formed a new nationality, an imperial race, and before long Canada will supply with men the army and navy of Great Britain.

Such views cannot tally with the aspirations of the Canadian people.

Our hon. friends opposite do not seem anxious to refer to the imperialistic role of our navy. On the 3rd February the hon. Postmaster General said:

> Those who say that this policy of a Canadian navy is a new one and that the people ought to be consulted regarding it, are singularly ignorant of the facts. Why the policy embodied in the bill we are now discussing, the very ideas expressed in that bill are to be found in the declaration made in the name of Canada during the imperial conference of 1902.

In that declaration, made in the name of the Canadian people, are found the following words:

> At present the Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are preparing to consider the naval side of defence as well.

In the same memorandum occurs the following statement which goes to show that the Canadian government, in 1902, was loath to sacrifice the principles of self-government, which are being infringed in 1910:

> The ministers desire to point out that their objections arise, not so much from the expense involved, as from a belief that the acceptance of the proposals would entail an important departure from the principle of colonial government.

Were those words calculated to induce the Canadian people to believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier would create a navy in order to participate in the wars of the empire? I am not ignorant of the facts and I believe that the electoral body stated on good ground that the government are embodying in this Bill a policy unknown to the people in 1908.

On the 3rd of February, 1902, Lord Minto wrote to the Colonial Secretary:

With the exception of a few details of minor importance, my ministers consider that the political relations between the mother country and the great autonomous colonies, and especially with Canada, are for the present absolutely satisfactory.

This declaration is far from pointing out a new departure.

On the 15th of April, 1902, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

We are going to London simply to discuss the commercial question.

Let us listen to the eloquent words fallen from his lips in this House, on the 15th of April, 1902:

The basis upon which the British empire rests, the basis upon which it has grown, has been the local autonomy of all its constituent parts, and I do not see that anything can be done at the present time that would warrant a change in that basis in any way whatever.

The leader of the Liberal party further said:

It would be the most suicidal policy that could be devised for Canada to enter into, the vortex in which the nations of Europe, England included, are engaged at the present time, and which compels them to maintain great military armaments.

He continued:

We are going to London simply to discuss the commercial question.

Those words are far from betraying, on the part of the prime minister, any wish or a determination to build a navy, in order to participate in the wars of the empire:

At the imperial conference held in London in 1907, Dr. Smartt, representing Cape Colony, moved the following resolution:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the Dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the upkeep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier strongly protested against that resolution and Dr. Smartt withdrew it.

Could the attitude taken by the prime minister in 1907 lead the Canadian people to believe that the government would bring down such a Bill?

If this policy respecting the creation of a navy is not an innovation, a new departure, it should have been embodied in the Liberal programme of 1908. Read again carefully the campaign pamphlet distributed to the electors by the Liberals in 1908; listen to the harangues delivered by the right hon. the prime minister, on the 15th of September, at Niagara Falls and on the 21st at Tilbury. Did he not say on the 19th of September, at Strathroy:

No large issues to place before the people.

Listen to the right hon. prime minister and to the hon. Postmaster General in the province of Quebec. Read the editorials published by the government organs. In vain should you try to find a single word, a single line concerning the building of a navy. Did any one, I ask, officially, lay down during the campaign of 1908, the policy which it is now sought to carry out? Let us be honest and frankly confess that for the first time in 1909, the government did give their adhesion to a policy they had refused to agree to in the past.

Our statesmen by their acts and by their legislation, have expressed the opinion that Canada should not participate in wars which do in no way concern Canada.

I subscribe to the opinion and approve the work of those legislators; but there are to be found in my province among newspapermen and members of parliament belonging to my race, men who seem to claim a monopoly of civic virtues; then as they are satisfied that their doctrine is sound, and not being able to bring themselves to believe in the patriotism of their opponents, they are charitable enough to call in question the sincerity of Mr. Monk and of those who share his views in claiming the rights of the electorate and the privileges of self-government.

I do not speak here in the name of the French Canadian Conservative party; but in view of such insinuations and malevolent attacks as have been directed against our patriotism, I exercise a legitimate right and discharge a duty in declaring here that I conscientiously fulfil my mandate.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) Was it not the Conservative party that introduced the Militia Act of 1862?

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) For the defence of Canada.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) A Bill which was introduced by the hon. John A. Macdonald and the hon. George E. Cartier.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Let my hon. friend hold his soul in patience for a few minutes, and I shall soon deal with that question. The students of history who are conversant with the past of that party,

its principles, its traditions, its spirit, its policy as vast as confederation itself which was created and extended by that party, could hardly conceal their astonishment, should I take a different attitude in the solving of that problem. In subscribing to the policy formulated by Mr. Monk, I remain deeply attached to the traditions handed down to us by Cartier and Macdonald. I am happy to hear my hon. friends opposite render homage to the memory of Sir George E. Cartier, against whom the Liberals of the Province of Quebec formerly directed such bitter attacks.

Mr. TURCOTT. (Translation). It was not for the same motive.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Are the hon. gentlemen who seem to be surprised at Mr. Monk's attitude and at the position taken by myself ignorant of the fundamental principles of the memorable pact concluded in 1854 between the Quebec Liberals and the Conservatives of Ontario. Are they not aware that the essence of the principles professed by the Liberal-Conservative party were the following: Equal rights and mutual respect of the different ethnical elements, equality of representation, due regard for the rights of the minorities and Canadian autonomy? They know very well that those great principles courageously vindicated against the fanaticism of George Brown, Cartier, Macdonald, Angers, Bowell and Sir Charles Tupper fearlessly stool up for the rights of minorities.

In 1905, the Dominion parliament drew up the charter of the privileges and of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. To my mind, the leader of the Liberal party and the leader of the Conservative party did not truly stand up for the rights of the minorities. I did remain true to Canadian traditions and to Conservative traditions, in lending my humble co-operation to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, when he stood up in this House and asked that such privileges as were claimed with respect to education and the use of the French language should be secured to the minority. The leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party, in coalition with George Brown safeguarded provincial self-government and Canadian autonomy in the British North America Act. To-day, as in 1905, I believe I am true to our best Canadian and Conservative traditions, in declaring that Canada, in the name of the principles of autonomy, should not introduce a new authority in our military and naval policy. In asking for an appeal to the people, and in declaring that our young people should not prticipate in the world policy of the empire and that Canada should organize its own defence, my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) remains true to Conservative traditions, to those traditions handed down to us by the fathers of confederation and also true to the teachings of that great English Liberal school which, in the last century, advocated the consolidation of the empire with free, independent self-governing colonies. The men to whom is entrusted the leadership in both political parties share other views in political economy, but I hope that they will acknowledge the necessity of consulting the people before embarking the country in a new policy the consequences of which affect our autonomy.

I am asked, in the name of the laws of evolution, to subscribe to the programme of participation in the wars of the empire. We have made satisfactory progress by remaining true to our traditions, and we may grow and prosper, without embodying in our statute-book the baneful section which violates our most sacred rights.

I bow to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, as to one of the conspicuous figures in Canadian history. Rising above mere party considerations, he personifies the aspirations of the native land. We all remember that never to be forgotten sitting of the 3rd February, when we saw the hon. member (Mr. Monk), with a voice shattered by physical pain, standing up with difficulty, but patriotically, and protesting against the statesmen who are parcelling out our autonomy, a sacred inheritance and the fruit of so many heroic sacrifices.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), sticks by the traditions handed down to us by Cartier and Macdonald. Let us turn over a page of our history.

In 1885, General Laurie and Colonel Williams proposed to raise two regiments and asked that the government bear part of the expenditure. Sir John A. Macdonald, after being consulted by Lord Lansdowne, wrote that Canada could not contribute to the wars of the empire. Never did Sir. George E. Cartier recommend to the Canadian people to participate in the wars of the empire. Therefore, I want to remain true to the great British principle: 'No taxation without representation.' We cannot be taxed without being represented. The voting of money and the control of public expenditures constitute the essence of the parliamentary regime. We are going to participate in the wars of the empire, and we are denied the privilege of having a voice in the councils of the empire. We are not entitled to express our opinion on such matters as the treaties entered into by England, her alliances, her foreign policy, the justice or the opportunity of her wars; and yet, this legislation will make us responsible for her policy.

We have no voice in the councils of the empire, and to-morrow we may be called upon to pay, to shed our blood on the

battle fields of the empire; to-morrow, I say, our fellow-countrymen may be sent to China, to Australia, to India. I cannot subscribe to such a policy.

The report of the last imperial conference is luminous, but it fills me with fear for the future. Read that report carefully; everything in it tends to deprive the colonies of their autonomy. They are trying to place our militia under the control of the imperial authorities. Let us read the following extract from that report (page 36):

Under the existing Militia and Defence Acts of the various Dominions their governments have no power to employ military forces outside their territories in furtherance of imperial interests.

Moreover, the forces raised over-seas are maintained on a militia basis. They have been so raised and organized in order to provide economically for the local defence of young nations whose development would be retarded by the much higher cost of maintaining regular forces. Citizen forces so constituted usually undertake responsibility for home defence only, but it is hoped that it may be within the power of the self-governing Dominions so to organize their forces as not only to provide for local defence, but also to be in a position to share to the extent of their will and resources in the defence of the empire as a whole.

It is confidently anticipated that co-operation will be forthcoming from all parts of the empire in the time of need. But, in order to utilize these resources from over-seas to the best advantage, it is urged that the arrangements for organizing, training, and mobilizing the troops of the over-sea Dominions, while primarily directed to local defence, should also include the possibility of the employment of a portion of such troops in a wider sphere.

That vast schemes of co-operation of the naval and military forces of the empire can hardly be acceptable to those who are anxious to safeguard our autonomy.

But it is claimed that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and his friends are not the true expositors of the traditions of the French Canadian Conservatives of the province of Quebec. After listening to the speech of the hon. Postmaster General, I glanced at the monument raised to the memory of Sir George E. Cartier, at a stone's throw from these buildings. In his left hand, Cartier holds the constitution of our country; with his left hand he points out that constitution to the Canadian people. What does that constitution say? What does the British North America Act say? Let me read section 91: 'It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Further on, under subsection 7, it is enacted 'It shall be lawful for the Dominion parliament to make laws respecting militia, military and naval service and defence.'

I remain true to the great principle laid down by Sir George E. Cartier, in our Canadian charter.

We have power to create a naval service for the defence of Canada; but, unless we ask the British parliament to amend our constitution, we cannot create a navy, in order that Canada may participate in the wars of the empire. Moreover, Cartier took good care to embody the principle we advocate in the Militia Act of 1868.

In 1870, Lord Granville, the colonial secretary, informed the Canadian government that henceforth they would have to provide for the defence of the country, in time of peace.

On the 19th of May, 1870, Cartier laid before the Governor General in Council, a protest which was sent over to London.

Cartier's fundamental idea, the cardinal principle of his administration is embodied not only in the charter of 1867, but in the Militia and Defence Act of Canada.

The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof at any time when it appears advisable to do so by reason of emergency.

On the 1st of August, 1904, Sir Frederick Borden brought irrefutable arguments in favour of the Act respecting national defence. Here are his very words:

The very fundamental idea of a militia force always has been and is now home defence. In every portion of the British empire, without any exception, the same principle is laid down which is found in the bill before the House—that the militia of that particular part of the British empire, including the British islands themselves, shall be limited in their service to the particular part of the empire in which they live. I have taken the trouble to examine the old militia laws of the different provinces which made up the Dominion of Canada, and in every one of those provinces we find the same limitation. It has always existed. Under these circumstances it is absurd to talk about service abroad. The words 'for the defence of Canada have been added in order to show that our militia cannot be sent on active service outside Canada except for the defence of Canada.

According to the great leader of the Conservative party, Sir George E. Cartier, our militia, in time of need, or during an emergency can be called out on active service only for the defence of Canada.

According to the leader of the Liberal party, our navy, in time of need, may be placed at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the Royal Navy. Sir George E. Cartier created our militia for the defence of the country. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is going to build a fleet which may

participate in the wars of the empire. And let us not forget these words of the British admiralty: 'It has been recognized by the colonial governments that in time of war the local naval forces should come under the general directions of the admiralty.' In time of war, Canada keeps the control of her land army; in time of war, our navy will be under the control of the British admiralty.

We cannot, without amending Cartier's Act, send our troops to fight in Europe, in Asia, in Africa and in Australia. Our navy may make war and fight battles on all the seas. It is essentially destined to take part in all the battles of the empire. We are taking the first step in a very dangerous direction. It is impossible to foretell the evils which will result from this legislation for our people.

Let war be declared between England and a foreign power or a colony like India, and then the Canadian government, under this legislation, will be bound to place its navy at the disposal of the British admiralty.

A proclamation shall immediately issue for the meeting of parliament, and our hon. friends opposite try to shelter themselves behind the intervention of parliament. Yet, parliament will have a very modest part to play. Will parliament be consulted as to the calling back of our ships? The ships might, perhaps, have begun action. They might, perhaps, have been destroyed. Shall we then ask His Majesty to send us back the ships placed at his disposal? Such a supposition is out of the question. Parliament will be summoned in order to vote the necessary money for the sending and the maintenance of the troops. But I am told that similar provisions are to be found in the Militia Act. Very well, but in that case parliament is not called upon to play the same part. Our militia is not under the control of the King of England· it is under the absolute control of parliament and the latter may give orders to the militia. There is no parity between the two cases.

I am ready, Sir, to assume the responsibility of our military and naval defence. I fully recognize all my obligations as a Canadian citizen and as a loyal subject of His Majesty; but, as Sir Wilfrid, in 1907, I am not ready to assume the responsibility of a legislation entailing the evils of militarism, and which encroaches on our autonomy without even consulting the people.

To quote the remark of a writer: 'Were England not sure of our readiness to approve of all her wars, she would be the first to insist on the statu quo.'

In case of an emergency, we lose the control of our navy. Before adopting a permanent policy, the government should inquire into the part we are going to play within the empire. We are not bound by the facts to take action definitively at such a short date. The right hon. the Prime Minister, owes it to his position in this country and in the empire to ground his statements upon well established facts. He delights us when he says that no danger is to be apprehended for Great Britain, and that he has no reason to suppose that Germany is organizing her fleet with any intention of attacking England, or that England is increasing her navy with the intention of taking the offensive On the 3rd of February, Sir Wilfrid said: 'What will be the position of things in 1912? The figures of comparison between the German and British navies will be as follows: the total tonnage of displacement of the British navy will be 20,000,000 tons, and that of the German navy 890,000 tons, a difference of 1,100.000 tons. Under such circumstances danger is not to be apprehended.'

A few weeks ago, Lloyd George said: 'Should ever the German fleet attack England, it would be sunk in a few hours, and lie at the bottom of the North Sea.'

Mr. Asquith said, during the electoral campaign: 'To-day there is no menace of an Anglo-German war; let no power ground its policy on the hypothesis of a war.'

There is no danger from Germany. But I may be told that all the South American republics have a navy, and then why should Canada not have a navy of her own? The South American states all are independent and we are a colony. Those countries have a navy in order to defend the integrity of their territory. They have a national navy, an independent navy. The government is very far from asking for the creation of a navy under similar conditions. Besides, I do not long for those wars that have stained with blood the South American republics, and we should be guilty of a national crime in walking in the footsteps of those nations. I cannot but protest when I see Canada entering into the lists with the nations of the old continent, crushed down under the burdens of militarism.

French Canadians are sometimes charged with giving expression to feelings at variance with loyalty and fidelity to the empire. I may perhaps be charged with being an enemy of the empire. It is allowed, even in this House, to insult the patriots of 1837. Besides, we are not ripe for independence. Mr. Edmond de Nevers, in his masterly work entitled, 'L'avenir du peuple canadien-français,' says: 'We cannot aspire to independence so long as a spirit liberal and broad enough to insure the respect of all our liberties, will not have taken root in the seven provinces.'

Personally, I desire to see Canadians, and especially French Canadians in the future as in the past, add to our history some

more pages bearing the stamp of loyalty. Ever since the cession of Canada to England, the French Canadians have been, so to say, the champions of British domination on Canadian soil, whenever our neighbours attempted to take away Canada from England. Lower Canada proved the bulwark of the mother country. In the darkest hours of our history, the French Canadians, without being bound by any such legislation as the one now under discussion, did loyally and generously fight for the British Crown. They have shed their blood for the glory of the empire. During the war of independence of the United States our militia fell in under the orders of the British Governor and saved Canada to England.

From 1760 to 1840 the English bureaucrats, through their persecutions impeded the progress of agriculture, paralyzed trade and commerce in the province of Quebec. Still, the loyalty of our forefathers remained unalterable. And when the United States, in the second decade of the 19th century, tried to get hold of Canada, our troops, under the command of M. de Salaberry, repelled the invader. As soon as the empire is threatened by some danger on Canadian soil, the scattered energies of our peoples form into a solid block, in order to defend the integrity of the soil and of the empire.

The other day the hon. member for Haliburton and Victoria, made a disagreeable reference, to say the least, to the heroes of 1837. The fiery colonel justifies the revolt of the American colonists against England, but he finds nothing but reproaches and bitter words for the patriots of 1837. I do not wish to go into review of the conduct of the American colonists and of the patriots of 1837.

Let me, however, quote an extract from the 'Life of Papineau,' by Mr. A. D. DeCelles:

> Such a seizure, so to say, of the public domain of the province of Quebec, was in our opinion a most crying abuse of power and one against which the House should never have ceased protesting; the American colonies had risen in arms against the mother country for a much less serious encroachment upon their rights. What was lord North's claim to tax the colonists of New England without their consent, compared to that unheard of spoliation of the public domain, against the will of the representatives of the people?

On the 3rd of February, the hon. Postmaster General said:

> Sir, if we were to follow the advice of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier we would have the province of Quebec in the position in which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), a few years ago, said the British empire was in; we would have the province of Quebec in this confederation, where the majority of all the English speaking provinces is a unit on this question; although differing in details, we would have the province of Quebec and the French Canadian race in a position of a splendid isolation.

Mr. Speaker, I am against the splendid isolation of the French Canadian race. I say to my hon. friend as regards his attitude on the question and as regards the attitude of his ally, the ex-member for Labelle, Mr. Bourassa, one of the most talented men that the French Canadian race ever produced, that in propounding this policy of splendid isolation for the French Canadian in this confederation of ours, they are not true to the traditions of their race.

Does the hon. Postmaster General really know the feeling, the opinion of the Canadian people on the Bill providing for the creation of a navy for the defence of Canada and of the empire? How can you speak of the isolation of the province of Quebec, when the electorate of the other provinces has had no opportunity to give their verdict on the question? Consult the people by way of a plebiscite and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, you will hear thousands and thousands of workingmen condemning the construction of a fleet for imperial purposes. I believe, in concert with the labouring classes, with the 'Grange' of Ontario, with the western 'grain growers,' that the policy of the government does not fall in with the aspirations of the Canadian people.

The hon. Postmaster General is naturally anxious to have that measure approved by the French Canadian element. Hence the efforts he has put forth to show how liberal, how generous England is to Canada. In return, the French Canadians, if we are to believe the minister should outdo the others in approving a Bill which aims at defending and protecting England.

The hon. gentleman has evoked the memory of the British parliamentarians who granted us the charter of 1774, when England was about to lose her American colonies. I am happy to pay a debt of gratitude to the British parliament of 1774, and I know how to appreciate the value of the liberties, the rights and privileges which they granted to us.

Those memorable struggles, those heroic battles were fought by the people, by its representatives, by the clergy, by a few seigneurs, at the cost of great sacrifices, at the cost of blood spilled on battlefields and even of death on the scaffold. God forbid that I should seek to diminish the respect of my fellow countrymen for England; but the eloquent page of history written on the 3rd of February, 1910, by the hon. minister would really be incomplete. He has done homage to the British parliamentarians of 1774, but he forgot to mention the famous charter granted to Canada in 1840 by British parliamentarians. That charter was the offspring of injustice and despotism;

it stands to this very day in history as a monument of hatred and hostility towards our race.

The statements made by the hon. minister warrant my completing that page of history, in order to show that the French Canadians, under such painful circumstances, did really win their liberties at the cost of heroic struggles.

The British parliament of 1840 deprived us of the rightful number of our representatives and abolished, proscribed the use of the French language in the Canadian parliament. Then it was that began the memorable constitutional battle, under Lafontaine's enlightened, calm and energetic leadership. The moderation, the conciliatory spirit of that eminent statesman are referred to. In the eyes of the historian, he appears under the striking features of the uncompromising Canadian, when the rights of minorities are at stake, when the French language is to be saved from shipwreck. To quote Mr. DeCelles: 'Interested with the mission of claiming the rights of a people, Lafontaine repels any semi-measure of justice; he is satisfied with nothing but a full remedial measure, and the uplifting of his fellow countrymen so long relegated to the lowest rungs of the political leader.'

During the session of 1842, Lafontaine is seen violating the constitution granted by the British parliament; he is seen addressing the House in French, in order to affirm as emphatically as possible the right we had of using our own idiom and at the same time to protest against the clause of the constitution which deprived us of that right.

In 1905, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier proved true to the traditions of Lafontaine, when he stood up and moved for the restoration of the rights to the use of the French tongue in the legislatures of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

I do not want the French Canadian people to be isolated. Still, I bless Lafontaine's memory; I owe him a debt of gratitude for declining to accept the position of Solicitor General, at the hands of those who wished to cover him with glory, instead of doing justice to his fellow-countrymen, Lafontaine denied his co-operation to Governor Thompson; he was loath to give his support to the policy of the Governor and of the British government, at a time when from the province of Quebec arose violent protests against the British authorities. Lafontaine declined to accept personal honours. As a Canadian he claimed equal rights for all races and creeds.

Let us be fair to England and to Canada. Let us give England due credit for her work in the history of civilization and for the liberties she granted us. But let us not forget the memorable strugles of our forefathers in order to secure to us the rights guaranteed by the treaties and by the constitution.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has also referred to Louisiana. He seemed to say to the French Canadians: 'The French in Louisiana have lost the official use of their language, under the star-bespangled banner; you have secured that right, under the British flag; it behooves you to make sacrifices in order to save the prestige of the empire.'

In 1803, the President of the United States negotiated, through Napoleon, the purchase of 'Louisiana.' The latter was to be provided with a constitution embodying the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty. The official use of the French tongue was maintained up to 1898. It was not abolished by congress, but by the legislature of the State of Louisiana, on May 12, 1898, without a protest in congress or in the state legislature. It was through their own fault that the French-speaking people of Louisiana were deprived of the official use of their tongue. Our countrymen in the west have lost the right to the official use of their tongue, in spite of our interference. Are they disposed to find fault with British institutions?

I shall wind up that page of history by asking this question: What would be the status of the French tongue in this Dominion parliament, had not Lafontaine protested with all his might against the constitution of 1840, granted to Canada by the British parliament? Should we feel thankful to Great Britain only for having obtained the official use of our tongue, or rather should we not bless the memory of our ancestors for having secured to us that privilege?

It is just possible that we are witnessing one of the most mournful pages of our history in the making. In my humble opinion, the government policy will lead Canada to militarism, conscription, and possibly the disruption of the colonial ties. Accordingly, I suggest that the government should consult the people through a plebiscite. Is not the right of the British subject to being consulted most generally recognized? I object to seeing violated one of the cardinal principles of our constitution, whereby parliament is not allowed to impose on the people a most serious departure from that constitution without having first obtained the consent of the people to such a change.

It is not that I wish to appeal to the feelings or prejudices of the electorate to bring about the rejection of such a measure; no, I have a loftier conception of my parliamentary duties; but it is of the very essence of British institutions that the will of the people should be consulted before effecting any fundamental change in the system of government. The mem-

bers of the Labour Conference, held at Quebec on September 23, 1909, with my hon. friend from Maisonneuve as chairman, plainly stated their wish that the government should consult the people through a plebiscite before complying with the views expressed at the last imperial conference. A body of workingmen belonging to all races, to all churches, should command attention. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Jacques Cartier strongly vindicate the rights of workingmen who demand a plebiscite. The plebiscite idea has not yet commended itself to all classes of society in Great Britain, but the British Prime Minister has referred in a favourable way to the proposal of a referendum. The plebiscite idea which has been put into practice in Belgium and Switzerland should be resorted to more and more in our country. As a matter of fact, that system seems to work well as regards municipal matters. I quote the following from a newspaper:

The time is at hand when, for all civilized nations, the public undertakings, budgets, political, economical, social, and military questions which have to be solved, are of such importance, and of such a novel character, that governments will no longer be willing to take the responsibility of solving them, and must, from sheer necessity, resort to a consultation of the popular will.

In 1907, the Swiss authorities, previous to reorganizing the party, had recourse to a referendum. The outcome of the Canadian plebiscite of 1898, on the question of prohibition of the liquor traffic, has been satisfactory. In suggesting a plebiscite, I am in accord with the labouring classes, the independent press, the agricultural press of Ontario and the west, with prominent farmers of Ontario, the 'Weekly Sun' of Toronto 'The Farmer's Advocate,' and the most active agricultural societies. That plebiscite idea had its origin in the great sister province of Ontario and in western Canada.

I may be allowed to quote the following lines from the resolution pased by the farmers of Ontario:—

Your committee is of opinion that the whole influence of Canada should be exerted in favour of any movement making for peace. That is why they are suspicious of the proposal for the building of a Canadian navy, a departure which instead of favouring peace, might lead to war. Therefore, we pray respectfully, but earnestly, the Dominion government not to adopt that policy before the question has been thoroughly discussed by the Canadian people, and before the latter have expressly declared themselves favourable to the plan, at a poll held especially for that object.

These fellow-citizens of ours, who ask that the people be consulted, are the descendants in large numbers of the loyalists who sacrificed their all to maintain the supremacy of Great Britain. How can it be contended that the French people stand alone, when the most worthy offspring of the Anglo-Saxon race are taking the lead in this movement and opposing the policy of the government? I shall quote from the utterances of Dr. Goldwin Smith, the oracle of the Liberal party:—

No parliament elected at a time when the question of the building of a navy was not even mentioned, has the right to force on the country such a novel policy.

On the other hand the farmers of Alberta demand that the government should consult the people. And what were the views expressed by the hon. member from Digby (Mr. Jameson) on January 12th:

By their policy of to-day they propose to bind the people of this country, without asking leave or opinion. They propose to spend the money of men who must man the ships and pay the bills without deigning to consult them. They are denying the people their right to speak as to the government's action in disregarding the advice of naval experts; they are refusing to let their voice be heard as to the old policy of one empire, one navy. I do not think the administration or this House possess that right, and I submit, with all due deference, that this question should be referred to the people of Canada by means of a plebiscite before the adoption of a permanent naval policy upon the lines proposed by the government.

Let me quote the words of an Anglo-Saxon, Mr. Smith, editor of the 'Weekly Sun,' Toronto:

What then is our first duty?

Our first duty is to ask that before irremediably tying down the country to the building of a Canadian navy, the whole question be submitted to the verdict of the Canadian people. It is monstrous that two hundred stray men, elected at a time when the matter was not even mentioned, should attempt to bind us to such a policy. Then the people should be consulted, and I trust that from this constituency there will come a cry which will be heard in Ottawa demanding that the whole electorate be called upon to express its opinion.

Professor Marshall, of Queens, is opposed to the building of a war navy, and contends that as a result of a plebiscite, the naval policy of the government would be defeated. I have done my duty in asking for a plebiscite, the effect of which cannot be to bring about a change of government. If the government and parliament imperil or violate our autonomy, if we are thrown in the vortex of militarism and imperialism, I do not wish to be held responsible for this invasion and spoliation of the rights secured at the price of the blood of our progenitors.

Should that unhappy proposal become law, 'there shall be,' in accordance with

section 40, ' an institution for the purpose of imparting a complete education in all branches of naval science and tactics, a naval college.' I trust the government will not forget to grant to the French language a fair and large place in the curriculum and examination papers.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) Am I right in understanding the hon. gentleman to say when that naval college will be established, he wishes the French tongue and the French Canadians to have a show? One might have inferred from his speech that he was opposed to the building of a navy.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) I will say this to the hon. member for Bellechasse: If that unhappy proposal is to become law, as I have just said, if the unfortunate policy of the government carries, and if that college is opened, I wish that the French tongue should be given the fair and generous treatment to which it is entitled.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) We are all agreed as to that.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) Great Britain had adopted in regard to Canada a policy that was wise and in harmony with our aspirations. If the colonies are to take a hand in the wars of the empire, there may result some friction which may bring about the disruption of the colonial system. The enormous sums which will be spent towards helping Great Britain will be a heavy burden on the shoulders of the Canadian people. Those who to-day proclaim themselves friendly to Great Britain may prove to be very short-sighted in their love for her. For a goodly number of distinguished people, the real fatherland is not the land wherein we live and toil, but rather on the other side of the Atlantic. The aim is to develop an imperial feeling, instead of developing in our loving and patriotic hearts a national, a truly Canadian feeling. I am unable to agree with them in that respect. They fondly love England, I respect the British flag, but I fondly love my country. We French Canadians who were ceded to England 150 years ago, we have Canada as our country, our home. We wish to see it live, to see it prosper, to see it grow, and with a view to reaching that happy destiny, we are intent on accomplishing deeds of life, and not deeds of death.

M. LACHANCE (Quebec Centre) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The House will go into Committee of Supply, and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will continue his estimates.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply to-morrow I propose to call attention to some matters relating to the flooding of lands in connection with the dam at Hastings and payments made to certain parties in the township of Asphodel. I shall refer to the valuator and the solicitor mentioned in answer to a question at page 3827 of the Unrevised ' Hansard '.

Mr. FIELDING. Is that in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 4, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved that the House do, on Tuesday next, go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Fisheries Act, chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by—

(a) Defining the standard size of the barrel in which oysters are sold, bartered or trafficked in;

(b) Prohibiting the taking, buying, selling, possessing or exporting of fish for the purpose of converting it into manure, guano or fertilizer, or for its manufacture or conversion into oil or manure or other fertilizing product, without a permit from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and

(c) Providing for the bringing into force, by proclamation, the regulations prepared by the International Fisheries Commission between Great Britain and the United States, now before the House, and to authorize the making of regulations to secure their enforcement, and fixing penalties for their violation.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN BUSINESS AGENT AT WASHINGTON.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to ask a question of the government. I notice in the Toronto ' Daily Star ' an item headed:

Message to Canada from United States lost for ten Days—Tariff Experts at Washington had Trunks packed waiting for Reply

from Ottawa that never came—Criticism of British Embassy, which mailed Message—Canadian Attaché needed.

Another paper contains the following item in reference to this despatch:

Where we Need a Man.

The Toronto 'Star' prints a despatch from a correspondent in Washington which lets a little light into the darkness of this difficulty which sprang up so suddenly ten days ago over the question of tariff relations between the two countries. It seems that the American authorities, when they entered on their work, issued a statement of their operations to the representatives of the countries that might be interested. Naturally, the British Embassy was the only place to serve notification respecting Canada. After waiting a while, not getting any answer, the Americans, with that courtesy which is bred of business training and the business man's allowance for unexplainable accidents, inquired again. Then it appeared that, in Mr. Bryce's absence in the West Indies, the best the British Embassy could do was to write over to the foreign office to see whether this was to be handled on the basis of four trips across the Atlantic between letter and answer, or whether it would be all right for Canadians to handle the business themselves. Fortunately, the foreign office very sensibly left it to Canada herself to settle with the States, and this answer came along about the time the Americans made their second inquiry. This time Canada was notified, but in the circumstances everybody was afraid to move, because on the one side it looked, from the newspapers, as if Canada was expected to dance to the Washington piping, and on the other side as if Mr. Fielding was on his high horse and wouldn't deign to notice the existence of our big neighbour. By dint of applying good humour and common sense the situation has now been straightened out. But—

If Sir Wilfrid Laurier had to make this week the speech he made one day before Christmas, he might not be quite so certain that the presence of a Canadian representative in Washington is wholly unnecessary in face of the efficiency of the British Embassy. It doesn't so much matter what his title might be, or in what order he would walk in to dinner, but if we had had one reasonably intelligent Canadian stationed in Washington this incident need never have occurred. As it is, apparently nothing but the civility of some democratic American officials saved us from having to argue the case with the maximum rates standing against us. The double crossing of the ocean as a route of communication between Washington and Ottawa is a very interesting survival, but really it isn't business, and it had better be eliminated in the interest of economy.

I also notice in another paper of an earlier date, referring to the Canadian office in Belgium, and the Canadian offices in Australia, and other places, an article. I ask the government if it is not about time that we should have a business agent in Washington, our nearest trade neighbour.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to say in reply to my hon. friend that it may be perhaps opportune to discuss whether we should have an agent in Washington or not, but certainly not for the reasons mentioned in these extracts.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—SIR FREDERICK BORDEN.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING. At the request of my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) I would ask permission of the House to make an explanation on his behalf as he is unfortunately unable through illness to be in the House this afternoon. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) in his speech on March 2, said:

Our minister of war (Sir Frederick Borden) delivered a speech here on February 10, and if hon. gentlemen will look it up, they will see that the hon. minister declared that the resolution that was presented by the Prime Minister last March was the one that was finally adopted by this House, and he puts in on 'Hansard' just as it appeared when first read by the Prime Minister. Let me read it to you:

The hon. member then read the first part of the resolution as introduced by the Prime Minister, and continued:

You will remember that that is the paragraph as it appeared in the resolution brought in by the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Militia has referred to that as the one finally adopted. But it was not so.

With reference to this passage I have received from Sir Frederick Borden the following communication:

My dear Mackenzie King,—Thanks for your kind letter directing my attention to Mr. Crother's reference to my speech. I had hoped to be able to bring the matter up in the House to-day and notified Mr. Crothers accordingly. Unfortunately after making the attempt, I have had a return of lumbago and must keep quiet. I am anxious to have the correction made in my speech, and it has occurred to me that you might bring the matter up for me to-day, so that the necessary instructions may be given to 'Hansard' to substitute the resolution which I read for the one published erroneously.

The speech itself carries with it the proof that I read the resolution finally adopted by the House.

As a matter of fact I had the resolution adopted March 29, 1909, and Mr. Borden's amendment to the motion for the second reading of the Navy Bill (February 3, 1910) respectively pasted on separate sheets of letter paper just like the duplicate I am sending herewith. At six o'clock recess I handed them to the 'Hansard' boy telling him he need not return them. They were not used by 'Hansard' in extending reporters' notes, but the resolution of 1909 was erroneously clipped from 'Hansard' of March 29, 1909, at the end of the premier's speech instead of at the end of the debate of that day.

I have a most distinct recollection of reading the resolution in which I had marked the words 'speedy' for special emphasis and remark.

The proof-reading was done by me but was limited to my own words. I did not think of proof-reading the extracts. When I took the proofs to the 'Hansard' room, I mentioned the fact that I had not read the extracts, &c., &c., and was told that it was not necessary as special care was taken to read and compare them.

Yours very truly,
F. W. BORDEN.

I wish also to read the following letter addressed to Sir Frederick Borden from the chief reporter of 'Hansard,' the letter speaks for itself:

Ottawa, March 4, 1910.

Dear Sir Frederick Borden,—In reply to your inquiry in regard to the resolution quoted by you in your speech of February 10 last as having been passed unanimously by the House on March 29, 1909, and referred to by Mr. Crothers in his speech of the 2nd instant, I would like to say that I find on inquiry, that, by mistake made in this office in copying the resolution from Hansard' of 1909, the resolution, as moved originally by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was erroneously inserted in the report of your speech instead of the resolution as finally adopted by the House, which was the one you did quote.

The erroneous substitution of the one resolution for the other appears not to have been detected in the revision of the report, and hence is continued in the revised edition of the debates.

While regretting the mistake, I beg to say that in these matters the chief reporter has no responsibility.

I am,
Very respectfully yours,
ALBERT HORTON,
Chief reporter.

Sir Frederick Borden, K.C.M.G.,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

I have to ask, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, that you give instructions to 'Hansard,' to have the necessary corrections made in the report of his speech.

Mr. CROTHERS. The statement just made by the hon. Minister of Labour from the hon. the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) does not of course challenge any remark which I made in my observations the other night, and therefore does not call for any reply from me. My observations were not based entirely on what the Minister of Militia said, but also upon a statement made, as reported in the Toronto 'Globe,' by the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) to the effect that we on this side had approved of the resolution passed last March, prohibiting in any event the granting of a naval contribution towards the maintenance or construction of the imperial navy, and it occurred to me that the Minister of Justice is labouring under the same misapprehension as was the Minister of Militia. However, I do not desire to add anything further than to express my very sincere regret that the absence of the hon. Minister of Militia, and express the hope that he will soon be fully restored to health, and resume his duties in this House.

PRESS GALLERY.

Mr. LEWIS. I notice in the 'Albertan,' a prominent newspaper published in Calgary these words:

It may be a question whether or not the members of parliament really earn their salary for attending the sessions of the Dominion parliament, but there can be no denying the fact that the reporters in the press gallery——

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman wish to put a question? The custom at this stage is to bring up only questions concerning the business of the House, or of an urgent character. Other questions are brought up by notice under the rules of the House. The matter may be brought up on the motion to go into Supply, but that motion is not yet made.

Mr. LEWIS. There is no one, Sir, more desirous of upholding your authority and the dignity of the House than I am, and I consequently bow to your ruling.

THE GERMAN SURTAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) been called to a rather curious error in the last memorandum brought down in respect of our trade relations with Germany? The minister will notice that in the statement he brought down it is declared that a kilogram is equivalent to 220·4 pounds.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. That is a typographical error. My attention was not drawn to it, but I shall now see that it is corrected. It is in the punctuation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No it is in the omission of the words 'one hundred' it should be one hundred kilograms.

Mr. FIELDING. I will have it corrected.

THE UNITED STATES TARIFF.

Mr. OWEN. I see by the papers that representatives of the American government are to interview our government re the tariff. Canada has entered into a treaty with France, and by a recent arrangement with Germany, the surtax has been removed wholly by Canada on all the articles we have to export, but only in part by Germany on what they have to export. Have we in any way forfeited our rights to the minimum tariff of the United States?

Mr. FIELDING. That is too large a proposition. In my judgment we have not, but that is a matter of opinion. When my hon. friend says that we have removed the whole of the surtax, and Germany only one-half, he is under a misapprehension. Germany had no surtax to remove.

SUPPLY—THE PRESS GALLERY.

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

Mr. LEWIS. I notice in a prominent paper in the west, published at Calgary, called the 'Albertan,' these words:

> It may be a question whether or not the members of the parliament really earn their salaries for attending the sessions of the Dominion parliament, but there can be no denying the fact that the reporters in the press gallery should have their wages raised many times over.. . . A bold, brave young man who will risk his life and understanding by sitting day after day and night after night listening to the debates upon the Naval Bill, endeavouring to get the kernel out of the volume of chaff, is worthy of better things. It is possible that he does get good wages, but it is also certain that he does not get enough. . . . . So the 'Albertan' repeats that whatever may be the salary of the reporters who sit by and listen to this kind of thing from day to day, from week to week, that they are underpaid. A man who risks health and mind on a proposition like that should get some sort of bonus from the State.

Sir, there's many a true word spoken in jest. I have taken the precaution to look into this matter, according to 'Sells' World's Press, 1909, I find that we have in Canada 892 newspapers, divided among the provinces as follows:

	Newspapers.
Ontario..	525
Quebec..	117
New Brunswick..	39
Nova Scotia..	62
Prince Edward Island..	12
Manitoba..	79
Northwest Territories..	25
British Columbia..	33
Total..	892

There are forty press representatives in the gallery, representing probably eighty newspapers. Now, it is to the interest of Canada that what is done here should be published through the country. The 'unrevised 'Hansard' is sent out, it probably does not reach the persons addressed for a week or ten days after the speeches reported have been made, but what the men in the press gallery report is sent by telegraph. I submit that, if we have anything for the people of the country to know, the country as a whole and the newspapers as a whole should help to pay for making it known. We allow a certain sum for a newspaper editor in the city of London, England, in order to secure information from there. The city of Toronto pays $4,000 a year for what? For a bureau of publicity. I ask that similar steps be taken here. It may be an innovation; no other parliament in the world may have it, but why should we wait for another parliament to show us the way. If there is any way by which a certain amount could be set aside for publishing by telegraph the news which we desire to have published, I submit, the government should take some steps in the matter.

TRENT CANAL—FLOOD DAMAGES.

Mr. LENNOX. I mentioned, last night as the House was about to adjourn, that to-day I proposed to bring up the subject of certain payments for alleged flooding in portions of the county of Peterborough in connection with the Trent Valley water system. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) mentioned to me just now that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is out of the city, and he preferred that I should not proceed with the discussion now. The proposition is one which I think I should accede to, and therefore I will not bring up the matter to-day.

HALIFAX HARBOUR—BIG GUN PRACTICE AND THE FISHERMEN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) to a resolution which has been forwarded to me from the municipal council of the county of Halifax, pointing out the detriment and danger to the fishermen in the vicinity of Halifax harbour—that is, the entrance to the harbour—from the big gun practice which is carried on, and suggesting that this practice should be carried on if possible, between the 30th November and the 15th of June, instead of at the seasons which have been utilized for the purpose in the past. From the statements set forth in the resolution, which I will not read in full, it would seem that the fishermen sustain not only inconveniences but considerable detriment under the present system. If the practice could be carried on with equal efficiency—as seems to be the case—during the season which has been suggested, I would strongly urge upon the government that this request should be complied with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will kindly send me the resolution, I will call the attention of my colleague to it.

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

Public works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—British Columbia—Lockport—Queen Charlotte islands—wharf, $2,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Most of the members of the committee know that the Queen Charlotte islands form a group in the Pacific at the mouth of the Skeena river. They are said to be very rich in minerals and are clothed with valuable timber. There is a good deal of development in the particular locality referred to. I believe that a wharf is quite urgently required. The amount here asked is expected to finish the work.

Mr. COWAN. What trade is anticipated over that wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe that at this point quartz mining is being developed.

Mr. COWAN. Have any steps been taken to ascertain how many immigrants are entering British Columbia over these wharfs without calling at the port of entry?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no information on that point.

Masset, Queen Charlotte islands—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that there is quite an important farming and lumbering district in the vicinity of Massett, and that this place is likely to become of considerable importance. The wharf is urgently asked for and it is expected that this $3,000 will complete it.

Nitinat Lake outlet—removal of obstructions—revote of lapsed amount, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to remove two large ledges at the outlet of Nitinat lake. One of these rocks is bare at low tide and the other is quite close to the surface. They form a menace to navigation and it is regarded as very desirable that they should be removed. This can only be done by blasting and we estimate that it will take about $5,000 to do the work. We shall have to remove from the large rock over 10,000 cubic feet and from the small rock 4,500 feet, representing a total of 540 cubic yards. We estimate the cost at about $10 per cubic yard, or a total of the amount we are asking.

Mr. BARNARD. Did the whole of that vote lapse last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. Why was not the work done last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY The vote was not passed last session but in the session before that. We allowed it to lapse because we thought this was one of those works which, in view of the then condition of the revenue, might well be allowed to lie over, and we are restoring it to the estimates as we are restoring votes for a large number of other needed public improvements.

Nootka—west coast of Vancouver island—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of building a small wharf at Nootka, where there is a large marble quarry, and machinery has been installed for manufacturing marble. The wharf is needed in connection with that business, and for general traffic purposes.

Porcher island—mouth of Skeena river—wharf, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount, it is supposed, will be sufficient to build the wharf at the mouth of the Skeena river. There are some fifty farms located on Porcher island, and the wharf is required to assist the farmers in getting in their supplies and merchandise, and in getting out their produce.

Queen Charlotte city—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Queen Charlotte city is on one of the Queen Charlotte islands. It is supposed this amount will be sufficient to build the wharf. Queen Charlotte city is quite close to extensive coal and copper mines, and there are also extensive forests in the vicinity. I think there are about 100 men already employed there, and my information is that large developments are going on.

Mr. COWAN. I think these wharfs are quite necessary on Queen Charlotte island, but I wish to call the attention of the government to the fact that the building of these wharfs is really facilitating the entry into British Columbia of immigrants, not only under the Immigration Act, but under the Chinese Immigration Act, contrary to the rules and condition of those two Acts. I know that the matter is scarcely relevant to this item, but I wished to call the attention of the government to these facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even though by possibility immigrants might arrive at British Columbia at other ports than Vancouver, I would not suppose my hon. friend would seriously object to public improvements being made in other places by reason of that possibility. Of course, if immigrants come into British Columbia at other points, there will be the necessary officials present to examine them, and turn them back if they are not entitled to come in. But it would not do to impede the development of other sections of British Columbia simply because some extra precautions might need to be taken to prevent the entry of undesirable immigrants.

Mr. COWAN. I am not objecting to these items, on the other hand I think they are

quite proper. But I think that the construction of these wharfs should go hand in hand with some provision to prevent the violation of these Acts by the entry over these wharfs into British Columbia of immigrants who do not comply with the conditions of those Acts.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Explain how they violate the Act. My hon. friend seems to object to the building of a wharf on Queen Charlotte island, because thereby there might be a violation of an Act with regard to immigration. I want my hon. friend to explain how the building of a wharf at any point in British Columbia is going to permit or encourage the violation of any Act whatever.

Mr. COWAN. I have made two unsuccessful attempts to penetrate the intelligence of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I have already said that I am not objecting to these items, but I do say that the construction of wharfs on Queen Charlotte island should be accompanied by measures to prevent the violation of these Acts by the entry into British Columbia of immigrants who have not complied with the conditions of these Acts.

Mr. KING. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that these Acts have been violated?

Mr. COWAN. I mean to say that exactly.

Mr. KING. Can the hon. gentleman give an instance?

Mr. COWAN. The instances on Queen Charlotte island are numerous.

Mr. KING. Cite one.

Mr. COWAN. I cannot give the names of the Japanese who have come in.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How do they get there? Do they swim across the Pacific?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A statement that Japanese are entering British Columbia by Queen Charlotte island without any restraint or restriction, should not be allowed to go uncontradicted. It is absolutely and wholly inaccurate; there is not a shadow of foundation for such statements. There is not a Japanese on the Queen Charlotte islands who has not gone there through either the city of Vancouver or from the city of Victoria. It is true that up to a recent period there was a Japanese company developing a mine at Ikeda bay, employing between fifty or one hundred Japanese. But I think that mine has been sold, and there are, I am told, very few Japanese on Queen Charlotte island to-day. No ships, large or small, ever land on Queen Charlotte island from across the Pacific ocean. Up to the last two or three years Queen Charlotte islands have been largely undeveloped, there were very few people on them. But now developments are taking place, and little communities are springing up, and we are trying to make provision for these places by the erection of wharfs. Just so soon as these communities become of sufficient importance to make it desirable to establish a port of entry there, the Minister of Customs will attend to them. But it is absolutely ridiculous, if my hon. friend will permit me to say so, to suggest that because we are endeavouring to meet the wants of the people at Queen Charlotte city by the erection of a wharf, we are thereby facilitating the violation of any customs regulations or any immigration law. It is unfair to say so, and it is not correct. I am sorry to see that my hon. friend from Vancouver is trying to throw obstacles in the way of a reasonable and moderate expenditure on Queen Charlotte island.

Mr. BURRELL. Do I understand the minister to say that Japanese no longer own mines in Queen Charlotte island?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have been informed that the Ikeda mines have been sold to another company.

Mr. COWAN. I wish to point out that on Friday evening the Minister of Inland Revenue woke up to make the general statement that British Columbia had never proffered a request for public works that had not been granted, and that it was absolutely ridiculous for us to say otherwise. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) promptly went to work and pointed out request after request from various sections in British Columbia which had been refused, and of which the minister knew absolutely nothing. Again he gets up and says that there has never been a boat crossing the Pacific ocean and making its entry at the harbours of the Queen Charlotte islands instead of Vancouver or Victoria. I shall have the pleasure of putting exactly the facts and the proof before the Minister of Inland Revenue upon that. But, I am sorry that I cannot penetrate the intelligence of the Minister of Inland Revenue. I am not opposing these items; I think they are correct, but I do think that the government should take steps at once to make some of these ports, ports of entry, or subports to prevent violations of the law.

Spallumcheen river—repairs to and extension of bank protection works, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make necessary improvements to already existing protection works that were constructed by the former government a few years ago. There has been some damage by storms and it is necessary to make repairs.

Mr. GOODEVE. In reference to this item, I would like to call the attention of

the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to the request I made with regard to the repairing of the banks of the Columbia river. In that case also the minister will remember that he had knowledge that the government had already paid half the cost of the repairs to the shores of the Columbia river. The shores are being washed away. The ground then taken by the minister was that he had changed the policy of the government in that particular, and that the government were no longer doing any work of that nature, and that he felt that it was the duty of the province to do it. I am not objecting to this item. On the contrary, I am very glad to see this amount in the estimates, but I should have liked to have an amount placed in the estimates for other improvements to which I shall call the attention of the minister. I want to take this opportunity, because it is the only one I shall have in connection with the estimates of British Columbia, to call the attention of the minister and the government to the fact that we have made application both in connection with the Kootenay river and the Columbia river, for some needed improvements in the way of wharfs and dredging. I have here three petitions, not merely individual petitions, but the petitions of the Associated Boards of Trade of Southern British Columbia, and, therefore, of such a character as should carry some weight with this government. I am informed by letters that each of these petitions has been sent to the minister. One of them relates to dredging at Burton City on Arrow lake. I took a great deal of trouble to explain to the minister the circumstances with regard to this proposed improvement. This is a horticultural community which requires shipping facilities. On account of the nature of the bed of the lake, sand and gravel bars are washed up with the result that during the winter season at low water the boats cannot get in, and traffic has been actually compelled to go around by way of Nakusp, Slocan lake and Slocan City to get down there, with the result that a number of ranchers are cut off from communication with the outside. They have only received their mail once a week owing to that. To a large extent that would have been obviated if the minister had seen fit to put a small appropriation in these estimates to do the necessary dredging at this place. Then, I have also called his attention to the necessity of having some dredging done at Kootenay lake, where somewhat similar conditions exist, and also to the necessity of having buoys placed in Kootenay lake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be under the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GOODEVE. Yes, that would come under their department more particularly, so that I will leave it until we come to the estimates of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. However, in regard to this dredging, I endeavoured to put it very fairly before the minister. I explained the class of settlers coming in there, and I told him that we did not want large or expensive works, but that all we wanted was such wharfs as would enable settlers to get in their necessary merchandise and ship their fruit out. I considered this very fair, and I asked that he would place in the estimates an amount of $1,500 for wharfs in some places, and in others $2,500 or $3,000, which would be sufficient to build wharfs necessary to enable these settlers to carry on their business. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are building a large summer hotel on Kootenay lake and they have seen fit to put on extra boats on account of the increased traffic. Yet, none of these considerations have affected the Minister of Public Works. I was very much surprised, in watching the estimates for the maritime provinces, to see that we are making grants to places much smaller and less populous, and that very large sums of money are being expended. In one place $15,000 was voted at the instance of the minister, and I saw where we spent it on day labour between October and November, 1908, a portion of it on the main street of the village. This village is said to have a population of 600 or 700. They put six inches of sand down on the main street, built culverts, &c. While that money is being expended in that way, we find it impossible in the new district into which a splendid class of settlers is coming to get these much needed improvements made. I think that this government should take this matter into consideration, and that they should fairly consider the great needs of a new country such as this is. It should also be remembered that British Columbia contributes a very large revenue. I do not propose to go into that to-day, because it was very clearly placed before the minister a few days ago by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), and my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor). Every member of the government is familiar with the very large revenue that we pay in proportion to population—more than any other province of the Dominion of Canada—and, therefore, it is only fair that we should receive some consideration in regard to the matters to which I have drawn the attention of the minister. During the first year I was here, I had several interviews with the minister, and I was careful to lay all the details before him. I appealed to his reason and fairness. I did consider that, while he made no definite promise, he would take this matter into his consideration, and particularly in one or two cases, while perhaps I did not quite understand the position he took, I concluded that there would have been amounts in the estimates for the

wharfs that we were asking for. I regret to see that they are not in the estimates at this time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has spoken of improvements on the Columbia river. If he will look at the estimates which we have already passed he will find a sum of $14,500 for improvements on the Columbia river. In regard to the wharfs to which he refers, they are under consideration, and in regard to the matter of dredging in Kootenay lake, it has been brought to my attention, not by my hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) alone, but by others, by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), and also by the Canadian Pacific railway. I may say to my hon. friend that I have now under consideration the question of building a dredge for operation on Kootenay lake. We have no dredge there at the present time. It has been impossible to do dredging work, and until we can build a dredge we cannot engage upon this work. I just want to say to my hon. friend that I do not think he strengthens his case at all by complaining that British Columbia is being discriminated against. If my hon. friend thinks there is any work in his province that is worthy of attention let him put it upon the ground that this province is being discriminated against by the Department of Public Works. I assure my hon. friend that in that respect he is entirely in error. There is no foundation whatever for the statement, and the mere making of the statement and putting it forward so persistently, it does seem to me, is calculated to do his case more harm than good. If my hon. friend will take the main estimates he will see that we have provided for public buildings in British Columbia, $259,259. He speaks of the province of Nova Scotia, for instance, being more favoured than the province of British Columbia. If my hon. friend will turn to public buildings he will find that the total amount being appropriated in the main estimates for public buildings in Nova Scotia is $105,000. One hundred and five thousand dollars for Nova Scotia public buildings, as against $259,259 for public building in British Columbia—more than double the amount beng appropriated for public buildings than is being appropriated in Nova Scotia, and this notwithstanding the fact that we have just completed a public building in Vancouver which is one of the finest in the whole Dominion of Canada, and notwithstanding the fact that a large number of public buildings have recently been erected in other parts of British Columbia. I do not say that we are doing too much in British Columbia; I do not say that we are dealing generously with that province. All I say is that we are dealing justly, fairly and equitably with British Columbia, just as we seek to deal with all the other provinces of Canada. Wherever there is a public work meriting an appropriation we endeavour to meet the wants of the people as fairly and as quickly as we can; but we cannot do everything at once. There are no doubt a great many public works in British Columbia, as there are in all the provinces of Canada which are worthy of being attended to, and which no doubt will be attended to in due course; but we cannot go on and construct all these public works at once, because we must have regard to the revenues of the country and to the demands upon those revenues. I want also to point out to my hon. friend that we are engaged in a great work of improving the Fraser river. Our attention has been directed strongly to the necessity of improving the entrance to the harbour of Vancouver. In Burrard Inlet, Vancouver has one of the finest harbours in the world; but the entrance is not as good as it should be, in view of the rapidly developing traffic. Perhaps it can be truthfully said that it is dangerous. Well, we have an appropriation in these estimates, under capital account, for the improvement of that entrance, which shows that we recognize the importance of Vancouver as one of the national ports of the country. We propose widening the entrance to a width of 1,200 feet. This is going to cost, in addition to the cost of the dredge, about $350,000 or $400,000. We have also a provision in the estimates for making a great improvement in Victoria harbour—for continuing the dredging and blasting out of the rocks for the purpose of broadening the harbour and making it one of the best harbours in the country. At Nanaimo and many other places we are making improvements. My hon. friend will find in these estimates that we are appropriating $138,000 for wharfs and harbour improvements in British Columbia outside altogether of the expenditure for dredging and these great improvements in the Fraser river and in the harbours of Vancouver and Victoria. Therefore, if my hon. friend will look at matters as they are, I think he will conclude that if we are not able to do as much for British Columbia at present as we would like to do, we recognize and are meeting as rapidly as possible the great necessities of this rapidly developing and marvellously rich portion of our Dominion.

Mr. GOODEVE. I do not think the hon. minister has answered any of the complaints I have made. I quite agree with him that, in view of the rapid growth of the province, the government are not expending too much in and around the city

of Vancouver, and the city of Victoria, on the coast or on the Queen Charlotte Islands. What I am speaking for is a place 500 miles from the place the minister has been discussing. He started out to discuss the amount to be expended on public works in the province; but as that item is not before us, I did not take up that question. When I spoke of the expenditures in the other provinces, I was not complaining of them; but I pointed out that when the government were expending these sums of money in other provinces, it was only reasonable that there should be some money expended in the district I represent. I took this matter up in connection with the estimates at the first session of this parliament, and I looked for something in the supplementary estimates of last year. As nothing was there, I took the matter up again, and the minister said that from the Minister of Inland Revenue and others from British Columbia applications had been made. Now, the resolution of the associated boards of trade of eastern British Columbia, to which I have referred, says:

Whereas, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company contemplates the discontinuance of steamship service on the Lower Arrow lake owing to difficulties in navigation arising from wash-gravel deposited near the mouth of Cariboo creek, and whereas, such discontinuance of daily steamship service completes an isolation of such settlers, who with their families have purchased holdings, with the understanding that they should continue to enjoy the convenience of a daily steamer service, and the isolation of this large settlement will retard the development and settlement of such large areas as are now offered for sale, and hamper a legitimate industry that bids now to become the most profitable in the interior of this province, viz., the growing of fruit, &c.

I need not weary the House by reading the whole of the resolution. The boards of trade have endeavoured to press this matter on its merits, and not in any contentious spirit, and I say again that in view of the revenue received by this government from the province of British Columbia, the development of the district to which I have referred, the number of immigrants going into it, and the fact that these are very large navigable waters, and that one of the greatest railway companies in the world is placing upon them a steamship service, I think they are entitled to some recognition on the part of the government. I went to the minister about this matter, having no desire to bring it before the House, believing that he would desire to deal fairly with it, and I am disappointed that nothing has been done. I am glad to hear the minister say that he has the matter under consideration, and I hope that he will still provide in the supplementary estimates, for the work I have mentioned, both the dredging of the Columbia river, and the improvements on the Arrow lakes. In view of its pressing necessity, I would ask him if he has in view any dredging at Kootenay lake?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have only one dredge on the Arrow lakes, and during the past season it was engaged in doing necessary work for improving the channel. We keep it at work wherever it appears to be most required. In these main estimates we are making provision for quite a number of works in British Columbia, and the fact that the others of which my hon. friend speaks are not provided for in these estimates is no proof that we have not given them either very careful consideration or even favourable consideration. Of course I cannot say to my hon. friend whether there will be supplementary estimates or not, I am not in a position to say that, and if it was understood there were to be supplementary estimates I could not say to my hon. friend what would be in them. All I can say is that the matter of doing work at Burton, Proctor and some other places as well as the dredging of Kootenay lake are all under careful consideration.

Mr. BURRELL. I think the minister's manner of replying to my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) was hardly fair. I do not intend to discuss this very big question of better terms, but I do not think he should put the members from British Columbia into the position of condemning the size of the grants given to other portions of the country. I think if the minister were a British Columbian and had the history of British Columbia fairly well at heart he would take exactly the same attitude as any member from British Columbia. He would have to take it because it has been clearly recognized in many high quarters that British Columbia has special claims on the consideration of the government, in fact claims which have not been met from our point of view and the leaders of his party when this question was being thoroughly discussed some time ago pointed out that they would not ask financial readjustment at the hands of the government, but would press for a larger share of public works because that was the way in which the government of this country ought to deal justly with the province of British Columbia. It is not a matter to be dealt with in the way the Minister of Public Works dealt with it. If he referred to the expenditure on public works being greater in British Columbia than in Nova Scotia this year the only fair comparison would be a comparison over a number of years, and if he referred to the figures in the speech of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) during the budget debate in reference to these

things, particularly with reference to questions of dredging, etc., he will find that some of the figures in connection with British Columbia's position compared with the rest of the country are very startling. We have a perfect right, as members from British Columbia, if we think the numerous claims of British Columbia have not been met to ask the government that they shall be fairly met on their merits. I will take the minister's word and am glad to know that the government are becoming a little more aware of the requirements of the case in British Columbia.

Last year I mentioned to the minister an item in the estimates of the previous year of $10,000 for deepening the channel between Okanagan lake and Dog lake. The Minister replied:

Mr. PUGSLEY. Provision was made last year for improving the channel between Okanagan lake and Dog lake, but owing to the fact that Dog lake is about 14 feet lower than Okanagan lake, I, myself, after considering very carefully the report of the engineers, have very grave doubts as to the desirability of proceeding with the work. I am inclined to think that it will not be proceeded with at the present time and I will tell my hon. friend why. I am afraid that if the outlet of Okanagan lake is lowered so as to give a free run to the water the result will be to lower the level of Okanagan lake and that might necessitate dredging. . . . I am inclined to think that it might be better to delay proceeding with the work until a more careful study is made of the conditions. There is always the danger when you attempt to alter natural conditions with the idea of improving the navigation so as to give access to Dog lake that the result will be to materially injure the navigation of Okanagan lake which will be very much to be regretted.

I find in the report of the chief engineer for 1909, that $2,492 was expended. The report proceeds:

Some dredging in December done in Okanagan river about half a mile from where it leaves Okanagan lake. Work was resumed March 1. From March 1 to 14 the time was occupied in building a house-boat to be used as quarters for the crew of the 'Heron' (dredge), the actual cost of which was about $350. Dredging was then continued where left off at the end of December. Expenditure, $4,621.79.

I understand that the engineer in charge expects to be able to deepen the channel in such a way as to be able to make navigation possible without lowering the level of Okanagan lake and I shall be glad if the minister would explain the present position there and what the government propose to do, and are doing, because this work is regarded as of some importance in that country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I made the statement to the House which the hon. gentleman has quoted. Last summer when I was in British Columbia I visited the locality in company with Mr. Aylmer, the assistant resident engineer, and in discussing the matter with him I found that his opinion was that instead of carrying out the plan which had been originally in contemplation of dredging the whole channel between the two lakes; it would be desirable only to restore the natural conditions as they were some 15 years ago when there was navigation between the two lakes, that is to dredge out for some distance south of the main Okanagan lake, and he was authorized to proceed with this work. I found that if it were done in that way it would not lower Okanagan lake, while we would get reasonably good accommodation between the two lakes, navigation suitable for light draft vessels and equal to the navigation of 15 years ago before it was obstructed by gravel from a stream tributary to the river connecting the two lakes so that it would be a quite desirable public work. With my authority, which was communicated to the department at Ottawa, the engineer was instructed to proceed with the work along those lines. It has not yet been completed, but I should think it ought to be completed very early in the coming season.

Mr. BURRELL. The minister expects to complete it with the previous vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It can come out of the general dredging vote. We have our own dredge.

Mr. BURRELL. Then there is a reasonable expectation that the navigation can be made fairly satisfactory without lowering the lake?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe so, yes.

Stewart, head of Portland Canal wharf, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a wharf at a very important place, where there are evidences of unusual activity and development in the way of mining. It is at the head of the Portland canal. Arrangements are already under way for the building of a railway fifteen miles in length into the country, and it is believed that the development there will be something unprecedented in British Columbia so far as quartz mining is concerned. The wharf is essential and we are asking $15,000 for it.

Mr. COWAN. Will this be sufficient?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is supposed this will be sufficient although it will be an expensive wharf, because the tide flats extend out a considerable distance from the shore; but we think by building a trestle and utilizing a head block which has been

built by the provincial government this will suffice. If the head block is transferred to the federal government, as would seem reasonable, this would be sufficient.

Upper Fraser river—improvement of navigable channel at Fort George canyon, above Quesnel, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is intended to give navagation up the Fraser river through the Fort George canyon to a point where the Grand Trunk Pacific will enter the valley of the Fraser, and pass on to Prince Rupert. The navigation is very fair now, but there is still some considerable danger, and this further amendment is required to make the canyon safe to navigate.

Mr. BURRELL. Will that be sufficient to put it into good shape?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that will take about $10,000. We shall require $3,000 more.

Mr. BURRELL. I hope there will be no relaxation of effort to improve this navigation. It is an important stretch of water, especially in view of the country opening up round Fort George, and I should like very much to see that work expedited. Has anything been done in the way of an inspection by government engineers of the Fraser between Lytton and Quesnel? There are large stretches of water there on which navigation could be made perfectly effective with perhaps very little expenditure. I have been asked to urge strongly on the minister to have this done, and would ask him to have the government engineer report on the general condition of the Fraser to see if the water highway between Lytton and Quesnel could not be made more useful.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall give the matter my attention. No doubt the upper waters of the Fraser are just as important as those lower down. We have made very considerable improvements at the Cottonwood canyon, which have greatly facilitated navigation, and the importance of making an examination between Quesnel and Lytton is well worth considering.

Mr. BURRELL. I would like to ask a question with reference to some immense waterways still further north. As the minister knows, the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific to Fort George westerly is opening up enormous stretches of country and bringing in very heavy settlement, and transportation facilities would be much cheapened if the necessary dredging were done in the Nechaco river. If the minister could see his way to have dredging done on the Nechaco and Stuart rivers, he would be doing a great service to that section of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has referred to the Nechaco river. The navigation between Fort George and the mouth of the Nechaco is all right. To the Nechaco river itself, I will give consideration.

Yakoun river, Graham island, Queen Charlotte islands—removal of obstructions to navigation, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will require a powerful engine to remove the rocks.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to ask what has been done about the approach to the wharf at Port Moody?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing has been done at present. To make a proper approach, which would be suitable at all times of tide would require a very large amount of dredging, and be very expensive. I have not seen my way clear to undertake that work.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Why did the hon. minister have the wharf left so that it cannot be approached by vessels except at high tide? When he was in British Columbia last year, I called his attention to this wharf at Port Moody, and he promised to go and see it. For some reason unknown to me, he did not keep his appointment, and did not see the wharf; but upon the day when he was to have been there and did not come, a photograph was taken to show the conditions which would have been revealed to him had he made his visit. There were 400 yards of dry land between the wharf and the water. Presumably that structure was built because the minister believed a wharf was needed there. Certainly a wharf is badly needed and the dredging would be comparatively simple, 400 yards through the mud. It is a work much more urgently needed than other works of that kind, discussed here lately, which were ordered by the minister the moment his attention was called to them, even by telegram, and without waiting for tenders or an estimate of cost. We have frequently to vote money for dredging offhand and in a hurry, and it is not fair to a place of the importance of Port Moody to be deprived of the facilities for steamboat traffic that an approachable wharf would give. All that is wanted is a little dredging to enable boats to get into that wharf at all stages of the tide. I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that this wharf being built to salt water at high tide is just as much subject to decay, and is costing the country just as much as it would if the work were completed and in use for traffic. Is it proper to lay out so much money and have the work in a condition in which it cannot be used? Port Moody is entitled to this expenditure. We have been in confederation thirty-nine years, and in all that time the government has not built a wharf at Port Moody until this one, and

this one was finished 400 yards away from where it can be used at all tides. Only at high tide can vessels get in and that is not sufficient for the regular traffic. What the people require is a wharf to which boats can get at all tides, and thus be able to give them regular communication with Vancouver by steamer, in place of having to depend upon the railway. At present there is great inconvenience, as the railway time tables are made to suit through traffic and not local traffic. But if the approach were improved by dredging so that vessels could get to the wharf at all times of the tide, we could have regular passenger and freight service to Vancouver all the year round. At present, however, the vessels cannot run on any schedule, and the people are deprived of the service they would like to have. Thirty-nine years is a very long time for any community to wait for a wharf, more especially when other communities have been served three or four times within that period, and we are still waiting for our first service.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I assure my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) that there was no intended discourtesy in my not visiting Port Moody with him as I had hoped to be able to do. But I was pretty busy when I was in British Columbia. There were a good many places I desired to visit, and I regretted I was not able to keep my appointment with my hon. friend. It was not a positive appointment, but I said I would let him know and if—well, it was pretty nearly an appointment, but not quite. But I did not fail to make inquiry at to the wharf at Port Moody. I satisfied myself that to dredge an approach to it would take a good deal of time, and we had no dredge available as all were engaged then in work that seemed to be more urgent and important from a traffic and business standpoint. Now, with regard to the wharf itself, my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) asks why it was built there.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. In that particular place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Apparently, both governments allowed it to remain in its present position. It was built thirty years ago, and I suppose it was built because the people wanted it and thought that a wharf that would enable vessels to come there at high tide would be better than no wharf at all. My hon. friend should bear in mind that Port Moody is only seventeen miles from Vancouver. Also, the Canadian Pacific railway runs through Port Moody and gives accommodation, so far as a railway can give accommodation, to the people. There are hundreds, if not thousands, of places in Canada which have no railway, and many of which have no wharf accommodation at all. I know hundreds of places myself which have wharf accommodation, but vessels cannot reach them except at high tide, the ground at the face of the wharf being bare at low tide. If the hon. member goes through the province of Quebec, he will find many wharfs in that situation. In the city of St. John he will find a good many wharfs, the faces of which are absolutely bare at low tide. Of course, we are doing dredging work there now to give accommodation for large steamers. But that work was begun only some fifteen years ago. It is important work. I recognize that it would be desirable to have this work at Port Moody done, and regret I am not able to say just how soon it will be done. It will be quite an expensive work, as I have said, and one must have regard to the interest of other parts of the Dominion. I am not without hope that, some day in the not distant future, we may be able to meet the hopes of the people of Port Moody in that respect.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Being naturally an optimist, I am disposed to believe from the minister's remarks that he intends to do something for Port Moody. I would ask also with regard to another work that is urgently needed—a wharf at Steveston. I think the hon. minister gave some attention to that matter last summer, and I shall be glad of any information as to the prospect of having the work undertaken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is enthusiastic enough to derive hope from my last remark regarding Port Moody, I can make him doubly enthusiastic as to the wharf at Steveston, because I have every reason to suppose that before very long we shall be able to build a wharf at that point.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. This being my lucky day, I would ask the minister about a number of applications for wharfs on the Fraser river. I observe that there is no appropriation this year for any wharfs there. There are a large number of applications before the minister, and I would like him to say when we may hope to see a resumption of wharf-building on the Fraser.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question of what amount we should ask for wharfs generally on the Fraser river is now under consideration. If there should be supplementary estimates in which public works of this nature are being looked after by my department, I have good reason to believe that further provision will be made for wharfs upon the Fraser river.

Yukon Territory—Lewes and Yukon rivers —improvements, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a vote similar to the one we had last year. It will be devoted to maintaining and keeping in repair works for the improvement of navigation.

Mr. BLAIN. What was spent last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A total of $2,860.

Harbours, rivers and bridge work generally, $12,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a vote similar to the one we are accustomed to take every year for general works of this kind throughout the Dominion. This is to meet small demands which may have been overlooked in the special votes.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $7,511.35.

Mr. LAKE. On Friday last, the minister promised to bring down information with regard to item 150—Last Mountain lake, improvements of navigable route. The minister was to make a statement as to the expenditure already made. I desire to know if he is ready to give that information, showing how much was spent on machinery and how much on labour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must apologize to my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) for not having this information now. I overlooked it My deputy says that he will have it this evening.

Public works—chargeable to income—dredging—dredge vessel repairs, $160,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision, according to estimates sent in by the superintendents of dredging, for the amount that will probably be required for repairs to hulls and machinery of dredges, tugs, barges, &c., owned by the government and being operated at various parts of the Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the general condition of this outfit? Is it good or bad?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We keep these vessels in good repair year after year. The vote last year was $125,000, and we expended $122,183 up to December 31.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this work of repairs done by public tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some of it. It depends upon the kind of work to be done. Some is done in our own yard here at Ottawa. Some is done at various machine shops and largely by day work, necessarily.

Mr. BLAIN. Where was the largest amount spent last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. At what points?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Particularly in Ottawa. We have a ship yard here. I could give my hon. friends, if they desire it, an estimate of the different barges, tugs and scows on which we propose making expenditures. These details cover a number of pages of my notes and would take some time to read. There is more or less work on all these dredges, scows and barges.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be interesting to have some of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As to the dredge 'Canada,' we will require to put her on the marine slip, paint the hull, repair the barge doors, and the engine room. That, with other improvements, is estimated to cost $8,000. The next is the 'Cape Breton.' We have to put her on the marine slip and generally overhaul and repair her.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the age of the dredge 'Canada?'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably thirty years old. We expect to spend $7,500 on the 'Cape Breton'; $7,500 on the 'George Mackenzie;' $8,000 on the 'Northumberland;' $6,000 on the 'St. Lawrence;' $7,000 on the 'New Dominion;' $3,000 on the 'Prince Edward Island;' $2,500 on the 'New Brunswick.' The 'New Brunswick,' will cost more than that, because we are changing it to a dipper dredge, and we have to widen the hull, and largely rebuild the hull. $8,000 on the 'W. S. Fielding.' But that will not be sufficient, because we are providing her with new buckets so as to have a spare set of buckets which we find is essential in order to keep the dredge constantly at work.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the 'Fielding' working?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The 'Fielding' is working at the entrance to the harbour of St. John. At last report which I saw she had dredged about 500,000 cubic yards, and she has done considerable since then.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the 'Fielding' was a comparatively new dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer says it is not over five years old.

Mr. SPROULE. What will a string of buckets cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between $25,000 and $30,000. Unforeseen expenses $5,000; that is for Ontario and Quebec. Dredge 'Challenger,' $3,500, 'International,' $8,000, 'Mattawa,' $3,500, 'Nipissing,' $4,500, Dredge No. 1, $1,500, Dredge 'Ontario,' $3,500, 'Ottawa,' $5,000, 'Queen,' $3,500, 'Quebec,' $3,500. Repairs to shipyard at Ottawa, $10,000; repairs and plant on Lake St. John and River St. Maurice, $7,500.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the last dredge built in the shipyard at Sorel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not build at Sorel, we build at Ottawa. If my hon. friend means the 'Fielding,' that was built some years ago at Sorel.

Mr. SPROULE. The one that went into service last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The dredge 'Ottawa,' and dredge No. 3 have both been built at Ottawa. The 'Ottawa' was working at Rimouski, and the dredge 'Industry' up on the lakes. Dredge No. 3 is on the St. Lawrence near Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the dredge on the St. Lawrence do much work on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not until quite late in the season. She had to have a new boiler put in.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking with reference to the dredge that was turned out last year, a new dredge turned out of the yard here, and I was asking what was the name of the last dredge turned out, and what it has been doing since, or if it has been working this summer, or last summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The last one was dredge No. 3, which was built in Ottawa, and it has been working in the St. Lawrence near Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. Did it do much work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It did considerable work for the time it was engaged; but we did not get her to work until quite late in the season. We expect to expend $1,500 upon her for additional equipment.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that the dredge turned out at Ottawa was practically of no use, and that although it was turned out as a new dredge, it has got to be either fixed over or reconstructed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What dredge do you refer to?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood it was the last dredge turned out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is entirely in error as to the dredges turned out by the Department of Public Works. We have no information of anything of that kind.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister need not be too positive. If there is one characteristic of the minister it is that he is always very positive until he is confronted with evidence to the contrary and then he will admit his mistake. It may be that my information is correct and that he is wrong. I am not supposed to undervalue information sent me or to accept the statement of the minister in face of the fact that I have heard him frequently make statements quite as positive and which were afterwards proved not to be exactly correct. Notwithstanding the positiveness of the minister I am disposed to hold to my information until I have some other information which would justify me in changing my mind in regard to it. I will endeavour to get more information regarding it, but I have every reason to believe, from the information I have, that what I say is absolutely correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The difference between my hon. friend and myself is that he says a thing upon mere rumour or gossip and, until something to the contrary is proved, assumes that to be a fact. My training has rather taught me not to believe anything until I have some evidence of it. Another difference between my hon. friend and myself is that he is influenced by mere rumour while I have the positive statement of the chief engineer to me that nothing of the kind has taken place in regard to a dredge turned out by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard the minister make a statement in regard to a wharf that was bought and owned by Canada and when the papers were brought down an agreement made, not to purchase, not to sell, or anything that could be construed into a sale, and not showing this property to belong to the country, was disclosed. Yet the minister was just as positive then as he is in the statement that he makes now. He says that the hon. member for Grey takes mere rumour. I had my information from men who I believe are in a position to know, and all the minister can do is to get his information from similar reliable sources because he does not know of his personal knowledge. He only knows what he gets from the chief engineer or some one else the same as I take my information from those who wish to furnish it to me. Therefore, we are both on the same plane in that regard, and the minister has no more warrant for his assurance than I have.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, for this reason that this could not take place without coming to the knowledge of the chief engineer and the deputy minister. If anything happens to a dredge they know it at once. It is the duty of the chief superintendent of dredging to immediately report, and they have told me there is no truth in the suggestion, that it is wholly based upon rumour and I have a right to believe their statement. Just one word in regard to another matter which the hon. gentleman dragged in. My. hon. friend did not do himself credit, did not show that desire to be courteous which ought to but does not always characterize him. He made the statement, which, if it were made by others, I would be disposed to resent, that I made an untruthful statement in regard to a certain wharf not long ago in this House. I would remind my hon. friend that gentlemen do not as a rule attribute to hon. members

of this House a desire to state what is untrue, or suggest that they have stated what is untrue. My hon. friend has chosen to do that. I would say to my hon. friend that he is entirely in error. The statement I made in regard to the wharf to which he refers was absolutely correct in every particular. More than that, I read an extract from an agreement which has been made in respect to the property to which my hon. friend refers. I did not say, and no gentleman listening to me could believe I did state, that that property had been conveyed to the Crown. What I said was that the property had been built by a company at an expense of $8,000, that company had entered into an agreement, the substance of which was read here, in which they had given to the Crown and to the whole public a free right of way over this property which they agreed themselves to maintain at their own expense. They had also conveyed to the Crown the absolute right to control it as to wharfage, both side wharfage and top wharfage, simply reserving to themselves the right to have vessels consigned to them come to the wharf free of toll.

Mr. EMMERSON. And with a right of way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the right of way was conveyed to the Crown too. I said that the Crown had built upon its own property a wharf, which was an extension or continuation of the wharf there. I said that the Crown had not spent one dollar upon any property except the property it owned, that every bit of the expenditure was upon Crown property. That is what I said, that statement is absolutely true, and it is confirmed by the records which ought to have been in possession of my hon. friend because he had the opportunity of looking at them. I think that my hon. friend, in all fairness, ought not to make suggestions of this character. It would be unworthy of myself, or of any other hon. member of this House, to make statements which are not founded upon fact. It is my duty and my interest always to speak the truth in regard to public expenditures and in regard to public works. I endeavour to do it. Sometimes it may be that I make mistakes, because of the lack of information at my command, but I have endeavoured, since I have been a member of this House, to state everything truly and fully to the members of this committee. In regard to this dredge, I repeat to my hon. friend that the only dredge that has been turned out by the Department of Public Works, has been from the shipyards here at Ottawa, and we have never turned out a dredge of the character to which my hon. friend referred. I know that from the statement of the chief engineer, and the deputy minister, who would have immediate knowledge if anything of that kind were taking place. I challenge the hon. gentleman to investigate the source of his information; I challenge him to produce that information before this committee. My hon. friend ought to be able to do it before he makes any such statement in face of the denial of his statement made upon the authority of the chief engineer of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, challenges are very easily made. Sometimes it is the part of the gambler to call the bluff, but I am not going to take the trouble to do it now. I want to say in reference to the observation the hon. minister makes regarding that celebrated wharf, that I am in the judgment of the members of this House who have heard the explanation which the minister gave to-night in regard to the ownership of the wharf, in regard to the statement that it was transferred to the Crown or that it was purchased by the Crown—

Mr. PUGSLEY—Mr Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I ask the hon. gentleman to accept my statement. I have made my statement and the hon. gentleman, as a member of this House, must accept it. That is the ruling which has been made by yourself, as well as by Mr. Speaker, upon other occasions, and I think it is the correct ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no doubt of the correctness of the rule quoted that where the word of an hon. gentleman is questioned, his statement must be accepted. But I have not yet understood the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to be contradicting the statement made by the minister. He has only uttered a few words, and I have not yet got that impression from his remarks.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He certainly gave me that impression.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has followed his usual habit of breaking in at the wrong time. What I wish to say now is that I am quite content to leave it to the judgment of the members of the House who heard the minister's explanation with regard to the transfer and all that passed between him and the hon. member for York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) and who are familiar with the papers which were laid upon the table. I am quite content to leave it to the members of this House to put whatever construction they desire to put upon it and to judge between the Minister of Public Works and myself as to which is correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is very fair, and I am quite willing to do that also.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the dredging business, I may say that I may be

able to refer to it again, and if I am I think I can remind the minister of his positiveness under these circumstances, which does not mean correctness in this case any more than it does in some others.

Mr. DANIEL. Did I understand the minister to say that the ownership of the Pink rock wharf is in the Crown?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the ownership of the Pink rock wharf, built by the government, is in the Crown. There is no question whatever about it, and every dollar of money which the Crown expended was expended upon its own property, a property which it owns to-day, and with regard to the property built by the Albert Manufacturing Company, at a cost of $8,000, the collection of tolls, both side wharfage and top wharfage, are vested in the Crown, except in respect to vessels which are consigned to the Albert Manufacturing Company. Further than that, by the agreement that is on file in the department, that company has undertaken at its own expense to keep in repair the portion of the roadway or approach which the company built. However, we are dealing now with the item of dredge vessel repairs.

Mr. SPROULE. There are a good many of these dredges that seem to require repairing, and it would be of value to us to know the age of these vessels, what repairs have been made to them in the last few years, and what grounds there are for incurring such a heavy outlay for repairs.

Mr. DANIEL. A few days ago I asked the minister what was to be his policy in the future with regard to dredging—whether it was to do the work by government dredging or by private contractors. The minister stated that he had a return in preparation giving the total number of government dredges in the Dominion and their location, and that he would be able to lay that return on the table of the House in a couple of days. So far as I know that return has not yet been brought down. I think the matter is an extremely important one. The statement as to the large amount of money expended in repairing these vessels and in dredging work makes this question a very live question, and I think the minister ought to have that information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The return was brought down some days ago by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in my absence. My hon. friend will agree that it is not my fault if he has not yet read it.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask if there was a dredge recently built for the government at Sorel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not for the Public Works Department. The last dredge built for this department at Sorel was the dredge 'Fielding,' which was built several years ago.

Mr. BLAIN. My information is that a dredge was built for the government at Sorel or some other point, and that when it was completed and machinery was being put into it, it began to sink and had to be grappled or it would have gone to the bottom, and that another bottom is being put in it. I am not vouching for this information, but it has been given to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no knowledge of the matter to which my hon. friend refers. Any dredge built at Sorel for the government would be for the Department of Marine, and it would be quite easy for my hon. friend to put a question to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he desires to get information about it. I, of course, would have no more knowledge of that than my hon. friend would.

Mr. DANIEL. How many dredge vessels require repairing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 46.

Mr. DANIEL. Are the repairs made in government shops or just where the dredges happen to be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Wherever they happen to be.

Mr. DANIEL. Where is the dredge 'W. S. Fielding' being repaired?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some of the repairs in the dry-dock at Halifax and such repairs as can be made at St. John will be made there.

Mr. DANIEL. How long is it expected that these repairs will take?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A very short time. The dredge will be returned to St. John within a month or two.

New dredging plant—maritime provinces, $180,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What does the minister propose to do with this item?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are only asking $180,000, but we ought to have for the department in the maritime provinces the following:

1. For plant operated in Nova Scotia, as per estimate submitted by Superintendent G. W. Graham, Aug. 10, 1909: dump scows and water-boat for dredge 'Geo. McKenzie,' $6,500.

2. For plant operated in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, as per estimate submitted by Superintendent C. C. Scovil, August 16, 1908, viz.:—

Dredge 'St. Lawrence'—

One tug, surface-condensing, to attend barges.. .. .. $ 25,000

Dredge 'New Dominion'—	
New hull for this dredge..	$ 15,000
One tug, surface-condensing, to attend dredge and barges..	10,000
Two centre-dumping barges (wood).	3,500
Dredge 'Prince Edward'—	
One tug, surface-condensing, to attend dredges and barges..	10,000
Two centre-dumping barges (wood).	4,000
Dredge 'New Brunswick'—	
One centre-dumping scow (wood)..	2,000
Dredge 'W. S. Fielding'—	
One barge, centre-dumping (wood).	35,000
One tug, surface-condensing, to attend dredge and barges..	35,000
New set buckets..	40,000
Dredge 'Montague'—	
One tug, surface-condensing, to attend dredge and barges..	10,000
Two wood centre-dumping scows. ..	4,500
Tug 'Cricket'—	
New hull..	1,500
Decked scow or barge provided with derrick, hoisting engine and 'clam-shell' or 'orange-peel' bucket for dredging boat harbours, &c., in Prince Edward Island, where services of ordinary dredging plant are unavailable, and for transportation of materials required for day labour works..	3,000
One hydraulic dredge with 15-inch. suction pipe, complete..	70,000
	$275,000

We have decided to put the 'New Dominion' on the scrap heap, as she has outlived her usefulness, so that $28,500 of this will not be spent, and should we not get the suction dredge it would take off $65,000, making $205,000, leaving just about what we are asking, $180,000. But we are in this position that, having decided to put the 'New Dominion' on the scrap heap, we will be left somewhat short of dredging plant in the maritime provinces, and we ought to obtain an additional dredge. However, we are asking $180,000. It may be that we can postpone the obtaining of some of the tugs and put the money into a dredge to take the place of the 'New Dominion.' That we have not decided, and will not without careful consideration with the superintendent of dredging and the other officers of the department who have given special attention to this subject.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that the government loaned two or more of their scows to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They hired them.

Mr. DANIEL. At what rate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think $10 a day for each one.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they still under hire?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. DANIEL. They have been under hire how long, two or three years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Dredging Company had two at Gaspereau in the fall of 1908, and the chief engineer says they have two at St. John. These scows were not in use in connection with the government dredges, and I think they are still under hire at $10 a day.

Mr. DANIEL. Were not those the scows from the dredge 'W. S. Fielding'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. I think not; I think they were brought from Nova Scotia. They had been used in connection with another dredge.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the new scows be built by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Those built in our shipyard at Ottawa would be built by our own men and most if not all of the others by public tender.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it not a new departure for the government to hire out dredges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are not dredges; they are two scows.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not know that they were so plentiful that my hon. friend would go into the business of hiring them out. Where will we find the total revenue from these scows in the past year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can easily get the figures for my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost of these dredges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are not dredges; they are scows. I shall get the value.

Mr. DANIEL. These are steel scows, and cost about $11,000 each.

Mr. BLAIN. For what were they originally used by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In connection with a dredge in Nova Scotia, but we had no immediate use for them, and it was considered good business to keep them in use if we could get a good rental for them.

Mr. BLAIN. Have they been rented for two years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were rented in the fall of 1908, and used at Gaspereau. They are not large scows. Those used at Gaspereau have a capacity of only 210 cubic yards.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the company hiring them doing government work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Doing government dredging.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a remarkable condition of things.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why? Would the hon. gentleman suggest it is better to keep the scows idle than to hire them out at a good rental?

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand there is a good deal of work in different parts of this country for scows of that kind. If the government do not require the scows it would be better to sell them than to rent them. I do not believe the people desire the government to go into the construction of scows to be rented to contractors who are contracting for the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The best policy would be to sell them if they were no longer required, provided a good price could be got for them, but pending that sale I think it would be thoroughly good business if, instead of keeping them lying up rusting, not earning any money, they should be hired out at a good, fair rental.

Mr. BLAIN. Has my hon. friend made any effort to sell them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the point. We say it is not good policy to lease them if they could be sold. My hon. friend's department has had them leased almost two years, and he now says it is better to sell them. I understand that these scows are not very long lived, they do not stand work any considerable length of time, and I am not quite sure whether even $10 a day for a portion of the year will be sufficient to pay the government, but whether or not, I must express my disapproval of the government having a considerable amount of money invested in scows, which they are leasing to contractors that are working for this government. That is a policy the people would not approve of, and I am sure my hon. friend himself would not approve of it. In fact, he has almost said so. If the department has decided that these are no longer of service to the government, they should sell them and put the money in the treasury, and not have this bartering with contractors. How many days did they work last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry I have no memorandum of the number of days, but would be glad to get the information and send a note to my hon. friend later, or lay it on the table.

Mr. DANIEL. I would ask the hon. minister if the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company has not, in addition to these two scows, the lease or hire of a large number of scows belonging to the 'Fielding,' including a scow that cost originally some $24,000? Is that under hire, and at what rate, and for how long?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall get the information. Does my hon. friend want to know about the hiring of any other scow?

Mr. DANIEL. The minister might bring down full information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. minister not know whether the statement of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) is correct or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not.

Mr. BLAIN. He ought to know, if he has a large number of scows in his department, whether he is using them himself or leasing them to some one else.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Neither the deputy nor the chief engineer can tell me at present, but I shall get the information.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like a statement of the number of cubic yards dredged by each of these during the last season, and the places where the work was done, and also the cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A return which the right hon. the Prime Minister brought down the other day contains all that information for the last four years. I do not know that it contains the information of the year expiring, but it does for the four preceding years. I could get the information for the present year, but that would be quite a job. Does my hon. friend not think that if he looked at that return, that would satisfy him?

Mr. SPROULE. I think that would probably do.

Mr. BLAIN. At page 280 of the Auditor General's Report, I find, purchase price of dredge 'Industry' and plant, G. W. Phillips, $157,378.78; custom duty, 25 per cent on $157,379, $39,344.75. Was that purchased after public competition, or in what way?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was purchased after most careful examination and valuation by the superintendent of dredging. It was a comparatively new dredge which had cost a great deal more money, but owing to conditions, those who owned it had no immediate use for it, and it was purchased on very favourable terms.

Mr. BLAIN. How did they come to pay the duty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Under the rule, every department has to contribute to the customs.

Mr. BLAIN. Was this item passed last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. The dredge 'Industry' is put down in the returns at $150,000, and the minister says she costs more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was some plant in addition and a duty of $39,000.

Mr. DANIEL. According to this return, the total cost of the dredge 'Industry' is $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then there were the spare parts which made up the difference. You will see it all in the account.

Mr. BLAIN. Did she require a new boiler after you purchased her?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. And I insisted on a reduction of $10,000 in the price.

Mr. BLAIN. But you said it was purchased after very careful inspection.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and we insisted on a reduction of $10,000 in the price owing to the necessity of putting in a new boiler.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that $10,000 appear in the purchase price in the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of the discrepancy between what appears in the return and the facts? The return shows that the dredge cost $150,000, and the Auditor General's Report $196,734. The House must surely be misled in trying to reach an understanding of the actual cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) has kindly handed me the return. The amount shown here of $150,000 is a mistake, and the figure in the Auditor General's Report is correct. The price should have been shown as $157,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the duty part of the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Part of the cost to the Public Works Department, but not to the country. The price of the dredge originally was $150,000, if I remember rightly. We had a special examination by experienced engineers, these gentlemen discovered a latent defect in the boiler. My recollection is that we then insisted that $10,000 should be taken off the price, and this was agreed to. Then we had to pay for the spares, of course, and for the actual cost of removing her from where she was to Cornwall.

Mr. BLAIN. What, then, was the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost was $157,378.78, which included the spare parts and also the cost of bringing the vessel from where she was to Cornwall.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not include the duty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then there was the duty of $39,344.75.

Mr. BLAIN. And the new boiler cost $4,650?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, $9,300; nearly the amount that we deducted—$10,000— for the defect in the boiler.

Mr. BLAIN. According to that she was purchased for $150,000, and after she was purchased——

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. This is what took place: The price agreed upon—I do not mean the binding price, but the price which the superintendent of dredging arrived at as fair—I think I am right in saying was $150,000. We decided to have a full examination made by experts. These experts discovered a latent defect in the boiler. The superintendent of dredging reported that there should be a deduction of $10,000 on this account.

Mr. BLAIN. Making $140,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The rest would be made up of the cost of spare parts and the cost of bringing her into Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. What are spare parts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An extra dipper and buckets, chains, and every thing of that kind.

Mr. BLAIN. Are these not included in the price of a dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they figure the spare parts as separate. They are in duplicate.

Mr. DANIEL. What is her capacity?

Mr. PUGSLEY. She has a large capacity —carries an eight-yard dipper.

Mr. DANIEL. She is not as large as the 'Cynthia', or the 'Beaver', in St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. DANIEL. They have nine-yard dippers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The 'Industry' has the capacity to swing a ten-yard dipper.

Mr. DANIEL. What about the length of arm? How deep can she dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer tells me, 48 feet.

Mr. BLAIN. What about $150 for legal expenses in this connection? Did the hon. minister have a lawsuit over the boiler?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was to get the title completed.

Mr. BLAIN. Title?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, of course—registration.

Mr. EMMERSON. Changing from United States register.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) will know that the $150 would be taxed by the Justice Department.

Mr. SPROULE. How much duty was paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We paid on $157,390.

Mr. SPROULE. And the dredge cost $140,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the spares and everything went in on the cost and duty would be paid on the whole.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there not a reduction of $10,000 on account of the boiler?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, on the dredge itself. But, in making that reduction the cost of spare parts and every thing brought it up $157,378.78, on which we paid a duty of twenty-five per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether I understood correctly or not, but I think the minister said, that while this duty was chargeable to the Public Works Department the country did not pay it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the dredge brought into the country free of duty? It used to be the rule that goods brought into the country for the use of the government came in free of duty. Is that the case still?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that rule has been done away with. If any department now imports for its own use goods that would be dutiable if imported by a private individual, the duty is paid to the Customs Department by the branch of government importing the article.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I thought. But I understood the minister to say that while this was chargeable to the Public Works Department, it did not cost the country anything.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Exactly, because it is taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not taken out of the consolidated revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and it goes into the consolidated revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. How?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the Finance Minister. It goes to the Finance Minister, it is drawn from the Finance Minister to pay the Minister of Customs, and the Minister of Customs puts it back into finance again.

Mr. DANIEL. It simply has the effect of making the income of the country appear much greater than it really is.

Mr. EMMERSON. And the expenditure of the country as well so much greater. It is as broad as it is long.

Mr. SPROULE. I would imagine that if one of us was to purchase that dredge for $150,000, and he paid 25 per cent duty on it, it would come out of his finances, it must have been paid for; and in case of the country, the country must pay for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But where did the duty go to?

Mr. SPROULE. The duty must go to the Customs Department. But it is paid out all the same. When you come to give a statement to this House as to what that article costs, it seems to me that statement would not be correct unless you included in it the duty paid on that article. So the return brought down cannot be correct, financially speaking, when it only discloses the cost of the dredge without the duty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has evidently been a mistake of the clerk in making up that return, a mistake of $7,000.

Mr. DANIEL. May there not possibly be other mistakes in regard to other dredges mentioned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It might be, of course. The returns never come under my notice at all. I do not suppose that, ordinarily, they come under the notice of the deputy as to details. The proper clerks are given directions to make up these returns from the papers on file; and I suppose that the clerk has seen the first report which put the price at $150,000 without the spare parts, and he has taken that without his attention being called to the reduction by reason of this latent defect in the boiler. That, I assume, is the way it has occurred. I will see how it has occurred, and if my hon. friend desires, I will get a memo of the exact cost, and how that item of $157,000 has been made up.

Mr. DANIEL. I think it is simply another typographical error.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it would be an error of the clerk in making copies.

Mr. BLAIN. Should not the $9,000, the cost of the boiler, be added to it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not a part of the original cost. I do not know, I am inclined to think my hon. friend is right, I think it should be added.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the return is very wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I think the clerk has not added in the cost of the boiler, because that was obtained afterwards.

Mr. BLAIN. Therefore, the return is $16,000 wrong on the price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand it, the return moved for—my hon. friend will cor-

rect me if I am in error—showed that this dredge cost $150,000; that is the return. Now, we turn up the Auditor General's Report and we find the first item is $157,000, that is $7,000 wrong. Then another item comes in afterwards of $9,000 for the boiler. These two items add $16,000 to the cost that were not added to the cost when the return was brought down to the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that my hon. friend is not reflecting on me at all, nor on my deputy; but it is a question of the clerk in copying. It is doubtful to my mind whether the clerk, in copying, should put in the duplicate equipment. A dredge is a dredge without that duplicate equipment, which is only procured as a matter of precaution. You have to keep that duplicate equipment on hand in case of a breakdown; it is like stores. It would have been erroneous if the clerk had put that in as part of the dredge.

Mr. BLAIN. Was it complete without that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perfectly complete without it. It is like the dredge 'Fielding.' We are asking now, in this vote for dredging plant, an amount to procure a duplicate chain of buckets for the dredge 'Fielding.' Now, if you ask what the dredge cost, it would not be proper to add that in, because that is a duplicate equipment.

Mr. DANIEL. All the same, the minister will allow that there is never a dredge put to work in any part of the country that has not duplicate parts ready. As he knows well, dredges are always breaking down, something is giving away, the spuds break, or something happens to the dipper, and it is impossible to work an ordinary dredge without duplicating parts of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and in the same way no farmer works a farm without having on it horses and cattle, and ploughs, and harrows, and wagons; and yet if I wanted to buy his farm, and he said the price was $5,000, he would think it absurd for me to say: Why all your horses, and cattle, and ploughs, and harrows, and wagons have come in, because you could not use your farm without those.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the minister's illustration is not apropos. He might as well include coal for working a dredge as for a farmer to include all the stock on the farm, unless you are buying the stock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can say is this: I would not necessarily blame the clerk, because in putting in the cost of the dredge he did not include the cost of the duplicate parts. Neither will I blame him because he did not add in the customs duty, or the cost of a boiler which was put in after the dredge was purchased. But my hon. friend can see there is nothing concealed, because here, on page B—280 of the report, is given the total cost of the boiler which was purchased afterwards, and the cost of duplicating the spare parts.

Mr. BLAIN. But the minister stated that the return brought down was correct. If it is not correct, how much should be added in order to make it a complete statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My view is that, strictly speaking, it is correct, that it gives the cost of the dredge correctly; but it does not include the cost of the boiler, which was obtained afterwards.

Mr. BLAIN. The boiler alone was $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $9,300. That does not include the duty which went out of one pocket, and was paid into the other. It was paid by the Public Works Department into the Department of Customs. It is a matter of argument whether it ought to have been included or not.

Mr. BLAIN. And that does not include the $7,000 paid for parts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it does not include the duplicate parts.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend say that when a return is asked for, and ordered by the House as to the cost of this dredge it is a correct return when it does not include the boilers, and parts of this dredge? Does my hon. friend suggest that the dredge would work without these parts costing $7,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Would it be complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Whether it is or is not, my hon. friend will not venture to say that the return as brought down stating that this dredge cost $150,000 was a correct return?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think on reflection that my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) would say so.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would say so.

Mr. BLAIN. The fact of the matter is that these items, $9,300 and $7,000 were both paid in connection with this dredge, and are part of the cost of the dredge. This increase, a little over $16,000, and yet my hon. friend says that the return showing that the cost was $150,000 was a correct return.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know nothing about the matter. I was only giving my judg-

ment. As I understand it a return was moved for the original cost of a dredge which was purchased at Massena, New York, and a certain amount was paid for the dredge as she then existed. What they paid for the dredge there is the cost of the dredge.

Mr. DANIEL. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is my view of it. Subsequently they also purchased spare parts.

Mr. DANIEL. From the original seller?

Mr. EMMERSON They may have purchased them from the original seller or anybody else; it does not make any difference. It is not part of the cost, and need not necessarily have come with the dredge.

Mr. DANIEL. Suppose the hon. member for Westmorland goes out and buys a dredge, he buys duplicate parts, and the whole costs him $150,000; if I asked him how much that dredge cost him, would he leave off the duplicate parts? Would he not include them with what he had paid for the dredge?

Mr. EMMERSON. If the duplicate parts were a portion of the dredge they would be included in the total cost of $150,000, as the cost price, and the very fact that these parts were purchased apart from the price of $150,000 shows that they are not a part of the dredge, and are not part of the original cost of the dredge. The fact that the dredge itself was deficient with respect to the boiler, and that subsequently a new boiler was placed therein does not prove that the cost of the new boiler would have to be considered as part of the original cost of the dredge at Massena, or wherever she was purchased. That is my judgment. It is the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum. It is like purchasing a house, there are certain fixtures that go with the house, and there are certain other items that do not.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the total cost of the house?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total cost of the house is, say $10,000. The fixtures do not go with it, and they are subsequently purchased, they are additional, and are not included in the original cost. I have in my mind an illustration in regard to myself where a certain fixed sum was paid for a house, and subseqeuntly I purchased certain other fixtures, incidental to the house, but not part of the original cost price. If parties asked me what that house had cost me, I would not include these other items.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this return ask for the original cost of this dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the original cost.

Mr. BLAIN. It says the price paid for the dredge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That makes it absolutely clear. Another reason is that the dredge was purchased at so much, these duplicate parts were separately invoiced, and the agreement was that they would sell them at the invoice price. Invoices were furnished showing that they were absolutely and entirely separate from the purchase of the dredge.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister purchased a dredge would he not believe that he had purchased something that was complete, and ready for work? What would he regard as a complete dredge? Must it not include the equipment so that it can go on and dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It would not be a dredge if there were some dippers absent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, then must not the equipment of the dredge be part of the dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I take it that these parts should go along with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they do not go along.

Mr. SPROULE. If I buy a threshing machine, I expect to get certain equipment. There are certain duplicate parts that always go along with it.

Mr. EMMERSON. That depends on the bargain.

Mr. SPROULE. No, that is the regular custom. You know you are getting parts in duplicate, but you get a completed machine, so that you can go to work with it at any time. What amuses the hon. member for Westmorland?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is wondering what is the bearing on the discussion.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was not laughing at my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). He need not be sensitive. I certainly would not think of laughing at him. I had better be laughing than looking glum.

Mr. SPROULE. I was saying that if I purchased a threshing machine I would get certain other parts in duplicate. It is supposed to be a completed machine. A completed dredge is a dredge with all the necessary parts to make it work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it include scows?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not imagine that it could very well work without scows unless you were working alongside of a wharf where you were dipping up the stuff and throwing it over to the other side. I take it that it would not be a completed dredge unless you had the dippers and other equipment necessary to go on with the work and, therefore, they ought to be included with the dredge. I would ask again: Could a dredge work without a dipper?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was all included with the dredge.

Mr. SPROULE. Could a dredge work without a boiler?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a boiler in when the dredge was bought.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member says that we have a right to take that out because there was a defect in it, and we have reduced the price by the cost of that boiler —$10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The owners were working it right along with that boiler, and we could have worked it with that boiler, but the Canadian inspectors were very particular. They pointed out this defect, and we thought it better to put in a new boiler.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that the cost of that dredge was reduced by the cost of the boiler which we refused to accept as value.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we accepted it. We owned the boiler, and we disposed of it when we took it out; but we made them reduce the price of the dredge because of this latent defect in the boiler.

Mr. SPROULE. And the hon. gentleman thinks that should not be included in the cost of the dredge. A dredge without a boiler would be incomplete and could not go to work. I do not know what parts of a dredge ought to be duplicated; but, as with other machinery, there are certain things that generally go with a dredge, and these ought to be included in the cost; otherwise the statement of the cost would be misleading to the House. When we ask the cost of a dredge, we mean the cost of everything connected with it completely equipped to go to work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I go almost as far as my hon. friend does. When we got this dredge she was ready to go to work. She was a comparatively new dredge, and had been working with that boiler; but the owners, as a matter of prudence, bought duplicate parts, which formed no part of the dredge and were not necessary to its operation unless some part should get broken, when it would be necessary to have repairs made or to buy new plant. In this particular case, we bought the dredge for a certain price, and the parts were bought separately. When the dredge was brought into Canada she had a boiler which was comparatively new, which had been working, but which we thought, under the Canadian inspection law, it would be desirable to take out and put a new one in its place. We asked a reduction in price which would enable us to put in a new boiler, and the owners agreed to the reduction because of this latent defect.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the dredge go to work before the new boiler was put in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. DANIEL. Has she gone to work yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. With regard to these duplicate parts, I think the minister is not entirely frank with the House when he says that a dredge is in working order without these duplicate parts. I think his experience and knowledge of dredging will bring to his mind the fact that there is not a dredge working anywhere that has not these duplicate parts. It happens constantly that something comes away, and these duplicate parts are absolutely necessary to keep a dredge in order.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NELSON RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company.—Mr. Rutan.

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask that this Bill should stand over for to-night. It contains a provision as to developing water-powers. Two or three similar Bills have passed the committee, but to-day, after a good deal of discussion, the committee postponed the consideration of a similar Bill in order that the minister might be present and declare some general policy in reference to matters of this kind. My desire, and the desire of many members of the House and the committee, is that all these Bills shall be treated on the same basis.

Mr. RUTAN. I cannot see the justice of asking to have this Bill stand over. The Burrard Inlet Bill had similar and even larger powers, yet it passed this committee. This Bill has been delayed and held up from time to time, and now that it has passed the Railway Committee, I would

ask that it should not be delayed further. We are not giving more than is granted by other Bills, and in justice to the promoters, it should be allowed to pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) asks that it should stand over, the Minister of Railways not being present, I would think it would be better for my hon. friend to accede to his request, as it will only mean a delay until Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. RUTAN. I do not object then to it standing over.

Progress reported.

PRINCE ALBERT AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 69) respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Neely.

Mr. BLAIN. The promoter of this Bill is not present, and I would, therefore, ask that according to our practice, it should stand over.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that is hardly fair; we do not observe that rule on all occasions.

Mr. BLAIN. There are reasons against this Bill, which I think it would not be fair to present in the absence of its promoter, and I am not quite sure, but that it is very good policy in any case not to advance a Bill when its promoter is not present.

Mr. EMMERSON. We did it in the case of the Burrard Inlet Bill—the very one cited.

Mr. LENNOX. The rule is that if no objection be raised, the Bill goes on, but if there be any objections, it stands. Objections should not be taken unless there is some reason, and my hon. friend from Peel says he has good reasons.

Mr. RUTAN. There are the same objections to this Bill as to the other.

Progress reported.

THE SASKATCHEWAN CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Railway Company.—Mr. Martin.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the directors of this company railway men?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I could not give a definite answer. Any of the directors I do know are not railway men.

Mr. BLAIN. We have a great many charters put through this House by men who are not particularly interested in the construction of the railway, and whose only object is to make money out of the charters. I am not suggesting that the present Bill is a case of that kind, although I suppose my hon. friend would not contradict that statement very much. I think we should put a provision in the Bill that the charter cannot be sold or disposed of without the consent of the Governor in Council. It seems to me that we should put a stop to this barter and sale of railway charters by people who are not engaged in the railway business and are not particularly interested in the development of the country. I am not going to say that this should apply to this Bill more than to any other, but I think it would be a fair precaution to take, so that in the event of a sale of a charter, the company would have to get the previous consent of the Governor in Council. Then the responsibility would rest on the government.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 142) to incorporate the Congregational Union of Canada.—Mr. A. Haggart.

On section 4, subsection (e)—amalgamation with similar associations.

Mr. A. HAGGART. It is thought that this clause is objectionable, first, because such associations are not required to be incorporated, and second, that they may be associations under provincial charters or otherwise. I suppose that that clause might better come out altogether.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. A. Haggart) that it would be better to let the Bill stand and consult the law clerk with regard to the matter. There is danger, in making a change at the table in this way, that we may spoil the Bill. Of course, if my hon. friend is satisfied, I have no objection, but I think it will be more satisfactory for him to take time for consultation with the law clerk.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Thanks for the suggestion.

Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 147) for the relief of Archibald Laurie.—Mr. Congdon.

Bill (No. 152) to incorporate the Northern Quebec Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. J. P. Turcotte.

Bill (No. 148) for the relief of Bernard Shea.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 149) for the relief of Clara Louise Holden.—Mr. Rankin.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 127) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Turriff.

SUPPLY.

The House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we have about finished the discussion of the item of maritime provinces dredging plant, and I suppose the item might carry.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the minister state now how much the cost was?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The item is $180,000. We had $100,000 last year.

Mr. BLAIN. We did not have the difference between the actual cost and the cost that was brought down in the return fully explained.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not been able to get the particulars. I did not know that the hon. gentleman would want them tonight.

Mr. BLAIN. Which is correct?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Auditor General's Report is absolutely correct. The other is correct also, being limited to the cost of the dredge, whereas the Auditor General has taken in the cost of the dredge, the duplicate parts, and the new boiler, and also the customs duty.

Mr. LENNOX. It is very important, of course, to members on this side of the House, who are not always able to get all the information we desire, and it is very important to the people, as the information they receive on these subjects must filter out to them through such channels as we can open, that the returns presented to the House should be correct. The return placed in my hands showing the cost of a number of dredges includes the figures concerning the dredge 'Industry,' which, I think, is the one spoken of—I was not in before the House rose at six o'clock. The price given here is $150,000. If I am correctly informed—the minister (Mr. Pugsley) will tell me if I am wrong—as a matter of fact, the dredge cost $157,000 or thereabouts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes the cost of the duplicate parts.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that the dredge itself cost $157,000, and that the new boiler put in cost something over $9,000, and that customs duty of 25 per cent on $150,000 was paid. As to the extra boiler, there might be room for argument as to whether that should be included in the first cost. But I understand that the item $157,000 is first cost, and the duty, about $39,000, is equally an item that we should be notified of in this return, brought down on the application of a gentleman for whom we on this side have the greatest respect—the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). We do not get very much aid from the activity of members on the government side of the House in the way of bringing out information, and, when information is so brought out we certainly desire to have it accurate. I hope that the government did not feel that, as one of their own supporters moved for this return, they need not be accurate in their figures. Now, I would be glad if the minister could explain exactly how this matter arises. As to this discrepancy between $150,000 and $157,000, I do not see how there can be an explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend was not here before recess. I stated then that the price of the dredge at first was to be $150,000. Afterwards, when the transaction was about being closed, we decided to have a further examination by boiler experts, and they discovered a defect in the boiler which they thought was ground for raising an objection. We did raise the objection, and on that ground, and as a result of further negotiations, the price was reduced to $140,000. Now the difference between that $140,000, and the amount of $157,000 mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, is made up by what the department paid for the duplicate parts, which, as I have said, were bought separately from the dredge, and were not in the contract for the dredge, except that they had to be taken at the invoice prices. The duplicate parts were all new, and had not been used, and we agreed to take them at the invoice prices. Then there was the actual cost of bringing the dredge from Massena to Cornwall in Canada, which the department agreed to pay, and I think some insurance, but I am not positive. This brings the figure up to what is stated by the Auditor General as $150,000 odd. Then the report shows that there was in addition the duty which was paid. Now I take it for granted that the clerk has seen the statement of the agreement to pay $150,000, I assume that is where he got his information, and he has put that in. But, he has not given any account of the cost of the duplicate parts, he has not given any account of the duty, because I suppose he assumed that that was paid by one of the departments, and went into another department. He has not taken any account of what was subsequently paid for the new boiler. He has simply taken what was the price of the dredge. That is the explanation which I think can be given for the clerk making the mistake he did. I may say that I had never seen this return, and have not seen it up to the present mo-

ment; but I assume that is the way in which the clerk has made up the amount. But the cost is correctly given in the Auditor General's Report, of course, that is, the $157,000 odd for the dredge, and the duplicate plant which was taken at invoice prices, also the duty and new boiler. But neither of these items were considered by the clerk as being a part of the cost of the dredge.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there anything on record in the department to show the change from $140,000 to $150,000 and the $157,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is all on record in the department.

Mr. LENNOX. This does not get better very fast. The original contract, according to the minister, was $150,000. Then another contract was made subsequently amounting to $140,000. The record of the $150,000 is of course in the department, as the minister says; the record of the changed contract, the reduction to $140,000, is also on record in the department. We have the solemn order of this House that they are to bring down certain information, and that is consented to by the government, and that information they profess to have given us. We are altogether dependent on these returns for the knowledge of what is going on in the department. Now it is a strange thing that neither of these transactions is correctly set forth. If it had gone from the $150,000 down to the reduced price of $140,000, and left at this, it would have been a little more consistent than it is to-day on what the minister says. But we have neither the one figure nor the other, and we have a figure between them. Now are we to understand that in this long list of probably twenty dredges, all these returns are as reliable as this one of $150,000? This return was not brought down until the 24th of February last. All this explanation was not made to appear in the Auditor General's Report, the last report I understand before that. Surely there was time enough to have these things brought down, and surely there is an indication at least of a very dangerous kind of carelessness, if this kind of thing can exist in a well ordered department of this government. Surely the minister realizes that these duplicate parts, which I understand to be parts to take the place of those which are worn out, and unfit, making the total $150,000, are as much a portion of the dredge——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Allow me to correct my hon. friend. The duplicate parts were not to take the place of the parts that were worn out, but the parts that might in future become broken or worn out, a very different proposition.

Mr. LENNOX. They were to take the place of what would be likely to give out. The government were not buying them for fun; I assume the government were not buying them for the purpose of pleasing any vendor of this class of goods, they were buying them because they thought they would need them. Surely the government must have considered them absolutely essential to the dredge, or else the government would not have bought them, and the price is as much a portion of the purchase money, when we ask what this thing cost, as the original figure of $150,000, or the substituted figure of $140,000. This has to be paid for, and has been paid for, and does form part of the price. To my mind, without going any further into the matter, I fail to see that the minister has made a satisfactory explanation, although no doubt he has made the best explanation the case is capable of.

Mr. BLAIN. Would my hon. friend explain why they put the $29,000 of customs in the Auditor General's Report if it is not paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. But it was paid.

Mr. BLAIN. Then as a matter of fact it was part of the cost of the dredge. The return states that the dredge cost $150,000. If we were without the Auditor General's Report we would have no opportunity of knowing whether this dredge cost only $150,000 or whether it cost more. We make a comparison between the return laid on the table of the House and we find that while the return says that the dredge cost this country $150,000 the Auditor General's says: 'New dredge plant; purchase price of dredge and plant, $157,378.78.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. You will observe the Auditor General uses the words, 'and plant'.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be duplicate plant.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Customs duty, 25 per cent on $157,379.	$39,344 75
Polson Iron Works: installing Scotch marine boiler, $9,300; less $4,650 paid in 1909-10..	4,650 00
Legal services, D. B. Maclennan, Cornwall..	150 00

From my hon. friend's explanation it appears that there is a great difference between the actual cost of this dredge and the price that was inserted in the return. I do not think my hon. friend's explanation will dispose of the fact that the return is altogether misleading, and if we had not had an opportunity of verifying the return we would still have been under the impression that the cost of this dredge was only $150,000. Was I wrong in understanding the minister to say before six o'clock that the dredge did not go to work until after the new boiler was put in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. BLAIN. The dredge was of no service to this country until after this boiler that the minister is leaving out of the price of the dredge was put in. Therefore, I think it is fair to say that the cost of the boiler should be included in the price of the dredge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose the clerk should have added in the duty, and the cost of the boiler, does my hon. friend think that is worth taking up a great deal of time over, because, before this return was brought down, the Auditor General's Report had been in the hands of members for months. Therefore, there could be no intention to deceive any body. The uttermost you could say would be that the clerk should have put in the cost of the duty, and the cost of the boiler.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister say that it will not occur again?

Mr. BLAIN. I am not offering any particular criticism of the clerk. Mistakes will occur, but I am pointing out that my hon. friend is unwilling to say that we have there a misleading statement. I am emphasizing the fact that we must be very careful when this government bring down returns, because we find that they are not always correct.

Mr. EMMERSON. The price is stated as $10,000 in excess of the actual cost of the dredge.

Mr. LENNOX. It is nothing of the kind; it is stated a great deal less.

New dredging plant—Ontario and Quebec, $135,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is required to make provision for the purpose of new dredging plant. The details are as follows:

New hull for dredge 'Nipissing,' complete..	$ 10,000
New boiler and machinery for dredge 'Nipissing'..	10,000
New boiler and machinery for tug 'Sir John'..	10,000
New hull for dredge 'Challenge'.. ..	18,000
New boiler for dredge 'Mattawa'.. ..	3,000
2 new 32 cub. yd. dump scows for dredge 'Deschenes'..	4,000
New light draught tug for dredge 'Deschenes'..	9,000
6 yawl boats for different vessels.. ..	300
New light draught tug for dredge 'No. 3'..	10,000
Dippers for different dredges..	5,000
New engine for tug 'Storm King'..	6,500
New steel spuds for dredge 'Industry'..	10,000
New 8-yd. steel-bucket dredge 'Industry'..	2,000
New steel scow dredge 'Industry'..	25,000
New spuds, dredge 'International'..	2,000
Extras on contract not yet decided upon tugs 'Lisgar' and 'Peel'....	$ 1,000
Establishment of a small shipyard on Lake Timiskaming, near Haileybury, to provide repair facilities and winter quarters for dredging plant, &c., used on this lake and the streams flowing into it..	5,000
Add for balance that may have to be paid in 1910-11 on new plant begun in 1909-10, unforeseen requirements for 1910-11, possible shortages in the above estimate, &c..	4,200
Total..	$135,000

Mr. DANIEL. How much for spuds for the 'Industry'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $10,000; these are steel spuds.

Mr. DANIEL. How many will that supply?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Four.

Mr. DANIEL. How many did she have when she was bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Four wooden ones.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think it would be a long time before the United States would come over to Canada to buy a dredge, and I hope that all the machinery for these dredges will be bought in Canada, and that the repairs will be done here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the custom to-day for all repairs to be made in Canada.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I see by the Auditor General's Report, Page V—318, that there is an expenditure of $17,401 on the steamer 'Speedy'. I would like to inquire where she is working, and what she is doing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The steamer 'Speedy' is used as a tug boat for towing dredges around from one place to another.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Where?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the St. Lawrence and the lakes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. In Ontario and Quebec exclusively?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Where did she spend last season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the lakes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Where was she fitted out in the spring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Toronto.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. And where was she laid up in the fall?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Toronto.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How does it come that there is an expenditure of $517.70 to pay travelling expenses in connection with the staff on that boat as follows:

Chief engineer, board and travel.. ..	$48 80
2nd engineer, board and travel..	43 08
3rd engineer, travel..	11 95
1st officer, travel..	65 11
Cook, travel..	33 60
Steward, travel..	59 81
Stewardess, board and travel..	54 38

Making $517.70 for travel for crew. I would like to know how that comes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The travelling expenses of the crew are paid from their homes to the place where the vessel might be in the spring, or from the vessel to their homes in the fall when it is laid up. The steward is utilized when not required on the 'Speedy' in connection with other matters, and his travelling expenses are paid. Then there would be the board of those of the crew who are engaged in the spring in fitting out the vessel before she is ready to enter upon commission. That in a general way explains all the travelling expenses.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the nature of the work done by this steamer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Towing government dredges and scows and also inspection work.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. She has a first, a second and a third engineer. Is the work such as to require the services of three engineers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes; she has to be going night and day.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Then you paid out in wages for the whole staff for the season, $7,255, and the board for the staff amounted to $2,595, equal to over 33⅓ per cent of the wages. We thought the government had dispensed with the patronage system. The Minister of Marine promised that he would make an arrangement with the steward to board the crew for a certain figure. That system was adopted on the 'Montcalm' several years ago, and resulted in a saving of about fifty per cent. But in the Department of Public Works the patronage system is still maintained, and not one dollar's worth of provisions is bought from a Conservative; they are all bought from the hon. gentleman's political friends. For the steamer 'Speedy,' provisions to the amount of $2,300 were bought from the hon. gentleman's friends.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are not the prices fair?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. As a rule they are not fair and just. We had evidence before the Public Accounts Committee last year that whenever a messenger with brass buttons came from the government to buy goods the prices would be raised from 25 to 30 per cent. All these dredges and tugboats requiring repairs are sent to two special friends of the government. One is Mr. Davie. Where does he live?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Levis.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. And Mr. Drolet is at Quebec. Last year the 'Speedy' was laid up at Toronto, but she had to have some little repairs, and she was sent to Levis to Mr. Davie. The hon. gentleman misinformed the committee when he stated that this vessel was laid up at Toronto last fall and winter, and started out in the spring, or else he paid Mr. Davie $1,778 for nothing, because this is what Mr. Davie charged up for hauling, wintering, repairing and launching the vessel; and I am informed that Mr. Davie does not do the work at tender prices, but generally gets a good round sum for anything he does for the government. Last year he got no less than $8,483 for hauling out and doing some little repairing on tugs, and Mr. Drolet was paid another large amount. The minister cannot, therefore, say that the patronage system is dispensed with in his department.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is not Mr. Davie a Conservative?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. No. My hon. friend knows that quite well.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed that he is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. George T. Davie is a very respectable and reliable man, even though he may be a Conservative, and he does his work thoroughly well. There is no better machinist in the whole of Canada. He has a dock at Levis, I think a marine railway, and he does a good deal of repairs. My hon. friend has unintentionally fallen into an error. He assumes that because the 'Speedy' was at Toronto last winter Mr. Davie's account for hauling up and wintering the 'Speedy' at Levis could not be correct. She was at Levis the year before, and that fiscal year ended on the 31st of March, and Mr. Davie's account for services during the winter and spring would be charged in the fiscal year following, the accounts of which we have before us. The important question is whether Mr. Davie's account is too large. I have no reason to suppose that it is at all out of the way. But that is work we could not let by tender. There was at that time nobody at Levis except Mr. Davie who could do that class of work. The Quebec Machinery Company is there now, and we are asking for tenders.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It is not very far from Quebec to the government shipyard at Sorel.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite a distance, and I do not think the work would cost us less there. Look at some of the items in the

Auditor General's Report. Soft coal bought on the St. Lawrence and great lakes at $4.25 a ton. Will any one say that is out of the way?

Mr. S. SHARPE. That is a pretty high price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it not a fair price for Sydney coal bought on the lakes or on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. G. TAYLOR. It is steam coal, is the minister sure it is Sydney coal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So the engineer says.

Mr. DANIEL. In that case it is cheaper there than in the city of St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Take anthracite coal bought in small quantities at $7 a ton on the lakes.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. $6.50 I pay, delivered in my cellar.

Mr. HARTY. $6.75 I pay in my city.

Mr. BOYCE. You can buy it at Sault Ste. Marie for $7 a ton.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Ottawa it costs $7.50. Then there are sailors' suits, $13 a suit, that is not out of the way.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the coal weighed by the department or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Weighed by the department, yes. Then there is coal oil, 18c. a gallon. Is that out of the way? So I ask my hon. friend to go through this item by item, and I venture to say he will find abundant evidence to support the statement that the captain and steward have exercised great care in making purchases and have gone around and got the lowest price. These are the directions to the captain. Where a steamer like the 'Speedy' is travelling about, we cannot call for tenders in a public way. They have to get meats and vegetables, groceries, &c., and their instructions are to get them at the lowest market price. I was on the 'Speedy' year before last, and saw evidence of nothing but the strictest economy. More than that, while a good deal has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite about the 'Speedy' the officers of my department assure me that the 'Speedy' earns to the government very considerably more than the cost of operation, so it is not a loss to the government. The only fault I have to find with her is that she is not as strong as she ought to be for doing towing work.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister said that the coal was really weighed by the officers of the department. Did he make that statement really and truly, or did it just come to him off-hand?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought my hon. friend was a gentleman, and I think so still, and therefore I am greatly surprised at his putting that question to me. The information I gave is based upon the statement of my deputy, who has seen the weighing actually going on, and the department is always careful to see that the coal is weighed.

Mr. BLAIN. I see two items, Geo. T. Davy, hauling up, wintering and launching the 'Speedy,' and on the same page an account of Geo. Summerville, wintering vessel, $75.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would not be the 'Speedy,' it might have been a caretaker, but I could not give the information to-night.

Mr. BLAIN. Are any of these items bought by public competition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they are all bought by seeing different dealers, and getting the lowest prices.

Mr. BLAIN. I see a whistle, $65.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is usual for steamers to have whistles, that is a fair price.

Mr. BLAIN. Has my hon. friend abolished the patronage list? Some ministers state that there has been a brand new departure lately, and that the patronage list is unknown. Would my hon. friend say that the list is unknown in his department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I think I can safely say that the patronage list, as it used to exist from 30 to 40 years ago, down to last year, has been abolished. We do not furnish to our officials a list, as used to be done when my hon. friend, perhaps, had a good deal to do with patronage.

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, my hon. friend's predecessors in love and affection. We instruct our officials to buy where they get the goods cheapest, but I take it for granted, where there are articles of any considerable amount to be purchased, they will invite tenders. Where purchases are made through the department, the rule is that we invite tenders here, but the resident engineers, the superintendents of dredging, must buy supplies, and their instructions are to purchase them at reasonable prices.

Mr. BLAIN. When did the change take place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was announced last session, I think.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister find, under the new arrangement, that goods have been purchased cheaper?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so, not so far as ordinary supplies are concerned. There has been a difference and a saving to the department in this respect, that when we require fittings for different public buildings we are in the habit of giving a wider advertisement than was formerly the case. We secure greater competition, and I think the accounts will show that we are making a considerable saving in that way.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister state that within the last year there has been really any change in the list of firms from whom the department has been purchasing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not follow that at all. Having done away with the patronage list, it is no part of my duty to follow that. We leave that to the discretion and judgment of our buyers and do not interfere with them at all.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the hon. minister say that the agents of his department have full liberty to purchase goods from any one outside the supporters of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have a perfectly free hand.

Mr. DANIEL. It is strange then that they do not seem to make use of their freedom.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They would lose their job if they did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I never inquire from whom they buy.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says that where tenders are called for, he has broadened the scope of the advertisement. Does he now advertise in any newspapers other than those supporting the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we have not ordinarily found it necessary to do so. We can get sufficiently wide publicity by utilizing the papers friendly to the government. What I meant was that we have widened the circle in the way of informing contractors. Formerly the practice was not to advertise in the newspapers for fittings but to send out to people in the business asking them to tender. We now, however, advertise generally in the newspapers so that there is wider competition and the same opportunity is given to Conservatives as to Liberals.

Mr. BLAIN. But the hon. minister does not deem it expedient to advertise in any Conservative newspapers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not found it necessary to do that.

Mr. BLAIN. Where the hon. minister finds a Conservative newspaper in a city having a very much larger circulation than the newspaper supporting my hon. friend's government, he will still advertise in the newspaper with the smaller circulation, and not in the Conservative newspaper with a much larger circulation. He will have some difficulty in explaining that there is very much change in this practice from the former one. The only difference he says is that heretofore the department had a list and only invited the people on the list to tender for supplies, but that now he has broadened that practice by advertising in the newspapers which support the government. Does my hon. friend think that is a change in the public interest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. BLAIN. Would not that rather increase the government patronage?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BLAIN. I beg to differ with my hon. friend on that point. Heretofore he had a list of the faithful, but now he advertises in the newspapers that support the government but not in any other. How does he know that a paper supports the government or not? Has he a list of the papers supporting the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a rule, I endeavour to see if they take an enlightened view of public matters. From that I can pretty well judge on what side they are.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister appears to think that in the letting of contracts for supplies he is taking an entirely new departure and is giving Conservatives just as good an opportunity to tender as Liberals. But he knows that the Conservatives, to a large extent, do not take Liberal papers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a great misfortune. I am surprised at that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When it comes down to advertising for tenders, it does not seem very good practice for the minister to advertise only in government newspapers. If he were conducting his own business, he would not conduct it in that way.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. My hon. friend the minister read out a few items a moment ago which he said were fair and reasonable. Let me draw a few to his attention, taken from page V—319 of the Auditor General's Report. On dredge scows—Mr. Davie had something to do with this—he spent $1,333.13. Let me just mention a few items and ask the hon. gentleman if he considers the prices fair. Elm, 950 feet at 8 cents per foot or $80 per 1,000 feet. Why, we are buying elm lumber at home at $12 per 1,000 feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. At my home.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That must be an elm country. Is that what they call swamp elm?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What my hon. friend bought no doubt was slippery elm.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would sooner have that than swamp elm. My hon. friend will not answer my question.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Here is an item of iron spikes, 457 pounds at 6 cents per pound. I want my hon. friend to state if 6 cents for spikes is a fair price. He can buy them by retail at 3 cents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer disputes that statement absolutely.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Let him go to any hardware store and he will get them at 3 cents per pound. What do you pay for railway spikes on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a vast difference in spikes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You buy them by the ton for the railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a difference between ship spikes and iron spikes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They are all made of iron and steel, and steel and iron are the same price to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told not.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I know better, for I am handling 1,000 tons every year. Here is an item for labour, one and a half day at $5 per day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends on whether that was expert labour or not.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. $5 a day would be a pretty good price for Mr. Davie himself.

Mr. LOGGIE. Ship spikes and steel spikes are entirely different. Ship spikes are wrought spikes. They are entirely different from the ordinary wire spikes and cut spikes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Here is oakum, 434 pounds at 8 cents per pound. What is pitch worth a barrel?

Mr. HARTY. I do not know. I never handled it. We do not use it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It is used in Kingston. The government use a good deal and pay $5.50. I can buy it at $3.50 laid down.

Mr. HARTY. How many barrels are charged there?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Four. The government are paying $5.50, and other people can buy it for repairing their roofs at $3.50. Then, there is an item, use of forges, etc., $30. These are hand forges that you can buy at $15 or $16 apiece. Yet, the department pays $30 for the use of two or three of them. Another item reads, use of tools, $75. These are tools brought over to repair these scows. And the minister pays a bill like that. It is like the cross-cut saw that was spoken of last year for the use of which $30 was paid. Then there is cartage of tools, etc., to and from dock, $25. Also wood wedges, $25.60. I am sure that if we moved for these accounts and got them down, we should find them all certified as 'fair and just'. But plenty of the members on that side of the House know that the prices of some of these articles are not fair and just. And the minister pays these prices that are made without tender and without calling for competition. Then he will tell us that the patronage list is done away with.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member (Mr. George Taylor) is out, as he sometimes—I will not say always—is. Take, for instance, the item of $5 for labour about which he makes such an outcry. This is a day and a half at $5 for the day and a half.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. No, it is carried out at $7.50.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I will not quarrel with my hon. friend over $2.50. With regard to the elm, I am told that such elm as was used for this work costs what is charged. It is what they call rock elm.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. You can buy it for $20 a thousand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member said it could be bought for $12.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I say we are buying it at $12—not rock elm.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we should be glad to take all that the hon. member (Mr. George Taylor) can furnish at a good deal more than $20. With regard to the hire of tools—

Mr. NESBITT. I will say that if the rock elm is of the right kind it is worth $80 a thousand.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I presume my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) is a good judge of it.

Mr. NESBITT. Yes, I know all about it. I will guarantee that I know more about it than the hon. member (Mr. George Taylar), and put up money on it.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I dont' bet money.

Mr. NESBITT. My hon. friend ought to be fair. You cannot buy mill run rock elm with the culls out, for $20.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does me good to have a practical man meet my hon. friend (Mr. George Taylor)—

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I do not admit that the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) is a practical man—practising law and knowing all about the price of lumber. I will tell him that we can buy elm lumber—we refuse it—at $12 a thousand, and not mill run—

Mr. NESBITT. I do not believe there is a man in the world who would be foolish enough to sell mill run, culls out, rock elm at $20 a thousand. And even swamp elm cannot be bought at $12 a thousand, unless he takes it mill run without the culls out.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. We are buying it, cut, four, five and six inches, specially sawn, five-eights thick, at $12 a thousand.

Mr. NESBITT. Log run?

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. No. I know what we are doing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From what the chief engineer of my department tells me—and he is an expert, buying these materials continually—I am led to believe that my hon. friend from North Oxford is a much more practical man than the hon. member opposite (Mr. Geo. Taylor).

Mr. COWAN. On what does the minister base his judgment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the opinion given me by a gentleman who knows about these prices.

Mr. COWAN. I thought it was on the noise the hon. gentleman made.

Mr. NESBITT. I have a letter upstairs offering me $18 a thousand, log run, dead culls out, for swamp elm.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is that from the government?

Mr. NESBITT. No, from a private party.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Carried.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. No, the minister was about to explain about the tools.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was in cases where the work was done by our own men.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How about the $30 for a couple of hand forges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends on how long they were used.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. You can buy them for $15 a piece.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What is the difference between the maintenance expenses and operating expenses as shown in the return brought down to the motion of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German)?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is sometimes difficult to draw the line between the two. In operating expenses are included wages, coal, oil and other items of that kind. Some slight repairs might also be charged in operating expenses. But it is at this point that it is hard to draw the line.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What principle does the department follow?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer tells me that there are charged to maintenance those repairs which cannot be fairly made by the crew when the boat is in use.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Are the expenses of each of these dredges shown separately in the Auditor General's Report—all the expenses of each dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand so.

Mr. S. SHARPE. In the case of the dredge 'Challenge,' I find at page V—305 of the report of the Auditor General for the year 1908-9, the items chargeable against the vote amounted to $7,394.44. But in the return brought down, the operating and maintenance expenses amount to $12,058.27. Why do not the items in the Auditor General's Report and in this return correspond?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason might be this: The statement in V-305, I think, is for dredge vessel repairs. In the statement which the department brings down, there is the cost of operating, $5,976 and the cost of maintenance, $6,081. Now the Auditor General may not apportion the cost of dredge vessel repairs or of operating and maintenance the same as the department does, he may take a different view. But the total should be the same for the 'Challenge.' The two items, dredge vessel repairs and dredging, ought together to make the sum total we have in our return. But the difference would be accounted for by the fact that the auditor might take a different view of the operating expenses.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I understand that the expenditure chargeable against any dredge, both for operating and maintenance, would be included under the name of the dredge in the report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because there is another item for dredging. My hon. friend will see in the estimates, page 72, for Quebec and Ontario, dredging, which includes operating expenses.

Mr. BOYCE. Is there any account kept with regard to this dredging work, giving the cost of dredging, then what amount of material the dredge has taken out, so as to get an idea of what the dredge is doing in the shape of work per day, and per quantity, classifying the cost, and ascertaining how much that class of work is costing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is done periodically. My hon. friend will find all that

in the annual report of the department. The report does not write off anything for depreciation, but the actual cost of operating is given with the quantity of dredging.

Dredging plant, Manitoba, $13,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is to make provision for the construction of new dredging plant to do the dredging required in Manitoba. We require a new hull and boiler and a small tug for the dredge 'Assiniboine'; also a new hull for the dredge crane, and improvements in machinery.

Mr. BRADBURY. Where is that dredge going to operate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The 'Assiniboine' works at the mouth of the Red river near Selkirk.

Mr. BRADBURY. Is that the new dredge built last year, constructed out of an old snag boat?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the 'Assiniboine' was renewed about a year and a half ago.

Mr. BRADBURY. The dredge I refer to was a snag boat converted into a dredge. I understand they are both working at the mouth of the Red river. One was a suction dredge, and the other a dipper dredge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not familiar with the names of the dredges, but the chief engineer tells me the 'Assiniboine' is working at the mouth of the Red river.

Dredging plant, Saskatchewan and Alberta, $65,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for building two snag boats and stone lifters, to be operated on the Saskatchewan river. We find these boats are urgently required to remove boulders and improve the navigation of the river.

Dredging plant, British Columbia, $160,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A new elevator dredge is required, and we require a gasoline launch for use on the Thomson river by the assistant resident engineer estimated to cost $5,000. Then we want a drilling plant for Victoria harbour, $30,000. We shall have to increase this vote largely. Improvements are very urgently required in Victoria harbour, and we want to make them more rapidly. These improvements are required by reason of the Grand Trunk Pacific having determined to build a wharf in Victoria harbour. They have applied to the department for approval of the location of it, and it is going to very seriously interfere with other steamers coming in unless we can widen the harbour. We will find it necessary to do a considerable amount of rock blasting and also a considerable amount of dredging. We have now in contemplation the purchasing of two Lobnitz rock breakers. We propose operating both of them and also having double shifts in order to get through with the work as rapidly as we can. The work is most urgently needed by reason of the increased number of steamers that are going to Victoria harbour. There are steamers running between Seattle and Victoria, between Vancouver and Victoria, between Prince Rupert and Victoria, and the number is to be supplemented by the steamers that have lately been acquired by the Grand Trunk Pacific. Therefore, we shall have to ask probably a little later on for a considerable increase in this vote. Then, in regard also to Vancouver harbour, we shall require a very considerable increase. We have had a very careful survey made of the entrance to Vancouver harbour, or what is known as the first narrows, and we propose to do a very important and very necessary work in the immediate future, namely: the widening of the channel to about 1,200 feet. This work is going to cost up probably $400,00, apart from the cost of the dredge. We will require a dredge having peculiar features to do that work most expeditiously and economically. The dredge which the engineer recommends is one of the elevator variety.

Mr. COWAN. Is that the dredge you referred to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and that dredge, it is estimated, will cost somewhere in the vicinity of $275,000 in addition to the duty.

Mr. BLAIN. Why could not that be built in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only dredge of the kind that has ever been built in Canada is the 'Fielding,' which was built at the Sorel shipyards, and which cost very considerably more money than this dredge cost. We may be able to get it built in Canada although it would take considerable time. This work is urgent. We have not positively decided that we shall go abroad. If we can get it built in Canada within the time that we ought to have it at work we shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. COWAN. I understand the minister to say that the elevator dredge for which $135,000 of this item is intended is for work on the first narrows?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. COWAN. That is the dredge the minister is speaking about?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. COWAN. As I understand from the reports of the various engineers who have

examined the situation, an ordinary dipper dredge or a suction dredge will not do; it must be an elevator dredge. Did I understand the minister to say that dredge will be ordered in Canada or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. what I said was that I am inclined to think that we shall find it most advantageous to purchase that dredge in the old country, because these dredges are not ordinarily built in Canada. I do not know of any elevator dredge built in Canada except the 'Fielding.' The capacity of the 'Fielding,' is about the same as the dredge we propose buying, and if I am right in the figures we will get this dredge, which is of steel and has a capacity of about 800 or 1,000 cubic yards per hour, for about half the cost of the 'Fielding,' excluding the duty. If upon inquiry we find that we can get an elevator dredge built in Canada within a reasonable time, I would be very glad indeed to get it here, but I am sure we can get it very much earlier if we buy it abroad.

Mr. COWAN. It is the advice of the government engineer, is it not, that it will be necessary, in order to get the right kind of dredge, to order it in the old country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, of the resident engineer.

Mr. COWAN. Did I understand the minister to say that this item will have to be increased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. COWAN. I understand then that the $90,000 taken out of this item will not be devoted to the purchase of a dredge or plant?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we will use the $90,000 for operating.

Mr. COWAN. Might I ask the minister, who has been giving, I am very pleased to be able to say, good attention to the first narrows, about when the dredge will be ordered, and in operation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The dredge will be ordered immediately upon the passing of the Appropriation Act. We have no power to give an order till then, but immediately after the Appropriation Act passes we shall give the order for the dredge. We are making inquiries and getting all the information, but we cannot enter into a contract until the Appropriation Act passes. I recognize the great importance of going on at the earliest possible moment with this work of widening the first narrows, and also the work in Victoria harbour. The work at both places is most urgently required, and I can assure my hon. friends from British Columbia, that there will be no time lost whatever after the Appropriation Act is pessed.

Mr. COWAN. I think the minister is aware that on the south side of the narrows there are some submerged or partly submerged rocks that the engineer advises should be removed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. COWAN. Some 63,000 yards, I believe. May I ask the minister what machinery is being provided for the removal of that rock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will be removed by means of the Lobnitz rock crusher. We also propose to remove the Parthia shoals as well.

Mr. COWAN. That is one of the objects for which these rock crushers are to be purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we intend using Lobnitz rock crushers there, and at Victoria harbour. We will put them at work in Victoria harbour first, but we will start work at the first narrows as soon as we can conveniently, and we will use the Lobnitz crushers on the south side of the channel.

Mr. COWAN. I think the attention of the minister was drawn when he was at Vancouver to the necessity of providing anchorage for vessels in English bay, at a cost for dredging and a breakwater of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember just what the cost is estimated to be, but I remember my attention being called to the need of it.

Mr. COWAN. May I ask the minister what provision is being made for that very much needed work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are taking an amount for operating the dredging plant in British Columbia. We have several very urgent propositions in British Columbia in respect to dredging. We have the Fraser river, the north arm of the Fraser, the entrance to False creek, the Vancouver Narrows, Victoria harbour, and Nanaimo. These are the most important places. Then we have quite a number of less important harbours in British Columbia where dredging work is urgently required. All I can say to my hon. friend to-night is that we shall give attention to the work of dredging the basin at the entrance to False creek as soon as we can, but I feel that the first work to be done is the widening of the narrows.

Mr. COWAN. The present estimates make no provision for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not specially for the work at the entrance to False creek. It can be done out of the general vote, if we have enough money.

Mr. COWAN. I understood that the engineer suggested that there should be a breakwater as well as a little dredging at the entrance to False creek.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We would require a special vote for that. I did not understand that a breakwater was needed, but simply dredging of a basin, and the approach to provide an anchoring ground for vessels entering False creek.

Mr. COWAN. Do the estimates before the House provide for the removal of Parthia shoal? I think the minister is aware that that will not require a rock cutter, but only an ordinary dredge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Both the widening of the narrows and the removal of Parthia shoal could be done out of the general dredging vote.

Mr. COWAN. The minister, with a keen eye to the situation, notwithstanding the entertainment he received at Vancouver, was good enough to tell us that we would have a dredge before the season expired. Our seasons there are fairly long, like our patience. We would be glad if the minister would be good enough to say, if he can, when a dredge for this general work is likely to be in the harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the best information I can get, I believe we can have an elevator dredge launched by the middle or latter part of July, and we can have her at work in Vancouver harbour probably by the first of September.

Mr. COWAN. I was referring, not to the elevator dredge, but to the ordinary dipper dredge, which has a good deal of work to do there—the removal of Parthia shoal, for instance. I believe that the engineer has recommended very strongly that a dredge should be got there at once to do this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that the dredges are all busy. The 'King Edward' is, I think, at this very moment engaged in dredging in False creek at the request of the city of Vancouver. We brought her from Nanaimo for the very purpose of doing urgent work there. What we are trying to do is to keep all the dredges busy all the time. I can assure my hon. friend that the removal of Parthia shoal will be done just as soon as we can do it.

Mr. BURRELL. I did not quite catch what the minister said about $5,000 for a launch.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is applied for by Mr. Aylmer, the resident engineer, for use on the Thompson river.

Mr. BARNARD. What work is he doing on the Thompson river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is work all around there—east and west, north and south; for instance, the inspection of booms, and the clearing out of the channel. Then, the Thompson river connects with the Shuswap lakes, and his duties will take him there. He told me when I was in British Columbia last year that he could not do his work without having a launch for the purpose of getting to these inland waters.

Mr. BURRELL. Is the engineer changing his headquarters from Revelstoke to Kamloops?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BURRELL. The minister had an application for some dredging on the North Thompson river to make that navigable. Will that be part of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not out of this vote, but that work, if recommended by Mr. Aylmer, will have careful consideration. He thought Kamloops would be a more central point for him, in view of the duties he has to perform in various directions.

Mr. BARNARD. In regard to the rock drilling plants which the minister spoke of for the harbour of Victoria, about how soon does he expect to begin operations there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We shall have to build very heavy scows on which the rock drilling plants are to be placed, and it will take probably three or four months to have the rock drilling plants delivered, as they are made in the old country. Of course, I cannot enter into a contract until the Appropriation Act passes.

Mr. DANIEL. It appears that this return does not comply with the order of the House, because it contains only a list of the dredges owned by the Department of Public Works. The return is indorsed as a return to an order of the House of Commons dated 15th March, 1909, showing the number and names of the various dredges owned by the government. This deals only with the dredges owned by the Public Works Department, and so does not comply with the order of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It complies as far as my department is concerned. It would be for the Marine Department and the Railways and Canals Department to bring down their returns separately. This is limited to the Department of Public Works and professedly so. If my hon. friend would bring the matter to the notice of the other ministers, I have no doubt they would bring down their parts of the return.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Why should it be necessary for an hon. member to call the attention of the government further?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be that the member only wished the Public Works Depart-

ment dredges. I know it was to me he spoke.

Mr. COWAN. Referring to the first narrows works, what is the capacity of the elevating dredges, what is the quantity that it is estimated will have to be removed, and will the $90,000 be sufficient to carry on the work to the end of the year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The quantity is estimated at about 2,500,000 yards, and the actual cost of removal with a powerful elevator dredge, without making any allowance for interest upon the cost of the dredge, wear and tear, sinking fund, &c., will probably be about 15 cents per cubic yard. The dredge has a capacity of about 800 cubic yards per hour. There will be no question about keeping the work going when we get the drege there, it will be kept going.

New Dredging Plant, Generally, $340,000.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What is the lowest price per cubic yard for any dredging done under the Dussault-Lemieux contract in Quebec harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is an entire contract for wharf building and dredging together. For dredging, my recollection is, it is 57 cents per cubic yard scow measurement for the crib seats.

Mr. S. SHARPE. When the minister rents a scow to a sub-contractor, I understand he rents the crew and outfit?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, just the bare scow

Mr. S. SHARPE. A dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we rent a dredge, that includes the crew, because we have to keep our crew aboard.

Mr. S. SHARPE. So in 1908, when the Dredge 'International' was rented to Dussault et Lemieux, we received $25,200 at 15 cents per cubic yard. That would be 168,000 cubic yards for which the contractor would receive 57 cents a cubic yard, and we, although we supplied the dredge and all the men, paid all the wages and bore the whole expense of the dredge, received only 15 cents a cubic yard. In other words, the contractor made 42 cents a cubic yard, and on the item of rent of the dredge alone, he has a profit of something like $57,200. The resident engineer, Mr. Valiquette, stated before the Public Accounts Committee last year that while the department received $150 a day, the expenses and upkeep came to $125, leaving apparently a profit to the department of $25 a day, but it was shown by the evidence of the same witness, that sometimes as much as 1,000 cubic yards, amounting ot $800 or $900, was dredged, so the contractor was making $600 or $700 a day out of the dredge, and the department was making only $25. According to the minister's statements, this item will give as alarming a profit out of a dredge owned and operated by the government——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which dredge is that?

Mr. S. SHARPE. The 'International.' The government pay all the expenses, and all they receive is 15 cents, and the department pays the contractor 57 cents for the work we do with our own men and dredge, while we pay all the expenses. In other words, out of that contract the contractor is making $67,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is far from stating all of the facts in the case.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I have stated all the facts from the minister's answers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has overlooked some facts.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Then it is due to the minister's answers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman overlooked some things. The contract was made long before I became Minister of Public Works. I found it in operation when I became minister. The dredge 'International' dredged out the crib seats, it is true, for the contractor, but it was also dredging out the channel, and, under ordinary circumstances, that dredged material would have been taken out three miles or so to deep water and dumped there. But the contractor, who had the contract for the crib work, dredging, and back filling—which he, being the lowest tenderer, obtained after public competition—bought this material from the government and paid 15 cents per cubic yard all round, not only for what was taken out of the crib seats, but also for vast quantities which the government was not paying him a copper for. The result, as brought out before the Public Accounts Committee, was that the government was actually the gainer by the operation.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I do not remember that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. George Taylor) brought that question up a couple of years ago, but when he found out the facts he dropped it like a hot potato, and we heard nothing more about it until my hon. friend resurrected the matter to-night. When I became minister I found, in connection with the further work, that there would be a greater amount of dredging in connection with the crib seats and less channel work, and I saw the thing would not work out as before. These contractors were going on with the work of building the cribs in regard to which their tender was very low—much less than the work could be done for to-day, in view of the advances in prices of materials. I made a new bargain and insisted on their

paying $200 per day for the use of the dredge. After allowing for the cost of operation and wear and tear, and sinking fund and a reasonable contractor's profit, that gives to the government for the dredge 'International' $110 per day in profit.

Mr. S. SHARPE. How many cubic yards per day?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It varies from day to day. Some days she would strike hard material and dredge a less quantity, or storms might arise when she would be more or less idle.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The hon. minister's statement may be clear to himself, but I cannot understand it. The bare fact is this, that the dredge was rented by the contractor on a cubic yard basis at 15 cents per yard and he is paid for excavation at the rate of 57 cents per yard, so that while the government dredge did the work the contractor got a profit on that work of 42 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not so.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The hon. minister obscures the issue by bringing in a lot of side contracts, dumping down the river, filling in the crib work, &c., but the main fact is that the dredge was rented by the contractor at 15 cents per cubic yard, and the contractor was paid 75 cents per cubic yard, and we did all the work, thus leaving him net 42 cents on our work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the case. That was ventilated before the Public Accounts Committee two years ago, and we never heard a word of it last session from my hon. friend or the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. George Taylor) when the matter was fresh in their memory. Now, however, when not only my hon. friend but others have forgotten the facts most absolutely essential to understand the matter, my hon. friend brings it up again. But in so doing he forgets the most essential fact, which is that, while we were paying for a portion of the dredging at 57 cents per cubic yard, the contractor was paying the government for thousands upon thousands of cubic yards for which he was not getting one cent from the government, so that the one account over-balanced the other, and the government received more than it paid out to the contractor. When I became minister I found that there was more dredging to be done in connection with the crib seats and less channel work, so I made the contractor pay $200 per day for the use of the dredge, on which we get a net profit of $110. There are many days when the dredge would not average 700 yards. It does not average that for the season. On some days, therefore, we would be getting at the rate of 40 or 50 cents per cubic yard for the work done.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. S. SHARPE. When we lend a dredge at so much per cubic yard, if there be a day when the dredge is not working the government pays the inspection.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This charge is for every day, whether the dredge works or not.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I am not speaking of the $200 per day, but of the item per cubic yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was an old arrangement before I was minister.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will admit that I was correct so far as 1908 was concerned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because my hon. friend leaves out of account the vast quantity of dredging out of the channel for which the contractor was not receiving one cent from the government, and which, if the arrangement had not been made with the contractor, we would have had to tow out to deep water some three or four miles distant. For those thousands and thousands of cubic yards of dredged material, the contractor paid us and used it for back filling.

Mr. S. SHARPE. If he had not got it from the government, he would have got it from some one else.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But we would have had to tow it out to sea and dump it there.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the $90 a day cover the wages of the crew and the expenses in connection with the dredging as well as interest upon the investment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $91 covers the wages, the coal, the interest upon the expenditure, and a reasonable amount for wear and tear.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the capacity of the dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Working under favourable circumstances, about 700 cubic yards per day at that depth of water.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the depth of water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Forty-eight feet.

Dredging, maritime provinces, $675,000.

Mr. CROCKET. What are the details?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is impossible to tell in a minute detail where this will be expended. We have many demands from different sections of the country. This covers the cost of operation of the government dredges in the maritime provinces, as well as contract work.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister an estimate which shows where the dredging is to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will take $250,000 for the government dredges, and about $425,-

000 for contract work. We have many applications from many points in Nova Scotia. In New Brunswick we have very urgent requests for dredging at the Miramichi and other places. We have most urgent requests for dredging Bathurst harbour, Shediac, Tracadie, Buctouche, Richibucto, St. Andrews and Leonardsville. We have requests for dredging on the St. John river, on Grand lake, in Prince Edward Island, and numerous other places. Until we go carefully over these estimates after the appropriation is made, we cannot tell where the various dredges will be put to work.

Mr. BLAIN. All this next summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As far as we can get along.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not hear——

Mr. PUGSLEY. And Gaspereau.

Mr. EMMERSON. Ah, I was going to say that I had not heard the minister say anything of Gaspereau. I want to impress upon the minister the absolute necessity of the continuance of the work commenced there in 1908. He was not in the House at that time, and was not familiar with the circumstances, but as early as 1901, the Minister of Public Works of that day, the late Mr. Tarte, had the original survey made and items were put into the estimates for one or two years, encouraging the people there to believe that the work would be speedily prosecuted, but year after year disappointment came. There are some very large industries there requiring navigation facilities. There are large lumbering operations, a canning establishment and others. Steamers go there and boats ply up and down the river. The difficulty in the way of navigation is the bar near the mouth of the river. The main reason always given for not going on with the work was that there were not dredging plants available—that the government had not dredges in the maritime provinces to undertake the work. In 1908 tenders were asked for and operations begun. In the spring of 1909—unfortunately, in my judgment, and to the injury of the work that had already been commenced in 1908—the work was not prosecuted. It was near the close of the season of 1909 when the government dredge was sent. Then, owing to the inclemency of the weather, she had soon to desist from operations. The work done in 1908 would have been of advantage had the bar been completely dredged through so that the channel of the river could have been reached. But, unless this work is prosecuted so as to reach that channel every dollar that has been expended is absolutely wasted. I know the minister has made every effort to have this work done, and I can appreciate the fact that he has been besieged from every section of the maritime provinces for dredging. There is more work to be done than the plant can accomplish. I know that that has been the case ever since I first had any knowledge of these things—and my knowledge began in 1900, when I first became a member of this House. Still, I would strongly urge upon the department the continuance of the work this year. It seems to me it would not require a great deal more to make the work already done of practical advantage to the port and to the shippers who find it necessary to reach that port. Larger vessels are being used, and a great deal of lumber is being exported. As a result of the conditions of the channel, the lumber merchants are sending their lumber to Cape Tormentine and other ports, incurring the cost of railway charges, this being necessary in order to secure shipping facilities. If the dredging were completed vessels would go up the river and load at the wharfs of the lumber establishments at Port Elgin.

Mr. CROCKET. How far is Port Elgin from the mouth of the river?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not sure, but I should estimate it at between a mile and a mile and a half.

Mr. BLAIN. Who owns the wharf?

Mr. EMMERSON. The lumber establishment own wharfs where they would ship if the vessels could reach them. Then there are fishing concerns that ship.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the government own any wharf there?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there is an old landing wharf below the railway draw-bridge. But the main shipping would be done at the wharfs above the draw-bridge. The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway which connects Sackville at the Intercolonial Junction with Cape Tormentine opposite Prince Edward Island, passes through Port Elgin and crosses the Gaspereau river at that point. In the bridge they have a draw to enable vessels to pass up and down the stream. Small vessels can go there. There is a large business with Prince Edward Island.

Mr. CROCKET. Do small vessels go to Port Elgin now?

Mr. EMMERSON. Vessels with light draft—yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What draught?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They can go at high tide.

Mr. EMMERSON. The difficulty is the bar which prevents the approach to the river. The river opens out into the Bay Verte. The sweep of the sea from Northumberland straits up into the bay has

formed this bar. In former days, I am told, larger vessels could approach that river and navigate these waters.

Mr. CROCKET. Would not the river require to be dredged?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not to Port Elgin. After you get beyond a certain point the channel is sufficiently deep. The dredging is necessary at the mouth of the river —that is my understanding of it. The people there were very much interested. They have from time to time got up petitions and had public meetings. They are very anxious for the advancement of the trade of that section of New Brunswick, and so to have this work proceeded with. I cannot use language strong enough in which to urge upon the minister the importance and necessity of this work. I think he has had applications from time to time directly from the residents of that community, and must himself have some idea of the necessity of the work. He can readily understand, representing that constituency, and coming more closely in touch with the people, how zealous they are in approaching me, and if I could be inspired with the same zeal in my attempts to approach him, I am sure my appeal will be a successful one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have been very strongly urged by my hon. friend, repeatedly and incessantly urged, to complete this work. I have also been urged by prominent business men of Port Elgin, and I am happy to be able to say to my hon. friend that I anticipate that early in the coming season I shall be able to continue this work with one of the government dredges, probably the same one which was there last year.

Mr. FIELDING. I wish to remind the Minister of Public Works that there are a number of places in Nova Scotia, which he has not mentioned, but for which I shall not fail to put in an application in due course, places in which my constituents are interested.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought that everybody was served in the county of the Finance Minister.

Mr. FIELDING. Not at all. My hon. friend must come down and see that lovely neighbourhood.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to ask the member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) if I correctly understood him to say that the government dredge was sent there too late in the season of 1909 to do any work, on account of stress of weather.

Mr. EMMERSON. I commenced early in the spring urging the minister to send a dredge there. His answer was that he hoped to have one available very shortly, one which was engaged either in Prince Edward Island or in Nova Scotia; he hoped that she would be relieved shortly and would go there early in the season. I assumed that it was because he was disappointed in his expectations that the dredge did not reach there earlier. She did reach there and did some work, but the season closed early with rough weather, and they were compelled to take her away.

Mr. WRIGHT. Following up the item which has just been introduced by the hon. member for Westmorland, asking for an appropriation for government dredging in some of those minor streams, I would like to ask whether the local government in New Brunswick does not do a good deal of this kind of work.

Mr. EMMERSON. No. I may say that the harbours and streams in the maritime provinces, as elsewhere in Canada, are not only under the control of the Dominion government, but are entirely within their jurisdiction. The provincial government and legislatures have never recognized any responsibility with regard to them for that reason, and for the further reason, that this dredging work being for the promotion of navigation, it is exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Dominion.

Mr. WRIGHT. I might point out that in the province of Ontario a good deal of this kind of work has been done by the provincial government, on just such streams as the hon. gentleman has made a plea for.

Mr. EMMERSON. In harbours?

Mr. WRIGHT. Navigable streams.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The provincial government?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, I have seen them doing it myself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell me of any case where the Ontario government has done any dredging, except of course in connection with drainage works?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, in the Muskoka rivers and Muskoka lakes, and I have seen them doing it. You will find them dredging below Huntsville, where they have worked in a chain of lakes and have made these lakes navigable for steamers. They have done dredging in Peninsula lake.

Mr. EMMERSON. I must say that the provincial authorities of Ontario have shown a magnaminity which is refreshing.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think they will be inclined to drop this kind of thing if the

Dominion government does it in other provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman will find that it has been pretty well dropped long ago.

Mr. WRIGHT. I know a good deal of that work has been done in the upper lakes by the local government. I think it would be unfair to saddle this kind of work on one province and do it for other provinces. If that is the way it is viewed in the maritime provinces, I am pleased to know it. We will know where to go to get dredging done in future.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Dominion government has done far more in the way of dredging for the province of Ontario than for any other province, I think we are doing more for Ontario than for all the other provinces combined. Take Port Arthur, Fort William, Victoria Harbour, Tiffin, Midland, Goderich, Port Burwell, Port Stanley, Rondeau, Cobourg, Toronto, Hamilton, Port Dalhousie—take them altogether, and you will find that they amount to as much as the dredging in all the other provinces put together. What my hon. friend says is a surprise to me. It is a strange thing that, having been minister for some years, I do not know of any dredging work being done by the government of the province of Ontario. I never heard of such a thing.

Mr. WRIGHT. In the very next item the maritime provinces get $675,000, a general vote for dredging, while Ontario and Quebec combined get the same amount. So the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Go back to capital account, page 55, and you will find for Fort William and Port Arthur, $800,000, Tiffin, $120,000, Victoria Harbour, $145,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister estimated the cost of the work that will be necessary at Gaspereau to make a channel which will enable vessels to go up to Port Elgin, as suggested by the hon. member for Westmorland?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My recollection is that it is somewhere in the vicinity of 200,000 cubic yards.

Mr. CROCKET. Does that include dredging in the river as well as at the bar?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. That will be dredging to give access to Port Elgin.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not propose to discuss this matter, because it has been under investigation in the Public Accounts Committee. But I saw the report of the resident engineer, Mr. Stephens, in which he stated that the depth of water there varied from 8 inches to 5 or 6 feet. Perhaps the hon. member for Westmorland has some information.

Mr. EMMERSON. On account of this bar a good deal of sawdust has floated down the stream and has reached a point between where the waters of the bay join with the waters of the river. There are some sawdust banks and they are a measureable obstruction, but they are of such a character that vessels going in and out, while they touch them are propelled or hauled through, I think, by tugs, and the passage is not difficult. As a result of that there may be a variation in the depth of the water near the mouth of the river. The cost of the removal of such obstruction would be a mere bagatelle. The main dredging is in connection with the bar and, where the bar comes along the channel, straightening the channel.

Mr. CROCKET. Did I correctly understand, the minister to say that the dredging which was done in 1908 did not complete the channel through the bar, but that it was left in such a condition that if the work is not continued that which has already been done will fill up and there will be an absolute waste of money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When it is completed through the bar the work will be done.

Mr. EMMERSON. If you undertake to make a channel through a bar, only cut a certain distance of it, and do not complete the whole channel, and the channel is not available between the harbour and the sea outside, it follows that unless that work is prosecuted through, the money already expended will practically be made useless.

Mr. CROCKET. That is the condition in which the work was left in the fall of 1908?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is the condition in which it was left in the fall of 1908. Unfortunately some heavy storms came there that compelled the removal of the dredge. It is a very difficult place to dredge.

Mr. CROCKET. Because of the class of material?

Mr. EMMESRON. No, but because of the winds and the exposed position of the dredge. When the winds come in a certain direction it is very difficult for the dredge to do any amount of work per diem. In the fall of 1908 the weather became very severe.

Mr. CROCKET. They got 1,300 cubic yards in a day.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know how much they did in a day; I can only say that during a great many days they were

unable to work at all. I know that from personal observation. What they did when the weather was good and when they could work is to me unknown, but I do know that time and again when I was in the vicinity, on account of the weather, the dredge was unable to do any work whatever. She was compelled to go away from the scene of her work in November.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. member's statement agrees very largely with that of the resident engineer who reported that the work would require to be continued, and he stated in his report last year that the work that had already been done was of such a character that it would fill up during the season of 1909.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not an expert on such matters, but it would be self-evident to me that this would occur at almost any place.

Mr. CROCKET. The statement of the engineer was that it would require to be continued last season. I understand from the hon. member for Westmorland that the work was not continued last season, and that the opening was not made in the channel.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then my hon. friend misunderstood me. The work was continued last season, but too late to finish it up and on account of the inclemency of the weather they had to leave it.

Mr. CROCKET. How long did the dredge work last season?

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not tell you. I was away in the United States during the time she was there.

Mr. CROCKET. The reason I ask is that I understood from the chief engineer of the department, in the course of his examination before the Public Accounts Committee, that the government dredge was not at work there, and did no work during the last season.

Mr. EMMERSON. She certainly did.

Mr. CROCKET. And I understood the minister to say the other day that the government dredge was sent there, and prosecuted the work during 1909.

Mr. EMMERSON. She did, and I know from a gentleman who was here recently who is very much interested, he being a citizen of Port Elgin, that the dredge had been there, and had done work during last autumn. I do not know of it personally, because I was absent from the country during the autumn months of last season.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman must be mistaken as to what the chief engineer said. I cannot conceive it possible that he made that statement knowing that the dredge was sent there, and he tells me that he did not say such a thing. I made the statement myself that last year, owing to it becoming necessary, if we were to do this work at all, to do it by a government dredge, I tried to send a government dredge there as early as possible, but the government dredges were all engaged upon necessary work elsewhere, and it was not until late in the season that I was able to take a government dredge away from other work and sent her to Gaspereau. She went to Gaspereau and continued the work of dredging there until the season was so far advanced that it was necessary for her to leave the place, and go into winter quarters. In the coming season we propose to continue the work commenced on 1908, and which was continued last year in order to give access for vessels to Port Elgin.

Mr. CROCKET. I certainly understood the chief engineer—and I do not intend to discuss the evidence which has been taken—to make the statement which I have repeated to the committee. I will be very much surprised if the minister does not find that statement in the concluding portion of the chief engineer's evidence where I asked him if the work was continued the following season by the government dredge, I referring at the same time to the statement that the minister had made in the House. He may have misunderstood me or I may have misunderstood him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman knows that I stated in the House that the government dredge had been sent there.

Mr. CROCKET. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer tells me, that you may have misunderstood him, or he did not understand your question, because he did not intend to say anything of the kind. The reports show the time she was there.

Mr. JAMESON. While the item of general dredging for the maritime provinces is under discussion, I wish to ask the minister whether he has decided that he can do any dredging at the port of Weymouth this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able at this moment to say when we shall be able to do the dredging work that will be required at Weymouth. What we intend to do, is to apportion the vote among the places which most urgently require dredging work.

Mr. JAMESON. At this point it may be desirable for me to give the minister some information respecting the needs of Weymouth. I brought this matter to the attention of the minister last year, and at that time there was no money available for the purpose, or the arrangements had been

made for the dredging for the season, and consequently it was not convenient to take the matter up. At present, Weymouth is very much in need of some dredging at the entrance to the harbour, and also for the straightening of the channel up the river. Some time ago a plan of the river and harbour was made by the department's engineer, and it was intimated that certain dredging work would be undertaken before long. Up to the present time the department has not reached that work. I may say that very great inconvenience is experienced by shippers and others at this important commercial centre owing to the fact that it is very difficult to get the class of vessels that go to Weymouth over the bar and up the river at different times of the tide. At certain times also two steamers, which call at that port regularly, are obliged to lie off St. Mary's bay, because they cannot pass over the bar at the entrance to the river. I pointed out to the minister last year that Weymouth was an important commercial centre, the geographical centre of the county of Digby, and the centre of a large population; that a large lumbering business and a large pulp business were carried on in the immediate vicinity, and that the business of the port would be very considerably increased if the shipping facilities were improved by some dredging and some improvement of the harbour. As the vote this year is almost twice what it was last year, I hope that it will be possible for the minister to give some attention to the needs of Weymouth. It seems, from the report which has been brought down in reference to the dredges which are available for the Department of Public Works, that there are now no less than ten in use; and as three of these at least—and they seem to be dredges of greater capacity than those that have heretofore been used by the department—have been provided in the last four years, I hope that the minister, when he makes his arrangements with regard to the dredging in the maritime provinces, will be enabled to consider the needs of Weymouth.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have given a good deal of consideration to the question of dredging at Weymouth, and, while I recognize that dredging is required there, as it is in many other places to which we are not able to give attention at the present time, yet the quantity of dredging required at Weymouth, to be effective and to give to the people what they are asking for is so large that I hesitate to recommend to my colleagues the undertaking of the work, at the present time at all events. If I remember rightly, the estimate of the chief engineer is that about 500,000 cubic yards will have to be removed. That is a very large amount of dredging; and, in view of this fact, I am not able to say with any definiteness to-night, whether the work will be undertaken during the coming season, or just what decision will be arrived at with regard to it.

Mr. JAMESON. I may point out to the minister one fact in regard to Weymouth which may influence him a little in making his decision; that is, that for years, I think since confederation, there has not been a dollar of public money expended there for any harbour improvements, with the exception of a very small sum which was spent at some little distance from Weymouth. I am not asking the minister to do all the work which the report he has before him states it is essential to do in order to bring that port up to the position it should occupy; but I submit that he might make a beginning. He might, for instance, do some work at the entrance to the harbour in connection with the bar which I have mentioned, which would afford considerable relief to shippers and to the operators of the two steamers which call regularly at the port. I do not ask that all the work which the plans show to be necessary should be carried to completion out of this vote or during the ensuing year; but I submit that some commencement should in all reason be undertaken during the year for which this vote will be available.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to get some information from the minister in regard to some of the dredging that is going on in the province of New Brunswick. I would like to know how much money has been expended in dredging at Dalhousie, and how much it is estimated will be expended there out of this vote during the coming summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give my hon. friend to-night a statement of the dredging which has been done at Dalhousie. I did not suppose my hon. friend would ask for that, because the matter has been under investigation by the Committee of Public Accounts.

Mr. CROCKET. How much has been expended at Dalhousie since the close of the last fiscal year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information to-night.

Mr. CROCKET. Also, when is it expected that the work of dredging at the public wharf and also at the ferry slip at Dalhousie will be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A good deal of dredging work is to be done at Dalhousie, and how soon it will be completed will depend on the description of dredge that will be used. If we had a large and powerful dredge the work would be done much more quickly than it can be with one of the small dredges. I am not able to give the

hon. gentleman the information to-night, but I should think that it would take the whole season and perhaps two seasons to complete the dredging at the railway wharf and public wharf.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the minister able to state the quantity of dredging required at the public wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the information in the department, but not here.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to have that information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the minister propose to continue the dredging which was done at Digby last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is more work to be done at Digby. I am not at the moment prepared to say whether we will continue it during the present season or not. I will look into the reports and determine whether it is urgently required or not? Of course, we cannot engage in all dredging work at once, and we have to take first the places where dredging is most urgently required.

Mr. JAMESON. The plans will disclose that they have not been worked up to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there is still work to be done under the plans.

Mr. JAMESON. To show the urgency of the need for this work I would say that an arrangement has been made with one of the steamship companies plying between the United States and Nova Scotia to run a direct boat from Boston to Digby beginning on the 1st of July. That boat will require more wharf and harbour accommodation than is required by the boats plying between St. John and Digby. The operating of this new service will be of importance and benefit to all of Nova Scotia, and also to the province of New Brunswick, which is sharing very largely in that profitable summer business. Then, the fishing interests in Digby, along with some others in different parts of Nova Scotia, are being, I am informed, amalgamated, and when that amalgamation is completed, I understand considerable additions will be made to the plant, and a much increased business in this line will be done in Digby. A reasonable amount of dredging in one part of the harbour would undoubtedly afford this Boston steamer increased accommodation, and would also afford better facilities for the larger fishing business which it is likely will be carried on by the fleet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we come to apportion the amount the question of continuing the dredging at Digby during the present season will be carefully considered. Referring to Dalhousie, during the season of 1909, the A. and R. Loggie dredge 'Reliable', afterwards named the 'Invader', worked in the ferry business at Dalhousie, dredging about the pier head, and the new ferry wharf berths for schooners with thirteen feet of water, and next the Dalhousie wharf a berth for deep water vessels seventy-five feet wide six hundred feet long, and twenty feet deep at low water. The material removed was 62,735 cubic yards, costing $31,632.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the work at the wharf of the Dalhousie Lumber company completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is completed to the depth of fifteen feet, but the traffic coming to the wharf requires a depth of twenty-one feet. It is for us to consider whether we will go on dredging to a depth of twenty-one feet or not.

Mr. CROCKET. How much was expended last year upon that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 30,546 cubic yards were removed since the close of the last fiscal year.

Mr. CROCKET. Was any work done at Caraquet last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, dredging operations were performed across the shoal in Caraquet harbour. 48,772 cubic yards were removed.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that to be continued during the coming season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided as to that; there is necessity for completing the work.

Mr. CROCKET. When contracts are let do they specify the depth to which the dredging is to be done, or the quantity that is to be removed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sometimes they have in the past and sometimes not. We think it is the better practice to determine the depth to which the dredging shall be carried on and specify it in the specifications. I think the coming year we will do it in all cases.

Mr. CROCKET. At Caraquet I judge the depth was not specified.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a matter for the resident engineer. He lays out the work and the dredge is supposed to work according to his direction.

Mr. CROCKET. This seems a very objectionable practice in the letting of contracts. At Dalhousie, for instance, I understand the contract was simply a contract to do dredging at Dalhousie without specifying where. The contract was let to

a contractor, and the work might go on from year to year for ten years, or as long as the resident engineer could find anything to dredge at any point in the harbour. In the case of Dalhousie, from the documents brought down, the contemplation of the department at the start seems to have been that the dredging should be done at the public wharf. The dredge was removed, after a few weeks work, from that to another point, where I do not believe any work was contemplated at the time the contract was let. They go on working her the greater part of the season, then they go on the next season at the same place, and the minister tells us the work is going on next year and has no idea where it is going to stop. This is a most reckless way of letting contracts involving such immense sums. The same remark is true with regard to Loggieville, and other places where dredging is being done. A contract is let and one has not the slightest conception how many years it is to continue. It is all done as the resident engineer may direct. He may direct dredging to be done and to be continued to a depth as in the case of Loggieville, of 15 feet. Then the department determines to carry it another season to 20 feet, and that contract goes on, and the government seems helpless. The practice is most objectionable. If the minister had any regard for the proper conduct of his business, he would introduce some new regulations which would provide for contracts that had some definiteness, and the department would have some idea when they would come to an end. At present A. & R. Loggie, and other firms in New Brunswick have contracts for dredging that may be continued for years to come.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman either forgets the facts or he does not think it worth while to state them. Ever since the department has been doing dredging work the practice has been, in the great majority of cases, to let contracts for dredging at certain points. The resident engineer is on the spot. He knows better whether it is best to make one cut right up to the wharfs or two cuts, depending on whether it is possible to give accommodation by making the one or the two cuts, or giving a lesser depth first and making the cut right up to the wharf and later on digging to a greater depth. The practice has been to let contracts for dredging at certain places without actually attempting to lay out the work definitely, to do which would require a great deal of survey work in order to have any accuracy. The hon. gentleman says that the Loggie contract may go on for years, and that the other contracts may do the same. According to my recollection, the contract of the Messrs. Loggie is for the season of navigation, or such further period as the minister may determine. Therefore, unless the minister extends the contract, the Messrs. Loggie or others will only be entitled to dredge for that season. As regards extending a contract, the minister would naturally consult his engineering staff, and from the plan made by the resident engineer he would see how much dredging had actually been done, what depth of water there was in the harbour, and what accommodation to shipping, and whether it was reasonably necessary to continue the work. By all these things he would be influenced in determining whether or not the contract would be extended. As regards Dalhousie harbour, a contract was let for the work.

Mr. CROCKET. Without specifying any particular part.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, where necessary to accommodate the people, and the layout of the work was done entirely by the resident engineer. Some remarks have been made by the hon. gentleman as to work being done at certain points. With that the minister has nothing to do. That was purely determined by the engineering department, especially the resident engineer. The resident engineer would be guided by the interests of the port and would have the work done where it would best accommodate the pressing necessities of business, and the layout of the work would rest entirely with the resident engineer. Neither the minister nor any of the officials of the department interfere at all with him in the exercise of his judgment.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister has said that I either forgot the facts or deliberately refrained from mentioning them. But no one who has listened to his statement could have failed to observe that he himself mentioned no fact whatever which I had not mentioned myself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not the hon. gentleman say that the Messrs. Loggie had a contract which they could hold the Crown to for ten years?

Mr. CROCKET. I said they had a contract which might go on from year to year for ten years, and which has gone on, in the case of the dredging at Loggieville and Dalhousie, for three years and apparently, according to the minister's statement, is intended to be continued the coming season at least.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is wrong. There was only one extension of the contract at Loggieville. They were tenderers in the different years and they received the contract in the ordinary way, and after that there was but one extension.

Mr. CROCKET. I refer to the dredging given them in the season of 1908, and which

the minister said had been continued last year, and they got some three years in all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was only one extension, and the hon. gentleman said it had been extended for three years.

Mr. CROCKET. I said in the case of the dredging at Dalhousie there was a contract two years and the minister announced it was to be extended next year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not.

Mr. CROCKET. Then I certainly misunderstood him. Did he not state the dredging was to continue next year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman wishes to draw the inference that I said the Loggie contract was to be continued another year. I made no such statement, and no decision has been arrived at on the subject.

Mr. CROCKET. Can he not state whether the Messrs. Loggie will continue the dredging at Dalhousie next season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The matter has not been considered at all.

Mr. CROCKET. But the work not completed, which was let them by contract in 1908, was continued by them last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister states that, according to his recollection, there is a clause in the contract which limited the dredging to the season of navigation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And which may be extended further as the minister may see fit.

Mr. CROCKET. I would not care to speak from memory as to whether in these particular contracts there is such a term. I know there are some which are thus limited, and the contents are sometimes required by order in council to be so limited.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I feel quite sure such a limit is in this, but I am not quite positive.

Mr. CROCKET. That does not alter the case if the minister, as a matter of course, does renew the contracts from year to year. If it be the case that the contract is limited to the season of 1908, did he call for further tenders in 1909?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has already been informed that I did not.

Mr. CROCKET. So it amounts to precisely the same thing, whether the term is in the contract or not. Contracts are let for dredging in a harbour without designating the wharf or the localities where the dredging is to be done, and it is only one who is able to get information either from the resident engineer or the officers of the department, who is in a position to tender. That is one thing which is very objectionable. Tenders are called for without giving any information whatever upon which contractors could base a tender. It is necessary, before a contractor can put in a proper tender, or estimate what the work is likely to cost, to ascertain where the dredging is to be done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which he always can do.

Mr. CROCKET. That may or may not be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And more than that, when the contractor puts in his tender, he must state that he has acquired information as to the dredging.

Mr. CROCKET. Nevertheless there are cases where intending tenderers have not been able to obtain that information. I have not introduced this discussion for the purpose of raising matters that have been under investigation in the Public Accounts Committee, but to call attention to what seems to me a very loose method in awarding these contracts, a method that leaves the door wide open for all sorts of conduct which, I think, would not be thought to be in the public interest. I think that, in connection with this matter, there ought to be some requirement that, when a contract is let, the department itself and the public ought to know just what is expected to be done, and not leave it open to what the minister says has occurred in the ports of Dalhousie and Loggieville—a contract made for one season and continued from year to year so long as the department can find anything to be done in the vicinity of the particular point which is named in the contract.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the item carry?

Mr. CROCKET. Is there anything in this vote for dredging in the St. John river between the city of Fredericton and Woodstock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not decided yet.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the survey of the St. John river channel between Fredericton and Woodstock been completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not wholly completed.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it to be continued next season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. CROCKET. How much has the survey cost up to the present time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid I cannot tell my hon. friend to-night. I will have to get that information. I will afford my hon. friend opportunity to discuss the matter after I get the information from him.

Mr. CROCKET. I was going to suggest that this item stand—

Mr. PUGSLEY. No need of keeping the item for that—

Mr. CROCKET. Not for that particularly. But there are many other matters in connection with this item, many other places referred to, concerning which I wish to get information—not only places of which I have spoken but other places in New Brunswick and in other parts of the maritime provinces. Furthermore, there are matters that I would like to discuss later on that are not ripe for discussion at the present time. Examination has been proceeding in the Public Accounts Committee with reference to dredging in the maritime provinces which cannot be properly discussed now because the evidence is not reported to the House. It may be that some of these are subjects which ought to be brought to the attention of the House, and it is only in connection with this item that this can be properly done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be very unreasonable to ask that the passing of items be delayed until the Public Accounts Committee get through the investigation of what may be before them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) has spoken of surveys of the St. John river. There will be an opportunity to discuss that. Upon the motion for concurrence, he can discuss anything he wishes. And, on any item in my estimates, I will afford him opportunity to discuss to the fullest extent matters in connection with dredging or any other matter. But I hope he will not ask that the passing of these items be delayed. I think that, upon reflection my hon. friend will not do that. There is nothing to be gained by doing it.

Mr. CROCKET. I think we are not called upon to pass this item with the meagre information which the minister has communicated to the House to-night. There are many places the minister has mentioned in which these moneys are to be expended. For my part, I wish to know, first, whether, where the dredging is to be done during the next season, and I want, at this time and before the item passes, to attempt to discover just what reports have been made as to the necessity of dredging at these places, what examination has been made and what reports received, and what the estimated expenditure of the dredging is. And I think it is a most unreasonable thing for the minister to think that we who are sent here to watch the expenditure of the people's money shall sit here and see $675,000 voted upon such meagre information as the minister has given here to-night. I do not think the request I make is unreasonable. I say to the minister, quite frankly, that I want information with regard to the places that he has named in which dredging is to be done, and this information I am entitled to as a member of this committee. As far as I am concerned,I certainly do press the request I made that the item should stand until the information is given to the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Question.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. CROCKET. No, it is not carried—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member cannot speak twice unless some other member speaks—he cannot resume his seat and then rise again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) is entitled to speak.

Mr. CROCKET. That is a rather novel proposition to come from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). But we in New Brunswick are all aware of the ingenuity which has characterized him all through his public career, and—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was referring to what I understood was the rule of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that in committee an hon. member is entitled to speak as often as he pleases. I do not know any rule under which it is provided that after he has spoken he cannot speak again until some one else has spoken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that is the case.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not so understood the rule. If the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) can point to the rule—

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the rule in the New Brunswick legislature, whose rules are modelled on those of this House, but I have not examined the rules of this House. Of course, I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman. In the New Brunswick legislature, whose rules, as I say, are modelled on those of this House, a member cannot speak a second time unless some other member intervenes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do nto so understand the rule.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to know, with reference to the dredging at Bathurst, just what it is proposed to do there. What expenditure was made at Bathurst last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as future work is concerned, we have not decided concerning Bathurst. We want a full report as to Bathurst. We did considerable at Bathurst last year. There appear to have been 272,00 cubic yards removed last year both from the harbour and from the bar.

Mr. CROCKET. Who were the contractors at Bathurst?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Messrs A. & R. Loggie.

Mr. CROCKET. When was the contract awarded for the Bathurst dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not these particulars with me to-night.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to have the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to give the information later.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to know if tenders were called for.

Mr. PUGSLEY, I will get the information.

Mr. CROCKET. That was in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908. That expenditure, the minister will remember, was ordered by himself, by telegram sent from Dalhousie on the 14th of October, 1908, to the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works, limiting the expenditure to $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was in the previous year.

Mr. CROCKET. How many cubic yards were taken out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some 72,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Was that done at the same rate as was fixed under the minister's telegram of the previous year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am satisfied tenders were called for that work; it was let under a contract.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like the information as to whether tenders were called for, and if so, when they were called for, what tenders were received, and the prices offered.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be happy to give my hon. friend the information later.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3 per cubic yard for rock, and 41 cents for loose material.

Mr. CROCKET. Was that material all towed to the dumping ground, or was it cast over as in the previous year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the information, but I will be glad to get it.

Mr. CROCKET. We understand that a portion of this $675,000 is to be appropriated for the continuation of this work at Bathurst.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not said so.

Mr. CROCKET. Well is it, or is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not decided yet, and will not be until the report is received.

Mr. CROCKET. I think the members of this House are entitled to know where it is proposed to expend this $675,000 which is appropriated for dredging in the maritime provinces. I would like to know, further, in reference to the dredging at Bathurst, if it is intended that the work which is to be continued, if it is to be continued during the coming season, is to be done by the firm of A. and R. Loggie, under the same arrangement they had with the Department of Public Works for doing last season's work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are considering doing considerable dredging at Bathurst, necessitated by the development of the iron deposits some eighteen miles from Bathurst. These deposits are being developed on a large scale, and Bathurst is the nearest point of shipment. The company have in contemplation, if the harbour can be improved, the shipment of a large quantity of their ore from Bathurst, and also the establishment of smelting works there. An improved harbour will also accommodate vessels taking out lumber. If this large work is entered upon, it is not unlikely that the government may arrange for a suction dredge to be sent there. But until a report is received showing the character of the soil, and the quantity of material to be dredged, and until we make up our minds as to what it is going to cost, we will not be able to come to a decision. Borings are now being made by one of the engineers of the department, through the ice. We expect these reports in shortly, and then the matter will be taken up and considered.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it is now about time to adjourn. This is an item that will provoke a good deal of discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we had better finish up this item.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not think the minister should attempt to force this item through. He has admitted that he is not able to furnish the information I have asked for, and that I am entitled to receive. With regard to the dredging at Bathurst, I think the great majority of the people of New Brunswick would approve of the scheme. If Bathurst harbour can be dredged so as to accommodate these large vessels for shipping the ore of the Drummond company, who are establishing a great industry there, I think the people would approve any reasonable expenditure to accomplish that object. I understand an engineer went down there especially to investigate that matter, and I would like to know if his report shows whether that scheme is feasible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have just stated that we have not the completed report. But the

engineer is now completing his work of survey.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister say that if that scheme is decided upon, and it he enters upon that larger scheme of dredging he has spoken of, a portion of this appropriation will be applied to that work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not unlikely that a part of this money will be expended for that purpose. It will be useful in connection with the larger work.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to know exactly where the work was done last season.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Part of it was done in removing a sharp bend in the channel at the approach to the public wharf and increasing the depth in the berth at the public wharf. Then there was a quantity of material removed to give passage for logs at low water near the Bathurst Lumber Company's mill. A quantity of material was removed from the ballast bar and also a quantity of mud from what is known as the Tetegouche bar at a point in the channel leading to Bathurst harbour. Of course, all that will be useful work in connection with the carrying out of the larger scheme.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this amount to be expended under contract or does it include any amount to be expended on government dredges as well?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will require about $250,000 to operate the government dredges and that will leave available $425,000 for contract work.

Mr. DANIEL. I was not here when this item was first called up, but as a matter of fact, most of the principal items in dredging are looked after in the Estimates by special appropriations. This vote, I suppose, is to place in the hands of the government a sum sufficient to dredge where appropriations have not been made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where there is no special vote.

Mr. DANIEL. It appears to me, when asking for such a large amount as $675,000, that the minister must have some knowledge as to where this amount will be expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave that when the hon. gentleman was not here. I gave the list of a large number of places where dredging was urgently required.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the minister given the places where this amount is to be expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave the names of a large number of places in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island where dredging was urgently required but I stated that we could not do all the dredging at these places this year, and I also mentioned the fact that there were quite a number of other places which I had not mentioned in the three provinces where dredging was urgently required, and that we will not have enough money to do all the dredging work at these places during the coming season, but we will have to use our best judgment to pick out those places where dredging has been urgently required, and do dredging at the other places after the next session of parliament, coming for a further appropriation. But, we have not yet decided as to the different places. We have to go through, and it is a very great labour requiring a great deal of care, all the reports, we have to look into the question of the necessity of the work, the depth of the water, the size of vessels frequenting the port, and then exercise our best judgment and pick out the places where we think the work of dredging should go on. In regard to Bathurst harbour, that work will either be done by a government dredge. or public tenders will be invited when we decide to go on with it.

Mr. CROCKET. That is for the larger work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it intended to expend any of this money in dredging the Oromocto shoals on the St. John river during the coming season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not been positively decided, but I recognize the necessity for the work, and I think it is not unlikely that a portion of the money will be expended there.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister any requests for that work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we have had requests from the board of trade at Fredericton and, I think, from the council.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand that there was a contract let for the work in the summer of 1908 to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company. Was any work done under that contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. How much was paid under the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was in 1908. I have not that here, but my hon. friend can find it in the Auditor General's Report. If the work is continued there public tenders will be invited during this season for it.

Mr. CROCKET. That is information that I would like to have. It is a portion of the St. John river in which the people of my constituency are very much interested inasmuch as the depth of water on the shoals governs the size of vessels that are able to get up to Fredericton, and we understand that these shoals have been filling up, and that navigation has been very considerably interfered with during the last year or two. I would like to know just what work was done under the contract let in 1908, how much was paid to the contractors under it, and if any work was done during the past year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, my hon. friend can find out from the report of 1908.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister surely has that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not keep everything in my pocket or in my head. There must be 1,250 of 1,500 works going on in different parts of Canada, and I do not keep all the details in my head.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister, or his officers should have that information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, my officers should not either. We are asking for an appropriation for 1910-11. It does not follow that when we come here we will have information as to all the work which was done two years ago.

Mr. CROCKET. I think I am entitled as a member of the committee to ask the minister for it, and the minister is entitled to give it to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad to get it for the hon. gentleman, and furnish it to him at a convenient time, but I will not go down to my office to-night, and unlock the office to get it. I am not going to send the chief engineer, and I am not going, unless by the desire of this committee, to stay my estimates until it can be hunted up.

Mr. CROCKET. It is for the minister to exercise his own judgment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend wanted to know about the work at Oromocto. Last year a channel 18,400 feet long, 225 feet wide, and with a depth of 11 feet was dredged. That was quite an important portion of the work.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the depth?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend does not, by the exercise of his abundant ingenuity, keep my estimates from passing, I propose to go on with the work on the Oromocto shoals during the coming year.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not think that the minister seriously supposes the House would believe that I could prevent him, by asking a few questions, from going on with a work which he says is necessary in the public interest. If that is the thing that influences the minister in the appropriation and expenditure of public moneys the sooner members of this House, and the people of the country know it the better. Is it possible that a little personal feeling which may animate him in reference to an hon. member would influence him in the expenditure of the public moneys of the country? I have asked the minister only for information which I am entitled to receive. All of the questions that I have asked the minister have been pertinent questions, and I propose to continue asking pertinent questions about any public work in New Brunswick or any other part of the Dominion that the people's representatives are interested in, and that we have a right to ask him about. I made a very reasonable request of the Minister of Public Works to allow this item to stand, because he mentioned a long list of places in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in which he said that he proposed to do dredging during the coming year; or rather, he mentioned a long list of places from which he had urgent requests for dredging. I wanted to ascertain at which of the places mentioned it has been decided that dredging shall be done during the coming year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can say to my hon. friend that if the matter stood for a fortnight, I could give no more information as to where the dredging will be done in the coming year than I have given to-night, because it has not yet been decided. I did not mean that the course taken by the hon. gentleman would at all influence me so far as the dredging at Oromocto is concerned, but if the hon. gentleman is sincerely desirous of having dredging done there or anywhere else, he does not take the best means of showing his sympathy for the work by obstructing the passing of the estimates.

Mr. CROCKET. I leave it to members on both sides of this House if I have attempted to obstruct the estimates, or if the questions which I have put to the minister are not reasonable questions respecting items of expenditure to which we are all entitled to the fullest information, or if I have asked for information which hon. members of this House ought not to have before voting away such a large amount of money as this. I told the minister some time ago that I did not propose to discuss any of those matters on which criticism might be made. I wanted to get information as to the different places in the maritime provinces where dredging is proposed to be done, and I suggested to the minister, I thought very courteously, that the item

had better stand, because there was information which the minister has admitted that he is not in a position to give to-night; and I advance the additional reason that there were matters which I wished to discuss under the head of dredging for the maritime provinces, but which are not ripe for discussion at the present time because some of those matters are under investigation by the Public Accounts Committee. I cannot conceive of any good reason that the minister can have for dredging contracts of the Department of Public Works. Surely he does not hope, by forcing this item through at this late hour, in a very slim house, to escape the discussion of these matters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be the fullest opportunity for discussion that the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. CROCKET. I have been in this House for six sessions, and this is the first time I have heard a minister refuse to allow an item to stand so that a matter may be discussed which a member desires to discuss.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will permit me, the proper time to discuss matters which are under investigation by the Public Accounts Committee is when the report of the committee is presented. Then it may be fully and completely discussed; my hon. friend may take all the time he wishes. We shall have the report of the committee and the evidence, and everything can be gone into. But surely my hon. friend will not suggest that it is reasonable that important items of supply should be delayed until the Public Accounts Committee makes its report. Therefore, I must urge that we proceed with the business before the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to renew the suggestion I have made to the leader of the House. It is now twelve o'clock, and whatever may be said of the opposition, I am sure that to-day and on other days when the hon. Minister of Public Works has had his estimates before the committee, there has been no suggestion of obstruction. I am sure that the leader of the House will recognize that this request is a reasonable one.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the Minister of Public Works has given as much information on this subject as can reasonably be expected. There are certain classes of information which a minister should give; there is other information which a member has a right to obtain but it is not reasonable to expect it from the minister in this off-hand way. For instance, the minister was asked to give the expenditure of two years ago at Bathurst. Th's information is really in the possession of the House. We never like to tell hon. members that they should look up the information in the blue-books, because we are glad to look it up and give it to them; but I do not think it is reasonable to ask a minister to withold his estimates until information of that character is obtained. My hon. frend wanted information because he wanted to discuss the question of dredging broadly, and because it is before the Public Accounts Committee. The assurance of the minister that there would be the fullest opportunity to discuss the question when the report of that committee is presented to the House should satisfy the hon. gentleman. This is a general vote and it has been dealt with exactly as in former years. On a general vote of this kind it has never been possible to give in advance information as to the places where dredging will be done. I have had to undergo precisely the same experience as my hon. friend from York in that respect, and after the assurance of the minister that we will have abundant opportunity to discuss the matter when the report of the Public Accounts Committee comes up, I hope he will let the item pass.

Mr. BLAIN. I was not appealing as to whether more information should be forthcoming or not. I was appealing because of the lateness of the hour.

Mr. LENNOX. We have made a good deal of progress to-night, and without considering whether more information should be forthcoming or not, when it comes to twelve o'clock on Friday night, I think we all feel that it is time to adjourn.

Mr. DANIEL. I may say that the Minister of Public Works has had over $1,000,000 voted to-day.

Mr. CROCKET. I am not seeking at all to delay the passage of the estimates. If an hour ago, when the members of this committee shouted carried, the item had been forced through, I would not have had from the minister the information that over 70,000 cubic yards of dredging was done at Bathurst last year, information which I was glad to receive. The minister was not able to complete that information, he could not say under what arrangement that money had been spent, whether it was a continuation of the expenditure——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said it was by public tender.

Mr. CROCKET. He stated he had not the information, and promised he would get it. This is all information to which members are entitled. I would like to know something about the dredging in the Miramichi river, whether it is at Chatham, the necessity for it, the depth of water, and all that.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend says he could not give you that because it has not been determined.

Mr. CROCKET. It is remarkable if the minister asks $675,000 and has no report in reference to any particular locality as to how much is to be expended here or there. There must be some data on which an estimate is prepared. It will be a revelation to the House if estimates are prepared in that way and votes asked without reference to places or to reports.

Mr. FIELDING. That is hardly a fair argument. The minister read a list of places, and spoke of many others from which he had applications for dredging, all, or most of them meritorious. He simply says: We cannot possibly do all this, but we ask an appropriation of a certain amount, and when expending it we will try to meet the various applications, but we cannot say what particular ones we will grant. That is not unreasonable. If it is unreasonable, we have been unreasonable for many years since I have been here, for that vote has always been dealt with in the same way.

Mr. BLAIN. I think our request is reasonable, and I am sure the minister will not press the item. I have never seen a session when there were so few requests for information, or such short criticism in Supply as we have had this session. We are not open to the charge of obstructing the estimates.

Mr. CROCKET. I want the minister's statement in reference to the dredging proposed in the Miramichi river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I had mentioned it. I have nothing to complain of about the hon. member for Peel, nor have I anything to complain of so far as the hon. member for York is concerned. I do not complain of his course; he can take any course that commends itself to his judgment, but if other hon. members took the same course as he is taking we could not get through the Public Works estimates alone before next August. I am willing to afford and always afford the fullest opportunity to every hon. gentleman in regard to items in my estimates. The member for York has chosen to take up the entire time of the Committee on Public Accounts for three months with matters connected with my department.

Mr. CROCKET. I rise to a point of order. Neither the Minister of Public Works or any other member has any right to refer to proceedings before a committee of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. There has been an occasional reference to it to-night.

Mr. CROCKET.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the report of that committee is submitted to the House hon. gentlemen can discuss dredging on the St. John river, upon the Miramichi, at Bathurst, and every where else. If he will give me a memorandum of what information he wants in regard to dredging at any place I will get it for him from the accountant of the department, and furnish it to him before the matter comes up for discussion.

Mr. CROCKET. If the minister had adopted the simple suggestion I made, that this item should stand until we had another meeting of the committee, I do not think any more time would have been lost. There are items before the Public Accounts Committee that one would not want to make a matter of discussion before the House, and which could be dealt with more satisfactorily in Committee of Supply. Some matters will be discussed, but there are others that could be more briefly and advantageously discussed in Supply. All I desire is an opportunity to discuss these matters, and to give the minister an opportunity to bring down the information, which he admitted he had not, and which he promised to bring down. I think the usual practice in such cases is to let the item stand. A discussion on the item cannot regularly take place once it is passed. The hon. minister could object to these matters being discussed on any other item. I have no desire to discuss a New Brunswick contract when an Ontario item is up.

Mr. FIELDING. Surely my hon. friend will accept the assurances of the minister that not only will he furnish the information, but put the hon. gentleman in possession of it in advance of any discussion he may require.

Mr. CROCKET. So far as the information is concerned, that is satisfactory, but there are a few matters that perhaps could not properly be made the subject of debate on a substantive motion before the House. Their discussion would take up very little time in the committee, and that is the only object I have in asking that this item be allowed to stand. Apparently the object of the minister is to take advantage of his position to shut off discussion from matters which he knows can only be discussed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. LENNOX. Cannot we have some understanding about this? Can we not have it understood that the hon. member for York will be given an opportunity to have all the discussion he wants?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He will have the fullest opportunity of discussing anything he wants in this committee.

Mr. CROCKET. In Supply?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister should have said that half an hour ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought that was the better time, but on any item of supply, the hon. gentleman can discuss this or any other matter.

Quebec and Ontario dredging, $675,000.

Mr. LENNOX. I think we ought now to adjourn.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has been waiting here all evening for this item, and I would not like the committee to rise unless he desires it.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is very kind of the Minister of Public Works to leave the matter with myself, but I would not pretend to govern the procedure of the House. I have waited here patiently during the whole evening for the purpose of referring to a particular matter with which I know the hon. minister is quite familiar. He was good enough, during the course of the evening, to refer to a considerable number of dredging appropriations throughout the province of Ontario, more particularly the larger places, such as Port Arthur, Tiffin, Midland, Goderich and down on the Lake Erie shore, and in the city of Toronto, but did not make any reference to the smaller ports. I was afraid he was going to overlook them. I very much desire that the minister shall pay some attention to the smaller harbours that require immediate attention if they are to be of use to the public. I refer particularly to Oakville. This is not new to the minister, because during the month of February I had the pleasure of drawing his attention to the great need, the urgent need, of dredging that harbour as well as of making improvements also to the wharf. The minister kindly suggested that when this item was up for discussion, I might draw attention to it, and this I now do. I do not know that the minister has ever visited Oakville. If not, I would cordially invite him to come there at the first opportunity. I think that should he visit that beautiful town and note its surroundings and its great need of harbour improvements, it would not be necessary for me, particularly at this hour of the morning, to urge upon him to make a small appropriation for those improvements. Oakville is about midway between Toronto and Hamilton, on the north shore of Lake Ontario. It is a town of considerable importance. In the past there has been considerable shipping at that port, but as nothing has been done for the last six or seven years to keep the harbour in good shape there is no means of vessels getting in except those of very light draft. The result is that very little trade is carried on in comparison with what was done in former years. And unless the government takes action I am afraid that the prospect for the future is not very bright. The difficulty with the harbour is a lack of depth of water due to the fact that the dredging has been neglected. I not merely ask the minister, but I urge him, urge him as strongly as I can, to do something for this harbour. Nothing has been expended there since 1902-3—almost seven years. During that time, the harbour has been so filled up that only vessels of the lightest draft are able to go in. The result is that the trade in flour, grain, apples and small fruits that was carried on there has not been carried on through the harbour of recent years, nor can it be unless some improvement is made. Nor can the passenger boats between Toronto and Hamilton call there as they formerly did. I would remind the minister that Oakville is practically a Toronto suburb so far as residents are concerned. Many Toronto people come out to Oakville to live. They come out in the evening and return to their work in Toronto in the morning. Had we communication by water, Oakville could be made a summer resort of much greater importance than it is. The water communication would be more agreeable to many than the railway. I understand the minister has an estimate from his district engineer of the probable cost of this dredging; I have been led by the district engineer to understand that he forwarded a report or survey to the minister showing the amount that would probably be required. I do not know the contents of that report. I should be very glad if the minister would give us an idea about how much would be required to put the harbour of Oakville in proper shape.

Now, I leave the matter to the minister's own judgment. I think he will be disposed to treat the town of Oakville fairly and do what little is necessary—I do not say too little, for I do not want him to be niggardly in the appropriation. I want him to do what is necessary to put the harbour in good shape, both with regard to depth of water and to the improvement of the wharf where necessary. I am told that some stone filling is required, and also that there are some projecting timbers that interfere with vessels coming to the dock. I am sure that if the minister undertakes the work, he will see to it that it is properly done. I make the appeal to him to do this work, and I trust I may meet with a favourable response.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The claims of Oakville have been very strongly urged upon my attention by residents of the locality as well

as by my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) who has very properly presented the matter, not only once but two or three times to my attention. I am impressed with the desirability of doing dredging work at Oakville so as to allow steamers to enter the harbour. At present they are obliged to lie outside of the wharf or breakwater, and, when storms arise, this is not a safe place for them to lie. If we had some such improvements as are suggested by my hon. friend, it would be greatly to the advantage of the people of Oakville. The report of the engineer has been received. I have not it here at the moment, but my recollection is that about $10,000 was estimated to make very effective improvements. In making the division of the amount we are asking for Ontario and Quebec, the claims of Oakville will receive careful consideration. While I cannot say positively that the work will be done, yet I can assure my hon. friend that I shall be disappointed if I do not find myself able to do this work at Oakville during the coming year.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. The naval debate will be continued.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 7, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DUTY ON FISH.

Mr. JAMESON. I wish to call attention to the following despatch which appears in the Ottawa 'Citizen,' under date of March 5:

A rather interesting state of affairs, showing the working of the tariff on fish as between the United States and Canada, is reported from Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. Citizens of the town are now importing fish from Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. These fish were caught in Canadian waters last season by the Dominion Fish Company, a branch of the so-called Booth Fish trust, and put into cold storage by the A. Booth Company at the Michigan Soo.

A quarter of a cent per pound duty is paid on Canadian fish entering the United States and one cent per pound on fish coming from the United States into Canada. The unique part of the transaction is that Canadian consumers at the Soo are paying one and one-quarter cents per pound in duties on fish caught in their own waters.

The duty on Canadian fresh fish going into the United States is not a quarter of a cent as stated, but one cent per pound, but owing to some elasticity in the regulations or in the consciences of those responsible for their enforcements, this duty is not, I am informed, imposed on Canadian fish which are purchased in Canada by Americans and imported into the United States in American bottoms. I wish to ask if the government are aware of this alleged condition of affairs, if they recognize it as a serious condition and what, if any, measures they propose to take to remedy it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The attention of the government has not been called to this matter, but I shall have it looked into. On first blush I see nothing extraordinary in it. If fish caught in Canadian waters is imported into the United States it pays duty, and then if it comes back to Canada it had to pay duty. If that is the extent of the trouble I do not know that there is anything wrong, but I will have the matter looked into.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to inquire about two returns, one ordered on December 15, with reference to the appointment of a government weigher at Montreal, and the other of November 24, showing the total amounts paid for printing and advertising.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) will send a note of these returns, I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. STANFIELD. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) when I may expect the return moved for on November 22, with regard to passes on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. I thought the return had been brought down. I will make a note of it and will have the matter looked into.

EXPORT OF HORSES FROM ONTARIO TO WESTERN CANADA.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) what has been done with reference to disinfecting the stock yards at the feeding points between here and Manitoba. I understood the minister to say that he would attend to it at once. I am informed that nothing has been done so far. I would like to know what the Department of Agriculture is for, if it is not to serve the interests of the farmers in such matters as this?

Mr. FISHER. Immediately after the hon. member's (Mr. Campbell's) remarks on the subject, I spoke to the director general of health on the subject. He said that the question was before him and would see to it that all necessary precautions were taken. I have not asked him further about it, but I think probably that everything has been done.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may tell the minister that nothing has been done up to date with reference to disinfecting the yards at feeding points between here and Manitoba. It ought to be done at once.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW—ALLEGED INFRACTION.

Mr. THOBURN. I desire to draw the attention of the House and of the minister to whose department the matter pertains, to an item which appears in the 'Central Canadian' published in Carleton Place in the county I have the honour to represent:

Twelve men took breakfast at the Queen's hotel on Tuesday morning. They were all bound from Buffalo to Braeside to build a steamer for the river traffic.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member can only put a question at this stage. Any other discussion will be out of order.

Mr. THOBURN. That is all I wish to do, Mr. Speaker. I wish to draw the attention of the House and of the minister to whose department this relates to the statement here made. This newspaper, with the item marked, was sent to me by the Trades and Labour Council of Carleton Place. I wish that the minister would investigate this case. For it does seem to me hard that, at this season of the year, when a great many of our Canadian mechanics have been idle all winter—especially that class of workmen who are engaged in building ships—they should be deprived of their employment by a horde of mechanics coming in from the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. I had difficulty in understanding the purpose of the hon. member's (Mr. Thoburn's) question. What is the information he desires?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He wants to know why the Alien Labour Act is not enforced.

Mr. THOBURN. A letter accompanies this newspaper in which the Trades and Labour Council of Carleton Place ask that the minister should take action under the Alien Labour Law to prevent these men coming into the country. They want to know if it is the intention of the government to take any action in the matter.

Mr. KING. If there has been a violation of the Alien Labour Act, it is open to any person to take action to have it enforced. Under the law, there is no need for the government to take action.

Mr. THOBURN. I thought this was a matter that would come under the supervision of the Minister of Labour (Mr. King).

PRIVATE BILLS.

NELSON RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company.—Mr. Rutan.

Mr. LENNOX. On Friday evening, in the absence of the Minister of Railways, I asked that this Bill be allowed to stand over. As the minister is now present I desire to direct his attention to the matter involved. This Bill passed the committee the other day with some amendments. Since that time, we have had several Bills of the same character. Notably we had one the other day that was very much pressed, but after a good deal of discussion it was decided that the matter should stand over until the Minister of Railways could have an opportunity to consider the question, not piecemeal but as a whole. The point involved is covered by the 13th section:

13. The company may acquire, utilize and develop lands, water-powers, rights, easements and privileges on the Saskatchewan and Nelson rivers or in the vicinity of its railway, and construct, maintain and operate dams, reservoirs, buildings and works for the general transmission and distribution of electricity for light, heat, power or any other purpose in connection with its railway, vessels and other properties and works, and may supply, sell or otherwise dispose of any surplus water, electricity, electric or other power not required for the purposes of the company, and may enter into agreements with any company or person for any of the purposes aforesaid.

This section has been slightly amended. But the point is this: we are authorizing companies, nominally railway companies—and sometimes, perhaps, bona fide railway companies, but often railway companies in name only—to acquire and develop valuable water privileges throughout Canada, sometimes to the impeding of navigation, at any rate, to acquire most valuable franchises that would be otherwise available for the benefit of the people of Canada, going to lessen their taxation and so decreasing the burden that they would otherwise have to bear. This is a somewhat new departure. But some Bills involving the principle have passed the committee, as in the present case. But there was one we struck upon the other day that

is still before the committee. I urged, and for the time being successfully, that the committee should stay its hand until the Minister of Railways had an opportunity to consider the whole matter. Now, it is a very serious question. I admit that it is a very difficult problem to deal with. The companies can put forward the argument that they want water-power to a greater extent than was formerly necessary in the case of a railway because they are going to use electricity, generated by water, as a motive power, and in every case they ask that they shall have the right to sell their surplus power. The result is that if they build a mile of railway, even with the amendments and safeguards we put in, if they build a mile of railway they acquire the right to develop whatever water-power can be developed to the utmost extent and to sell the surplus power. They interfere with the distribution of wealth in that locality, and they interfere—as in the case of the province of Ontario—with the control the provincial government is exercising over water-powers for the benefit of the people. They accumulate in this way, and will continue to accumulate, large unearned fortunes in many cases, and there is every reason to believe that many of these schemes are only railway companies in name. The minister can see that if this came in as a power Bill, it would not go before the Railway Committee at all. In many respects it is a power Bill and nothing else. I would ask the hon. minister to stay progress of this and all Bills of a like character until to-morrow, when the Railway Committee holds its session, or until he can enunciate some scheme which will safeguard the interests of the public. The onus is upon the minister. The matter is not an easy one, but I would ask the minister to allow this Bill to stand over in order that all similar measures may be dealt with alike. We shall have more or less of a contest over it in the Railway Committee to-morrow, and it will be well to allow it and others like it to stand until the minister has stated the policy which the government intend pursuing. If you provide in all these Bills that the railway company shall have the right to develop only such power as they want for their own use, their charters will be shorn of a good deal of danger, but whatever policy the minister may enunciate, I would urge him, in the interests of the public, to see that he does enunciate a policy which will apply to all—some definite, clear policy—and if necessary amend the Railway Act so as to prevent companies, under the garb and name of railway companies, acquiring these valuable franchises and controlling industries. These water-powers will be the cause of great industries springing up at certain points; they will be the producers of trade to be carried over railways, and if railway companies obtain the right to hold up the people in this matter of power, they will have an enormous leverage to exercise.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question raised is very important, and, as my hon. friend admits, not altogether free from difficulty. The problems that confront us in a young country change so rapidly, the conditions surrounding them change so rapidly, that we have something new to solve about every year. My opinion may be an erroneous one, but I do think that tieing up water-powers and preventing their development is not conserving, but wasting them. If we can surround their development with safeguards to the public, and at the same time encourage their development, we shall be doing the best possible in the public interest. It is not in the public interest to tie these water-powers up so that the public cannot get at them, either through themselves or through some company. One of the objections to railway companies being authorized to acquire water-powers is the fear that they might in some way get the rights to expropriate water-powers. But we have a safeguard against this in this measure, and the other Bills. No Bill has gone through the committee which allows any company to expropriate water-powers. As regards the impeding of navigation, the Public Works Department has to approve of every obstruction, of every bridge, or other impediment on a navigable stream, so that way the rights of traffic by water are protected. Some are opopposed to the development of water-powers by railway companies. I cannot see what difference it makes, so long as the people are absolutely protected. My hon. friend had no doubt in mind the case of the coal mines on the other side of the line, which were owned by the railway companies, so that any reduction in the rates on the railway could be added to the price of coal, and the railway company thus escaped the control of rates; but in these Bills the rates to be charged for power as well as the railway rates are to be subject to the board of commissioners, so that if a railway company should have surplus power to sell, the price is controlled by the government. It is difficult to say how far we ought to allow a railway company to go on developing power. Suppose we were to provide that a railway company cannot develop water-power except for the use of its road, and suppose it should develop more water-power than it requires for its operation, how are you going to deprive it from selling its surplus? Who will step in to prevent it? It is well known that a large amount of horse-power can be developed cheaper pro rata than a smaller amount. Now, if a railway com-

pany should need only 5,000 horse-power at present, but lays out its plant to provide double that quantity in order to be ready to meet the growth of trade, would it be wise for that company to prevent it developing 10,000 horse-power, although it can do so cheaper pro rata than 5,000, and limit its development to its actual need of 5,000. Would it not be more reasonable to allow the company to develop all it wants, and a little surplus and sell its surplus, so long as we take a proper safeguard to control prices? But even if we should strike it out altogether, the provision giving a railway company the right to sell its surplus water-power, no one, outside some shareholder of the company could prevent its doing so. I have no objection to let the Bill stand until we discuss the other Bill in the Railway Committee, which has a like provision, although several have gone through with that clause in allowing the development and sale of water-power.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. My hon. friend missed the objection altogether of the hon. member for Simcoe. His argument was that in the case of these valuable water-powers, there should be something for the people, and not have the whole profit go to the individual. In the United States they have a policy by which the people of the United States, and the different states insist that the profits arising from these natural advantages shall redound to the people. What my hon. friend asks is that the government should lay down a clear, well defined policy with regard to this matter so that if an individual or a corporation wants to develop water-power they shall develop it on the policy laid down by the government, under which a certain portion of the profits shall revert to the people. All my hon. friend asks is that this government should have a policy on this matter just as every other country in the world has at present, that the natural advantages of the country shall be for the benefit of the people, and if necessary, that a certain portion shall go to the corporations or individuals who do the developments.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. This is not a railway Bill at all. But simply a Bill to acquire some water-powers along the Saskatchewan and Nelson rivers. I would call particular attention to section 7. That provides that the railway may begin—where? At the mouth of the Saskatchewan river, at the mouth of the Nelson river, or at any place between these two points, which are 150 miles apart. It may begin any place along the north shore of Lake Winnipeg between two points 150 miles distant, practically it begins anywhere. It runs neither east, nor west, nor north, nor south. It runs to some place where it may intersect the Hudson Bay railway. The Hudson Bay railway is not located yet. It may run directly west or north, or it may run northeast along the banks of the Nelson river, and with its other powers to construct canals and dams it is placed in a position to grab all the water-powers along that river until the Hudson Bay railway strikes it. It is quite plain that what the promoters are looking for is the acquiring of rights in reference to these water-powers. Another point. Manitoba is interested in this Bill. This territory is all within the limits described by the resolution of the Prime Minister which passed this House about two years ago, whereby the boundaries of Manitoba are set forth. Then there may be another question, the same question that arises in reference to the canal that was projected along the Winnipeg river. There they are developing water-powers under local charters. Here then we may have local jurisdiction in the course of a year, or in a few years, over this stream and the serious question arises as to whether the title that is given to this railway company by this parliament is not paramount to the title which may be given to some other corporation by the local legislature. For these reasons, and for others, I think the matter ought to be seriously considered by the government. As it is to-day the city of Winnipeg is instructing counsel to see that their rights are protected in reference to the Winnipeg river. If you look at the applications that have been made for charters in the unorganized country north and northwest of Manitoba it will appear that there is some concerted action on the part of promoters to secure or grab all the water-powers in that territory.

Mr. RUTAN. Before further action is taken I would like to ask the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) if he has any petition or objection from the city of Winnipeg to the construction of this railway or a like undertaking. If there are no such objections it seems to me a very peculiar proposition that this particular company which proposes to establish a line of steamships to ply on Lake Winnipeg and then to build a railway from some point on Lake Winnipeg to connect with the proposed Hudson Bay railway should be the one that is subjected to all the objections of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. We all know that only a few days ago these hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill assembled in a body to put through the Burrard Inlet Bill which contains similar powers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RUTAN. And that that Bill went through the committee and also passed

this House. I cannot see wherein we can afford to have one policy for one company and another policy for another company. It seems to me that it is a very dangerous principle to go upon. This company are only asking for the ordinary powers. Compared with the powers granted in the Burrard Inlet Bill they were modified, and there is no reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should undertake to obstruct the carrying out of an enterprise which is intended to promote the development of a country which needs development, a country which to-day has no chance of development on account of not having the means of transportation such as this company would provide, and a country which beyond doubt is rich in resources. The people in the northern part of Saskatchewan and the northwest territories, where this enterprise is to be undertaken, are just as anxious for the development of the country as are the people of British Columbia or any other province in the Dominion.

Mr. BRADBURY. In what way will that affect your province?

Mr. RUTAN. It affects my province as well as Manitoba or any other province, for in the future the transportation lines will no doubt extend from the southwest to the northeast, and vice versa, just as the transportation lines of to-day extend from east to west. Natural resources are of no value whatever unless they are developed. What are lands worth to the country if they are not developed? They are not worth anything unless they are developed. Why are we advertising to the world the great opportunities which Canada offers for the investment of capital? It is because this country needs development and we are inviting capital to come and assist in this development. If hon. gentlemen are interested in the conservation of these powers, and if they want to take the attitude which some of their remarks have indicated to-day they had better commence at the beginning of the session and treat all alike. Numbers of these Bills have passed this House during this session, and there is no reason why this should not be passed as well. If we are to adopt that principle let us adopt it at the beginning of the session and treat all alike.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite agree when the hon. gentleman says, treat all alike, and it is because I feel that all ought to be treated alike that I have urged that this matter should stand over.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about section 11 of Bill 118?

Mr. LENNOX. I think one at a time is pretty good fishing, and I will not bother about anything further at the moment. I am very glad that the minister has decided to leave it over. I recognize, as the minister says, that it is a very difficult question. The promoter of the Bill wishes to leave it until the end of the session, but it seems to me that if we leave it until the end of the session, by the way the thing is going, we will have no more water-powers, because they are going at a very rapid rate. It is a pity that this was not considered at the beginning of the session. To return to what the minister has mentioned, I do not know the Bill to which he refers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Bill 118, to incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, and which gives very much the same powers.

Mr. LENNOX. I was not present when that went through, but I understand that that whole section of country petitioned or urged upon the House that it was very desirable in the public interest. I understand that the circumstances were exceptional, and it may be that we were wrong even then in acceding to their proposal. My position is that every one of these great water-powers, where they are of any considerable extent, should be conserved in the interest of the people, and they should, in some way, if they are granted to private corporations, afford a revenue to the public. I therefore move that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think it is hardly fair to put it as the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has put it, that these water-powers are being grabbed up by private companies. This company, under the Bill which has been passed by the Railway Committee, obtains no power, or right, title or interest in any water-power whatever. It is merely given the right as a corporation to apply for water—the same right which any individual now has.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Does it give it any right to expropriate?

Mr. GUTHRIE. No. The right to expropriate is expressly stricken out. I think that we have pretty well safeguarded the public interest. In the first place there is no right to expropriate; in the second place, if they desire water-power they must apply to the Governor in Council to secure it, as any individual has; in the third place, we have placed the tolls which the company may charge under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners and, in the fourth place, the company cannot use their surplus power in any municipality without the consent of the municipality. I do not know what further safeguards we could impose in the interest of the community. This is hardly the

place or hardly the occasion to discuss what the policy of this government or this House should be in regard to the matter. That could be better settled when the company apply to the Governor in Council for water-power and then such conditions as are thought proper may be laid down far better than they could be settled in committee while discussing a private Bill.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. All these regulations ought to be statutory.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think that suggestion is a good one.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not agree with the policy laid down by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Surely the time to lay down the policy of the government is not when a private corporation makes application to the Governor in Council to be regulated in respect to their Bill. It seems to me that the House and the Railway Committee should be in possession of the policy of the government upon matters of this kind; and that those that are allying themselves together to make applications for such charters shall understand what the policy of the government is.

Mr. NEELY. As this Bill and Bill (No. 69, which follows it on the order paper, were held over on Friday for the same purpose, I want to say a word, as my name is attached to the other Bill. As the members of the Railway Committee are aware, the point raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was thoroughly discussed in the Railway Committee, and after that discussion this Bill, together with Bill (No. 69) were reported to the House. I must congratulate the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) on constituting himself the watchdog of the natural resources of Canada, and I must also congratulate Canada on having such a faithful watchdog.

Mr. LENNOX. Good.

Mr. NEELY. But there are other members of the Railway Committee and of this House who are just as much interested in conserving the natural resources of Canada for the people of Canada as is this self-constituted watchdog. Now, I may tell the member for South Simcoe that I have absolutely not one cent's worth of interest, directly or indirectly, in the Bill to which my name is attached, and I can tell him also that if there was anything in that Bill which I thought interfered with the rights of the people in the water-powers of Canada, I would not have my name attached to it nor would I seek to promote it in this House. The hon. member (Mr. Lennox) is therefore not necessarily the only hon. gentleman in this House, or in the Railway Committee, who is interested in conserving the people's rights in the water-powers of this Dominion. It has been pointed out by the Minister of Railways that our natural resources can be of value only to the extent to which they are developed, and the clause in this Bill, as in the Bill following it to which some of these gentlemen take exception, is a clause which simply gives these railway companies the power to acquire water rights. It is not a new clause; it is a very ordinary clause to be inserted in such Bills. Every railway company requires the privilege of acquiring water rights for the development of power for the purposes of its railway undertaking, and if a railway company develops more power than it requires for its own undertaking, can the hon. member for South Simcoe or any other hon. member point out wherein the people of Canada are going to be injured if the balance of the power not used by the railway is sold to the municipalities in the immediate vicinity of the railway works. Why, it seems to me, that any reasonable man would consider that such would be for the benefit of the people, provided, of course, that the rates at which the surplus power would be disposed of are properly regulated. Now, in every instance, so far as these two Bills are concerned, these rates and tolls are subject to the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. I am perfectly satisfied, and I think the people of Canada are perfectly satisfied, to have such rates placed under the control of that board, because the Railway Board to my knowledge has never shown any undue discrimination or any discrimination of any kind in favour of railway companies or any other monopolies or corporations, as against the interests of the people of Canada. I cannot see where these hon. gentlemen can find any serious objection to these particular clauses of the Bill. Now, I am not prepared to say whether the hon. member for South Simcoe was in the Railway Committee when the Burrard Inlet Bill went through, but if he was not it was his own fault, and it would be at least one instance in which the watchdog failed to be on the job. I think, however, that the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) was present in the Railway Committee when the Burrard Inlet Bill went through, and strange to say, there is in that Bill, which has passed the Railway Committee and passed the House, a clause identical with the clause contained in this Bill to which these hon. gentlemen now take such strong objection.

Mr. BRADBURY. Was not that clause inserted in the Burrard Inlet Bill after a compromise between those who were interested?

Mr. NEELY. Not at all, so far as I know. Of course, the incident which I

have just mentioned may not have any particular significance taken in connection with the fact that it was the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) who has the task of piloting the Burrard Inlet Bill through the Railway Committee and through the House. That may be merely a coincidence, but it is a very strange thing to me that there are such serious objections raised in the Railway Committee and in the House to some of these Bills, even though the rights of the people are absolutely safeguarded from every standpoint, so far as I am able to judge. Now, when the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern railway, or some of the other great companies, have exactly the same kind of legislation before the House, we do not find the same objection taken by these hon. gentlemen. But the moment some others than these larger companies ask for a charter and in that charter ask for these very ordinary powers, the question of the rights of the people is at once raised. Now, Sir, the Bill succeeding this on the order paper has a clause similar to that in this Bill which is objected to. That Bill passed last year, and this year all that is asked for is an extension of time. The Bill at present before us was held over in the Railway Committee, and held over on Friday night last in the Committee of the Whole House, and now the hon. member for South Simcoe asks that it be again held over for a few days until the government expound a policy that will be satisfactory to him. Well, even though the Minister of Railways should, after weeks of consideration, announce a policy to this House, I am very much afraid that that policy would not receive the approval of the hon. member (Mr. Lennox). I do not know why the passing of these Bills ought to be made the occasion for the announcement of a policy, because whatever policy the government announces is absolutely foreign to and has nothing whatever to do with the passing of these Bills. If the government wish to make a statement as to what safeguards there should be placed around the acquisition of the water-powers of this country, well and good, and I shall be as glad to hear it as will the hon. member for South Simcoe, but that has absolutely nothing to do with the passing of this Bill, which simply asks that the company shall have the power to acquire water-powers for the purpose of its railway.

The Minister of Railways intimated that he would be satisfied to have this Bill stand over. I am not the promoter of the Bill, but it seems to me that this matter has been sufficiently discussed, and I would ask the hon. member for South Simcoe to withdraw the objection. In any case, whether he does or not, I think this committee ought to consider this Bill and the Bill following to-day.

Mr. NEELY.

Mr. EMMERSON. This subject has been very fully ventilated in the Railway Committee. In the consideration of two or three of the Bills now on the order paper some three or more days of the committee were occupied. I am quite in agreement with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat in his statement that it is not of material moment in connection with this Bill whether the government announces a policy now or whether it never announces one on the point raised by my hon. friend, because that policy goes beyond these Bills. It is fair to bear in mind that this particular Bill has no powers of expropriation.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. Section 14 gives the company the right to build tramway and to expropriate land.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was struck out in the committee, and there was an express reservation that there should be no powers of expropriation. I think it unfortunate that we should take up the time of this House with this question at this moment. I have very strong views with respect to the granting of these powers. I had heard that pretty rigid rules were laid down in some of the state legislatures on the other side of the line with respect to the granting of water powers. In this Bill we simply give the company the right to acquire water-powers for the purposes of its undertaking.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there any reservation of anything to come to the country, or are these companies to have all the profits?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend has raised quite another point, which I was about to raise myself when I was interrupted by my hon. friend. In some respects our legislation has differed entirely from that on the other side of the line. In the legislation adopted during this session we have been very insistent in limiting the powers of these companies to the purpose of their undertakings; but we have granted them the privilege of selling their surplus power, which I conceive to be in the public interest; but there is this distinction between legislation here and legislation on the other side of the line. There, wherever franchises of this character are granted, there is imposed upon the companies a certain tax. I had heard of this in a general way, and since the committee met and had these Bills under consideration, I have received, on an application which I made some weeks ago, a copy of a Bill passed by the legislature of the State of New York, being 'an Act to incorporate the Long Sault Development Company, and to authorize said company to construct and maintain dams, canals, power-houses and locks at or near Long Sault Island, for the purpose of improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence river and developing power from the

waters thereof, and to construct and maintain a bridge and carry on the manufacture of commodities.' Having a copy of that Bill in my hand, I will call the attention of the committee to this fact, that in the very inception the company is required 'to pay into the treasury of the State the fixed sum of $10,000, and in addition to the payment just mentioned, the company shall pay into the treasury of the State for the year 1910 the fixed sum of $15,000, and for the year 1911 the fixed sum of $20,000. For each year after 1911 the said corporation shall pay at the following rates upon the average amount of electrical horse-power generated during such year under the authority of this Act, that is to say: upon all amounts up to 25,000 electrical horse-power, at the rate of 75 cents per horse-power; upon all amounts in excess of 25,000 electrical horse-power and up to 100,000 horse-power, at the rate of 50 cents per horse-power; upon all amounts in excess of 100,000 electrical horse-power, at the rate of 25 cents per horse-power. In case said corporation shall generate or develop water-power as mechanical power without transmuting the same into electrical power, then for so much of said water-power as may be developed payments shall be made at the above mentioned rates per mechanical horse-power.' There are provisions with respect to determining the amount, which I need not read. Now, it occurs to me very forcibly that this is legislation which we might very properly and in the interest of the country imitate in Canada; but in doing so, let us bear in mind that there should not be any discrimination in this regard. I simply invite the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this particular Act, because we all realize that if there is not already, there will be in the near future, an application to the parliament of Canada from this same company for Canadian rights, and in the consideration of that application it will be well to bear in mind just what the gentlemen who come here were obliged to meet when they went to the legislature of the State of New York and to the Congress of the government of the United States to secure powers for the purposes of the company. It is not necessary, of course, that we should incorporate this provision in these several Bills that are now under consideration or those which may have been under consideration by the Committee of the Whole of this House.

Mr. LENNOX. Why?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because there can be general legislation. The only effective way in which that can now be done is for the government to pass legislation. Where would the Burrard Inlet, and other Bills be? We have passed these Bills, and they are now before the Senate, and then we hold up these new Bills, and impose upon their promoters burdens which we have not imposed upon the Burrard Inlet and other companies. That would be manifestly unfair and unjust, and I would say if action is to be taken it should be taken by the Department of Public Works, that there should be legislation in that regard. I see no reason why these particular Bills should be held up or should go back to the committee to have those conditions imposed now. If we take that course it would be necessary in order to be fair that we should ask that these amendments should be made by the Senate to the other Bills or else that they should not receive the assent of the Governor General.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The passage of the Bill may give the power of expropriation, and the power to acquire property. Would it be fair for the government afterwards to pass legislation imposing penalties?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be fair to do this. If they get the power to use and operate the water highway for purposes of a canal or for electrical power they must go to the Department of Public Works with their plans, and these plans must have the approval of that department through its minister. It would be fair for the government of Canada to-morrow to enact legislation whereby before any such privileges are granted or approvals given there may be imposed on these companies a certain percentage on the amount of the power.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Before they have acquired the right, but not after the right is acquired.

Mr. EMMERSON. The granting of the authority to a company to go to the Public Works Department is one thing, and it is another thing for that company to appear before the Public Works Department in order to get the execution of that right or the right to exercise the privileges which they are authorized to exercise by the particular Act of parliament incorporating them.

Mr. J. HAGGART. But if they can get it without any imposition?

Mr. EMMERSON. They can go there, but it would be a matter of regulation for the government of Canada to impose a charge, and that would be the only way that we could reach these numberless companies that have acquired these privileges, and this authority. You say this policy should have been adopted long ago. Perhaps it should, but it has not been. I am not dealing with this from any political standpoint. I am dealing as a member of this committee with conditions which present themselves, and we realize that other states, and other countries require the pay-

ment of such charges. Why should not Canada follow in the same line, and if it is too late for us to amend the Bills, then let us follow these Bills by legislation of a general character, which could not be in any respect looked upon as being invidious. If to-day, we were to hold back this Bill or during this parliament were to refuse to grant the privileges to these gentlemen when we have granted them to so many other gentlemen during this session, it certainly would appear to be an unfair discrimination, and I hold that these Bills should all be treated alike. Members of the Railway Committee will remember that I have taken very strong grounds there against the granting of privileges without restriction, I have endeavoured to hold them all down to have limitations, treat them all fairly, and to give to no set of men privileges which were not accorded to others who appear before us.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Can the Bill not be made to read: Subject to such terms and conditions as the government may from time to time stipulate?

Mr. EMMERSON. That might very well be done, but we want to deal with other Bills, and we want general legislation which will affect the Bills that have already passed the gamut of this committee.

Mr. BRADBURY. Let it be retroactive.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would hardly be retroactive, because after all these gentlemen could not complain without realizing that when they get the authority to do certain things they do not get the right to do them until the Public Works Department gives them that right, and if in the intervening period the Department of Public Works under the authority of this parliament imposes regulations and charges, they could not complain of any enforcement, and it would be retroactive in so far as the action of the Department of Public Works is concerned.

Mr. BRADBURY. I agree with the hon. gentleman's views, the question is, will the government enact this legislation?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend and I cannot throttle the government, we cannot take the government by the throat, and say what they shall do, and what they shall not do, but I say it would be unfair on our part to hold up these Bills in view of the action which we have taken within the last week. It would be unfair to deal with these gentlemen in any other way than we have dealt with previous applications, and then we should place the responsibility on the government of dealing with the whole question, having regard to the companies which have already been incorporated, and dealing with the companies which may be incorporated during the remainder of this session.

Mr. GOODEVE. As a member from British Columbia, and a member of the Railway Committee I take exception to the statement made by the hon. member for Humbolt (Mr. Neely), and the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan), that the members from British Columbia gather together and act as a body when they have a Bill in which they were interested to pass through the Railway Committee of this House, and then took exception to Bills brought forward on similar lines by members from different parts of Canada. On my own behalf, and on behalf of the members from British Columbia, I say we have never made any attempt of that kind, and neither has such a principle as that guided our action in this House.

Mr. RUTAN. I did not say the members from British Columbia; I said that in relation to a Bill from British Columbia the members of the opposition——

Mr. GOODEVE. I am pleased to accept the explanation of the hon. member, but the hon. member from Humbolt went much further and made the statement to which I took exception. But I wish to say further that the position taken by the minister in allowing this Bill to stand over meets with my approval. He has stated, very fairly I think, the point that we are constantly dealing with varying conditions in matters coming before this House and before the Railway Committee, and that, therefore, careful attention to all matters is necessary. But it seems to me, he does not deal with the crux of this question when he states that if the government, as a government, are not prepared to go ahead and develop these natural resources, we should not prevent their being developed by private individuals. I agree that we want our natural resources developed, and we ought to encourage capital to develop these resources. But this does not touch the point raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). At this particular time, a large number of Bills are before the House dealing with these matters—and it is for that reason, no doubt, that the question now arises. These Bills deal with water-powers upon many streams, some of them running in more than one province, and thus practically interprovincial streams. Many of these rivers run through little known or comparatively unknown territory. We cannot tell what is the value of the water-powers that may be involved in these Bills. In view of this fact, we see the importance of the point raised by the member for South Simcoe that the government should lay down some policy to regulate the granting of these powers in connection with railway enterprises and other-

wise. In that connection, the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. A Haggart) seems important. In my own province, we have our Water Act, with clauses similar to those of the laws referred to by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) as being in force in the United States. One of these sections provides as follows:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time, by order in council, reserve and fix such rents, royalties, tolls and charges in respect of the water used or taken and used, and of the lands of the Crown used, and of the rights, powers and privileges which may be required by any licensee unler this Act.

The point I wish to make and to call particularly to the attention of the Minister of Railways is that a similar control is being exercised in the province of Ontario, and it is altogether likely that the other provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, feeling that they have a valuable asset in these great water-powers, would like to derive some revenue from their development. This was my strongest objection to the present Bill. This Bill covers no certain, definite territory:

—from a point on Lake Winnipeg, at or near its outlet into the Nelson river, or at or near the discharge of the Saskatchewan river into Lake Winnipeg, or from a place between the said points, to a point of junction with any railway to Hudson bay which may be located by the government of Canada.

This involves several waterways, and deals with water-powers in two provinces, Manitoba and Alberta. I do not think that the members from either of these provinces are prepared to tell the committee—I certainly did not receive the information in the Railway Committee—what particular water-powers there may be on these great waterways. Possibly, in future, both of these provinces will feel that they have a vested right in these powers, that these powers belong to the people, and that this parliament ought not to give a company power to expropriate these natural resources and use them for its own interests. This is not a question as to whether the municipality to which they sell power is charged proper rates or not; the question is whether the people of Canada as a whole are not entitled to some revenue from these water-powers and the privilege of their exclusive use. That is the question at issue as I understand it to be stated by the hon. member for South Simcoe; that is the question that we discussed in the committee. Now, I would like to call the attention of the minister to the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. A. Haggart). That hon. gentleman speaks as a lawyer, and, though I am a layman, and my opinion on such a matter will not carry great weight, it seems to me that there is something in the point—that, possibly, if we give this power, that fact will make it impossible for the province of Manitoba hereafter to claim this right. Suppose that hereafter, the province of Manitoba were to grant a strictly water-power Bill to develop power in the province of Manitoba within territory covered by this Bill, it is a question whether or not the mere passing of this Bill by this federal parliament would not nullify the rights and prerogatives of the province of Manitoba in the matter. The company could develop, use and sell power for their own profit without regard to the people of the province or the people of the Dominion as a whole. That is the point we are considering at this time, and I am glad the minister has seen fit, in a broad-minded way, to say that he will allow this Bill to stand over, that this great and important question may be considered.

The position taken by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan), I understand to be that we can do that possibly at the end of the session. The difficulty is that we have not only this Bill but other Bills dealing with the great water-powers throughout the west, Bills involving many important rivers upon which are immense powers of incalculable value to the people of Canada. I understand the suggestion of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) to be that we might let it go through and afterwards pass retroactive legislation imposing conditions. But that might be difficult, and possibly even unfair. For, if the company has invested $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 in good faith in developing a water-power under a charter granted by this parliament, it is a question whether we should place restrictions upon that company afterwards. The right time to deal with this matter is now, before we grant the power, so that each company will know exactly the conditions with which they have to comply before getting their charter. For these reasons, I am glad of the attitude of the Minister of Railways in allowing this Bill to stand over, so that we may consider this Bill in connection with others involving a similar principle and see if we cannot formulate a policy that will be in the interest of all.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am glad this question has been brought up. It is a question that has taken up a good deal of time in the Railway Committee, more especially this session. We had some talk of it last session also. I believe that the time has come when the government should lay down a policy in connection with the granting of special privileges to railway companies applying to this parliament for charters. Possibly, the time may have

come when a railway company should be given a charter for the building of a railway only. But I think it would be manifestly unfair if we, at this stage of the game, should say to the member (Mr. Rutan) who has charge of this present Bill simply that it should not go through. It is manifestly unfair because hon. members opposite who are now so keenly opposing this Bill either sat still or supported other Bills even during the present session containing, I believe, the same clauses exactly. There is far less objection to this Bill and to the Bill that follows it on the order paper than to other Bills that hon. gentlemen opposite supported last week. For this reason: The custody of the water-powers affected by this Bill is in the hands of the Dominion government. The same is true of the next Bill on the order paper, respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company in the hands of my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely). But in the case of the Bills supported by hon. gentlemen opposite, the water-powers were owned by the various provinces. Why did not these hon. gentlemen, who are now so anxious not to have these water-powers granted to railway companies, object to the Bills introduced by some of their friends? It seems rather unfair that, having got their Bill through they should get up now and say that the same powers that have already been granted to another company should not be granted in this case, and the one to which I have referred. Further, nothing in these Bills gives the company any rights in water-powers. This Bill does not give the company a single iota of right that any member of this House does not possess at this moment. All it gives them is the right to go to the minister who has charge of the water-powers in the western provinces and make arrangements with him. It is open to him to impose conditions under the Dominion Lands Act. All the regulations are there providing the terms on which these water-powers may be acquired.

The minister has it in his power now to impose any stipulations or regulations that he likes on those railway companies when they come to apply for water-power. To my mind the most serious aspect of this granting of railway charters is where the railways run through provinces which own their own lands, and I think the time has come when this government should fairly consider whether it is advisable to grant water-power privileges to companies when the water-powers are under the jurisdiction of the different provincial legislatures. I am sure it is no advantage to this government or the Liberal party in any way to have the different provinces sending their lawyers here to oppose in the Railway Committee every one of these Bills, on the ground that we are infringing on provincial rights. If the provinces have certain rights, they should be respected. I think it would be far better to lay down the principle, in connection with railway charters, that power shall be given only to build the railway, and that if the company should want to get hold of water-powers to run the railway, let it go to the province that owns these powers. I quite agree that the time has come when something should be done along these lines, but I cannot agree to my hon. friends opposite getting Bills of their own through and then denying the same rights to others who happen to be opposed to them in politics. I am not saying that we are very much better on this side, but there has been a good deal of wrangling in the Railway Committee pro and con, and I think it would be better for the government to lay down a policy so that we would know exactly what to expect. As regards the particular railway under discussion, and the one following, under the name of my hon. friend from Humbolt (Mr. Neely), there is less objection to these than to any other, because the water-powers belong to this Dominion government, and the Minister of the Interior has the right to place any restriction on their development he likes. We are not giving any power itself, but only the right to go to the Minister of the Interior and acquire a water-power for the purpose of operating the railway and the right to dispose of any surplus. No one can object to that. We all want to see the west develop, and to object now to these two Bills would be eminently unfair. I think that they should be passed and then some definite policy laid down which would govern us during coming sessions.

Mr. NESBITT. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) all we are doing is to put this company in the same position as a private individual, and it will have to go to other powers for its rights. The Bill which my hon. friend read from an American legislature was probably inspired by the views of President Taft this year, concerning the conservation of natural resources and recommending that a certain charge or revenue should accrue to the state. That is all very fair and right, and probably it would be a good thing for us to adopt, but you must bear in mind that these companies will have to submit their prices to the Railway Commission, and that commission, no doubt, in fixing the rates, would take into consideration any charge or fee which the government might impose. Therefore the consumers would probably have to pay more

on that account. The Railway Commission would no doubt make the rates higher than they would if the company had not to pay any federal charge. It is only wise therefore, that we should consider that aspect of the case, and I draw attention to it because, if we do not impose any Dominion charge, the communities served would no doubt get the benefit.

Mr. BRADBURY. There seems to be a general consensus of opinion on the other side that something should be done to conserve the interests of the people in these great water rights. The argument advanced by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) why this Bill should not be made an exception, is a very weak one. The reason he gives is that in the early part of the session we did grant similar rights. But if we have made mistakes in the past, is not that all the more reason why we should stop now? If we have failed to safeguard the interests of the people in one or two other Bills—and I am not prepared at this moment to say that we have—surely it is now time to cease making any further such mistakes. The water-powers covered by this Bill are situated almost on the northern boundary of the province of Manitoba and will come within the limits of that province as soon as the right hon. gentlemen sees fit to extend its boundaries, so that perhaps in the next few months they will be under the control of the Manitoba government, and therefore, we ought to hesitate legislating with regard to them. They are the two greatest water-powers in Canada. My hon. friend from Assiniboia knows something about the water-power at the mouth of the Saskatchewan, that great river which drains the whole western country from the Rocky mountains and empties into Lake Winnipeg, with about 125 feet of a fall into Lake Winnipeg. On the Nelson river there is the Sea falls, which this Bill covers. All the waters from the two Saskatchewans, Red river, Winnipeg river—all the waters that enter into the Hudson bay, run over these falls, thus creating one of the greatest water-powers on the country. These are two great water-powers which by this Bill this company will get control of.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where is there anything in this Bill which would enable the company to utilize any one of these water-powers without making terms either with the Minister of the Interior or, should they be vested in Manitoba, with the government of Manitoba?

Mr. BRADBURY. That may be all right, but that is not enough to meet the argument which has been put up by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and by hon. members on this side of the House that the people of this country should have some rights with regard to the conserving of these great water-powers. I think that before this or any other Bill affecting these water-powers is dealt with, the government should be given time to bring down a policy. It should be framed in such a manner that every one of these powers granted should come under it. I do not wish to oppose this Bill because it is coming from our friends here, but with the information that is now before this committee, and realizing that in granting these powers we are not conserving the best interests of the people, I cannot very well see how hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House can ask the committee to pass this Bill.

Mr. RUTAN. I am rather surprised at the inconsistency of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). He well remembers that at the beginning of the session, or shortly after, Bill (No. 52) was brought up before the Railway Committee and he remembers the stand that was taken by himself and other hon. gentlemen at that time. He also remembers the stand that was taken on other Bills by these hon. members, that passed the committee and also passed this House. It seems to me that his argument is very inconsistent. If these hon. gentlemen are so critical about the right to acquire extra powers which this company may dispose of, it was just as much harm to confer similar rights on other companies incorporated in other Bills that have passed since then, and in regard to which the hon. member for Selkirk has not opened his mouth. He has either remained neutral or has taken a position the direct opposite of that which he is taking to-day. It seems to me that he cannot have forgotten what has happened in the Railway Committee or on the floor of this House. More than that, I cannot see why it is necessary to attack this particular Bill and the Bill which immediately follows it for the reason that they affect a new and undeveloped territory and which, without enterprise of this kind, has no chance of development. If this were an old country like the state of New York, or like the well settled portions of Ontario, and a large amount of power had been disposed of, a question might perhaps arise as to the wisdom of the measure, but I cannot see why a new country like this where we are looking for development should be the one place to be sought out by hon. gentlemen opposite in order to keep development from going forward. The hon. gentleman is inconsistent in his argument, for he certainly knows that this Bill was held up in the fore part of this session, and that it was kept on the order paper until last Friday when it passed the com-

mittee. The hon. gentleman knows very well that during that time several other Bills with exactly the same powers passed the committee and also passed this House.

Mr. OLIVER. The demand has been made that this government should come forward with a policy with regard to water-powers. In so far as the waters of Canada are under the jurisdiction of this government, the government has a very definite policy in regard to water-powers, which has been in force for some time. With regard to the water which exists in the three prairie provinces, by the terms of the Irrigation Act, this water was vested absolutely in the control of the Dominion government. Under the terms of the Dominion Lands Act, passed in 1908, provision was made for the development of power upon these waters. Under the terms of the Act regulations have been passed and have been in force now for something like a year, providing the method by which rights in water-powers are acquired, making provision that a rental may be charged for the use of the water by the power company, which rental may be determined from time to time—that is at periods of 21 years—and making provision for the regulation of the charges which should be made to the consumers of the power generated from the water, such charges to be under the control of the Railway Commission, and to be subject to adjustment at periods of seven years.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would point out to the Minister of the Interior that this Bill does not affect any of the three prairie provinces; can he tell us what is the law in the Northwest Territories which are affected by this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I should have mentioned that I think the Irrigation Act applies to the Northwest Territories as well as to the three prairie provinces, but at any rate the Dominion Lands Act does and under the authority of that Act regulations have been made which would certainly apply to the water-powers that would be affected by either of these Bills. There is no question as to the policy of the government, or as to the administration of the government in regard to water-powers which are unquestionably under the jurisdiction of the Dominion government. The present Bill applies to the Northwest Territories outside the limits of any province and therefore no question of provincial rights is involved.

Mr. BRADBURY. How long will these territories be outside the limits of the province?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say that, but I can say that as the Irrigation Act declares the control of water in all the provinces to be in the Dominion government, it will not make any difference, because either the Irrigation Act or the Dominion Lands Act, and the regulations under it will apply whether the territory is inside or outside of the province. As a matter of fact, within the province, to-day we are administering the water-powers under the regulations authorized by the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. LENNOX. Suppose that this territory is given over to the province of Manitoba, does the minister mean that the Dominion government would still continue to exercise full control over these water-powers, and that the province will have no jurisdiction over them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has just said that.

Mr. LENNOX. Let him speak for himself.

Mr. OLIVER. I think what I said in the last few sentences made that quite clear. In the province of Manitoba to-day we are administering the water-powers under the regulation framed by authority of the Dominion Lands Act, and if this territory were added to the province I presume the conditions would be the same.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Minister of the Interior has pointed out quite clearly that what hon. gentlemen have been asking for is the law, and has been the law since 1908. Let us understand exactly the position. There are a large number of gentlemen in this House to-day, and so far as getting water-power is concerned any one of us can obtain all the rights that this Bill gives to the company, by making application to the Interior Department. The terms on which the power should be given would come under the contract or lease so granted, and since the Dominion Lands Act of 1908, the Interior Department has made regulations under which this power is leased for a certain period on terms stipulated, and these rates can be altered at the expiration of the first period mentioned in the lease and an advance rental charged if an increase in value should take place. Therefore everything which hon. gentlemen have asked is already provided for. There is the other point to be considered: That every extra dollar you charge for the lease of a water-power will come out of the consumer of the power at some point, because the companies are not in this business for their health.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite follow that. If that be the case then it would be entirely in the interest of the public to give all these water-powers away so that those acquiring them might supply power at a very cheap rate.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not exactly. These rates come under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and they will be

based on the cost to the company of the production of the power, and every dollar you add to the cost of production will come out of those who use the power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite so.

Mr. GRAHAM. And if we charge a very large rental the people of the locality who use the power will have to pay the interest on that charge. That is another side to the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another side also.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is another side, and it is, that all the people of Canada ought to have some benefit from the power that may be developed in a certain locality, although if we apply that to the transmission of power in the province of Ontario perhaps we may not think that the principle which the hon. gentleman has announced, is applied. However, on the Trent canal system we have fixed a rate of, I think, $2 per horse-power, but the rates to be charged by the company to the public are under the Board of Railway Commissioners, and I have taken the ground, whether rightly or wrongly, that if we charge a reasonable rate for power it will enable the commissioners to compel the company to give the people in the locality a reasonable price, so that the greatest good may come to the greatest number by making that power as cheap as possible. I am not at all objecting to the proposal that the Dominion should get some revenue, but do not let us run away with the idea that if we impose a big tax to get revenue for the Dominion, we are not taking it out of the pockets of the people who have to buy that power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the argument of the minister were carried to its legitimate conclusion, then, the city of Montreal, or the city of Toronto, which get a very large revenue from the street railway companies would do much better in the interest of the general public to exact no revenue at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the rates were under control perhaps it would be just as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not agree with the minister there. The interests of the people of Canada who own these water-powers have to be considered on the one hand, and on the other hand the government is bound to consider the interests of those who may be purchasers of that power in the several districts. The minister puts it in a very plausible way when he says that if you give the companies these water-powers for nothing, then the people will get the power very cheaply. I take issue with that. I say it is not the history of corporate action, I say that the advantage gained in that respect is much more apt to go into the pockets of the shareholders in dividends than into the pockets of the consumers. The principle of controlling rates is a proper principle and the government is taking the right course when it invests the Railway Commission with that jurisdiction, but if you exact a reasonable rental for the benefit of the entire people of Canada on the one hand, and if on the other hand you control the rates, the result will be that the Railway Commission in fixing these rates will always look at the rental which must be paid to the people of this country, and the commission will govern its control of rates accordingly. But to say that it is absolutely desirable to give away a public franchise to whomsoever comes and asks for it, and to base that idea upon the proposition that the consumer in every case will get the advantage is an argument which does not commend itself to my mind.

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose the hon. leader of the opposition will agree that I did not say anything of the kind. I distinctly said that I was agreeable to a reasonable rental.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So am I.

Mr. GRAHAM. But that is not what I rose to say. I think, perhaps, it would straighten out this matter if we said in these Bills, what is an absolute fact anyway, that these companies are subject to the regulations made by the Minister of the Interior with regard to the leasing of water-powers.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to point out that at the beginning of this discussion the Minister of Railways intimated that he would allow this Bill to stand over, and in pursuance of that I moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, and that is what is before the Chair at the present time. The minister, like the rest of us, seems to have obtained some light on this subject during the discussion, assuming that the Minister of the Interior is correct in his interpretation of the question as it stands. I do not think it will do any of us any harm to refresh our memories on that matter. I for one would be willing to plead my ignorance to the utmost extent in order that I might look into this legislation and see if the result would be as the Minister of the Interior states. Hon. gentlemen who object to this Bill standing over seem to think that we want to hit this Bill in particular. My understanding is that we shall not necessarily deny the promoters of this Bill the legislation that they ask, but we wish to take time to consider whether or not the matter can be put in better shape while we are considering the other Bills in the Railway Committee, so that all these Bills can be dealt with together, and so that we shall not be handicapped in considering the

other Bills. With regard to the argument that because we have allowed some other Bills to go through, either inadvertently or improperly, therefore we should allow this Bill to go through, I entirely dissent from that proposition. Even if we had allowed nine out of ten Bills to go through, that ought not to go through, I would fight against the passage of the tenth. My position is that however often we may have made a mistake, it is always better to remedy the wrong, even at a late day, than not to remedy it at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have had a good deal of discussion since I said that I was quite willing that we should let the Bill stand. In doing so, I do not think we shall lose a moment, because this matter has been threshed out for days, in fact, this particular Bill has been held for nearly a month, during which other Bills containing the same power have been put through. I do not think there will be any difficulty in putting through the committee in one form or another the various Bills of the same kind, and I assure the promoters of this Bill that it shall receive the same treatment as the others, and its passage will not be retarded by its being allowed to stand over.

Mr. WRIGHT. With regard to all the charters that have been mentioned as having gone through, I think this is the only one that lies entirely within the jurisdiction of this parliament. I do not remember any other that is in precisely the same geographical position. I think it is very undesirable to include water-power privileges in railway charters, and this purports to be a railway charter. One striking peculiarity of this charter is that the company do not appear to know within 150 miles where they want the railway to start from or where they want it to run to; it is a sort of roving charter. In my opinion, there should be a proper map outlining the proposed railway, and that has not been furnished.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a question for the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is a question I wish to mention here. There is a map in the Railway Committee, but there might as well not have been any so far as it is any guide to the members considering the question.

Progress reported.

PRINCE ALBERT AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 69) respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Neely.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. LENNOX. This Bill is similar to the other, and I move that it stand over.

Mr. NEELY. The reason for holding over Bill (No. 52) does not apply to this Bill, as the company is not asking for any powers except in extension of time, and power to extend its line of railway from Prince Albert southwest to Calgary. There is no more reason why this Bill should be held over than that the committee should reconsider Bills that have already been passed by the committee and the House this session, because whatever rights this company has were granted last session, and it is not asking for any new rights.

Mr. GRAHAM. This company was chartered last session, and is not asking for any new powers, only for an extension of time and an extension of its line. No objection has been taken to that in any Bill, so far as I know.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, the objection has been taken in the committee, in this way, that where a company comes for a privilege in the way of an extension of a charter, we have a right, and it is our duty, to consider just what it is we are extending.

Mr. GRAHAM. This charter was only passed last year, and it would not lapse for another year.

Mr. LENNOX. By section 4 of the Bill, the time for construction is extended. We are now considering the question of a policy as to water-powers, and the question arises whether it would be wise to extend the powers conferred by this Bill in respect to water-powers, so this Bill stands on the same principle as the others, and I submit it should remain over pending the consideration of that question. As the minister has said no wrong is done, because we will get them all together, and will consider them as one proposition, all being accorded fair play.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let us be reasonable. Suppose we do not grant this. Then for one year more they have all the rights which they have to-day. Under ordinary circumstances they would not come to this House for another year, but they want to extend their line, and incidentally they follow the usual course of asking the privilege of starting within two years, and completing within five years. We granted a year ago all the powers in that Bill whatever that may be. Their time has not yet expired. Is this House going to pass an amending Act this year taking away the powers we gave last year? This Bill is in a different position from the others. The committee has been liberal in renewing charters year after year, and does not deprive companies of powers already conferred. Here they are asking an extended

time to build the line, and the hon. member suggests that we should take advantage of that to deprive them of some of the rights they have under the old Act. I think that is going too far.

Mr. LENNOX. I see it in another light. They ask an extension of time. It may be that we granted them something a year ago that we ought not to have granted. Give them the privilege of extending their line according to our fixed policy, but we should not grant them an extension of time in which to acquire water-powers to which we should never have, perhaps, given them a right, not at least until we determine just what policy we will adopt as regards new charters. Let them have the time they were granted last year, and if they exercise their powers within the time let them keep those powers, but do not to-day extend that time until we have determined on a general policy. Therefore, inasmuch as we may devise some policy within a day or so, let this Bill stand as the other Bills stand.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think the positions are equal; I do not see any reason why this Bill should stand.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller). Mr. Lennox moves that the committee report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. LENNOX. As the minister is opposed to that course there is no object in putting the motion.

Mr. WRIGHT. By this Bill the company are granted an extension of time, and also the right to extend their line. Will the granting of the extension of the line give them the right to exercise in respect of such extension the powers in relation to water-powers conferred on them in the Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not, but we can let the Bill stand for third reading in order to have that matter looked up.

Bill reported.

VANCOUVER, VICTORIA & EASTERN RAILWAY & NAVIGATION COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 99) respecting the Vancouver and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member (Mr. Burrell) who is in charge of this Bill, is not present.

Mr. BARNARD. The hon. member asked me to take charge for him.

Mr. GRAHAM. Can the hon. member (Mr. Barnard) tell me, if the original charter—this is an extension, I believe—includes clauses about water-powers?

Mr. BARNARD. I do not know. This is an old incorporation.

Mr. COWAN. It is a provincial charter.

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe that the original charter contains no rights with regard to water-powers. This company was incorporated by the legislature of British Columbia, and, at a later date, came before this parliament. This is a renewal. There were amendments, one particularly, limiting the extension of time to those branches or extensions the termini of which were definitely named. The amendment suggested by the Railway Committee, I think, was accepted by the hon. gentleman in charge of the measure.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let it go to the third reading, but allow it to stand then and we can deal with it later.

Mr. COWAN. I have here the original charter, and it gives no power to acquire water rights.

Bill as amended reported, and read the third time, and passed.

THE RESTIGOUCHE LOG DRIVING AND BOOM COMPANY.

Mr. CARVELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 150) respecting the Restigouche Boom Company and to change its name to the Restigouche Log and Boom Driving Company.

Mr. PERLEY. Before this motion passes, I would like to suggest that this Bill be referred to the Public Works Department and carefully gone over. It is a very complicated Bill with many powers and no doubt intended for a very good purpose, but there are some curious things in it. For instance, there is a provincial charter referred to in section 27, and this section empowers the company to buy up and extinguish the present shares of this provincial company and force the shareholders to take in lieu bonds in the new company. I question whether this parliament has the right to give any such authority. Then there are no names of shareholders mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. CARVELL. This company has been doing business some 25 or 30 years on the Restigouche river both in Quebec and New Brunswick, and its business is increasing very rapidly. A cut of 25,000,000 feet a year was at one time considered fairly good, but last year the cut exceeded 100,000,000 and this year will likely reach 125,000,000. The facilities of the boom company are entirely inadequate to hold the lumber for certain periods, and the only way possible to get additional fa-

cilities is to take a portion of the rights on the province of Quebec side. Application was made to this parliament a number of years ago to secure this extension of rights, but because of the opposition of one important bond or stockholder, it was allowed to drop. I am now in a position to assure my hon. friend that every stockholder in the old company has agreed to the proposition and the stockholders are really promoting this Bill. They will be represented by their solicitor who has been here on two occasions, and the Bill has been redrafted by the solicitor of the old company and the law clerk. There will be no objection from any of the old stockholders, and the understanding is that the stockholders shall take the bonds in the new company for their stock.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is the old company a provincial one?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes.

Mr. J. HAGGART. In that case we should not empower them to sell to this company.

Mr. CARVELL. It would do no harm to give the power. We can create the new company and give it the power to purchase. The matter will be one for the old company to work out at their end if necessary. This is in the interests of the company. I would like to have the Bill pass its second reading to-day because I understand there are some interests opposing the Bill, and I should like to have the Bill go before the Private Bills Committee so as to give every one interested sufficient time to be present.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is it not necessary that those who are promoting the Bill should have their names in the charter?

Mr. CARVELL.—I am not promoting the Bill myself, but am speaking on behalf of my hon. friend from Restigouche (Mr. Reid). I know, however, a great deal about the old corporation and something about the preparation of this Bill. I supposed that the names of the gentlemen applying were in the Bill; but if not, they can be put in the Bill in committee if necessary.

Mr. PERLEY. I have no desire to block the second reading. No doubt the Bill is for a very good purpose, but there is a company on the Ottawa river very similar to this one, all the tolls of which are under the Public Works Department and have every year to be submitted to the government before they become law. There is no provision in this charter in that regard whatever. If there are no shareholders, at the end of 30 years when the bonds run out, who will own these works? There is no provision as to who will own them when that time is over. There are officials in the Public Works Department who have had to do with this kind of work many years and this charter should be submitted to those officials, who understand their business, before it is brought to the committee. The members of the committee necessarily cannot be conversant with the technical details of a Bill of this kind.

Mr. CARVELL. All these matters can be argued before the Private Bills Committee.

This is not a new principle by any means in New Brunswick. There are other companies in which this principle is worked out and in which it has worked very satisfactorily the last 25 or 30 years. The company is mutual and there are no stockholders.

Mr. PERLEY. To whom will the works belong after the bonds are paid?

Mr. CARVELL. To the company.

Mr. PERLEY. But if there are no shareholders, there will be no company.

Mr. CARVELL.—This Bill provides for persons who have the right to vote and the man who has a certain quantity of lumber in the river has a vote. There are other parties who take the place of shareholders, who can vote and decide what to do with the property at the expiration of the charter.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 142) to incorporate the Congregational Union of Canada.—Mr. A. Haggart.

QUESTIONS.

CERTIFICATE OF ARTHUR JOHNSON.

Mr. LANCASTER:

1. Has Arthur Johnson, of Midland, engineer of the barge 'Reliever' during the season of 1909, a third-class engineer's certificate? If so, what is the date of same?

2. By whom was he examined, on whose report of fitness was same granted, and where was such examination held?

3. What certificates were filed with the department as to service, what was the time of service, the name of tug or vessel, by whom owned, and by whom each certificate was given, respectively?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Yes, dated July 30, 1909.

2. Examined by J. Dodds, steamboat inspector at Midland, Ontario, July 1, 1909, and recommended for a certificate, which was approved by the chairman of the

board of steamboat inspection, and certificate granted.

3. The certificates produced for service, character, ability, and sobriety are as follow:

No. 1, dated Windsor, Ontario, April 3, 1905, as six months second engineer on tug 'Onaping' in 1893. Signed Thomas Conrick, first engineer.

No. 2, dated Midland, Ontario, October 12, 1905, as chief engineer on tug 'Maganetawan' in 1895, six months and 24 days. Signed, Paul Dusome, master.

No. 3, dated Midland, April 18, 1905, as chief engineer tug 'Maganetawan' in 1896, five months and twenty-seven days. Signed A. W. Clark, master.

No. 4, dated Midland, April 18, 1905, as chief engineer on tug 'Beaver' in 1899, five months and six days; also as chief engineer on tug 'Clipper,' 1903, eight months and twenty-six days. Signed, George Kinnee, master.

No. 5, dated Midland, 18th April, 1905, as chief engineer tug 'D. L. White,' 1900 and 1901, eight months and three days. Signed, William White, master.

No. 6, dated Midland, April 18, 1905, as chief engineer on tug 'Lake,' 1902, seven months and nine days. Signed, John Shuman, dredge captain.

No. 7, dated Midland, 18th April, 1905, as chief engineer on tug 'Clipper,' 1904, four months and four days. Signed, T. E. Cook, master.

No. 8, dated Midland, April 10, 1909, as chief engineer tug 'Clipper,' 1905, eight months and fourteen days; also chief engineer tug 'Aubrey C,' season of 1907, nine months and six days. Signed, Manley Chew, owner, Charles Gould, master.

CONSERVATION COMMISSION—COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES.

Mr. JAMESON:

Referring to a question on February 14 last, as to the powers of the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources, what are the names, residences and occupations of the Committee on Fisheries, appointed by said commission?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

Hon. Hugh Armstrong, Winnipeg, Man., Provincial Treasurer of Manitoba.

Hon. Price Ellison, Victoria, B.C., Chief Commissioner of Lands, Forests and Works of British Columbia.

Hon. W. C. H. Grimmer, Fredericton, N.B., Surveyor General of New Brunswick.

Hon. A. P. Maclean, Halifax, N.S., Attorney General of Nova Scotia.

Dr. Howard Murray, Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S., Dean of Dalhousie University.

Hon. Frank Cochrane, Toronto, Ont., Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines of Ontario.

ESTIMATE OF POPULATION.

Mr. MAGRATH:

In the statement giving the population of Canada in various years, which appears in the hon. Finance Minister's last budget speech, what is the exact method employed to estimate the population since the last census?

Mr. FISHER. The last census of each province is taken as the datum, to which is added (1) the yearly immigration into each province as reported by the Immigration Office; and (2) the natural increase per 1,000 per annum according to the last sensus, table IX of volume IV. The total natural increase in each year is computed from the estimated population of the preceding year.

COST OF HEATING RAILWAY COMMISSION BUILDING.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

If the cost of heating the Railway Commission building, Queen street, for the year 1908-9, amounted to $1,164, what are the various items of expense making up this amount, including the amount of coal, cost per ton and other particulars?

Mr. FISHER:

72 tons of coal, at $7	$ 504
Salaries, at $55 per month, for six months, of night and day firemen	660
	$1,164

LIST OF BANK SHAREHOLDERS.

Mr. HENDERSON:

Has the Minister of Finance yet laid before parliament the list of shareholders of banks transmitted to him for the calendar year ending 31st December, 1909, as required by subsection 6 of section 114 of the Bank Act? If not, when does he propose to do so?

Mr. FISHER:

The Act allows the banks some time after the close of the year to send in these returns. The returns have been received, are in course of preparation for parliament, and will be laid on the table in a few days.

JUDGE OF KING'S BENCH.

Mr. A. HAGGART:

1. Is the government aware that the Manitoba Act providing for an additional King's Bench judge has been brought into force?

2. Have representations been made that there are serious arrears in the Court of King's Bench work, and that the appointment of a judge is urgent?

3. Is it the intention of the government to provide at this session for the payment of such judge, and to fill the vacancy without delay?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH:

1. The government has been so informed.

2. The benchers of the Law Society of Manitoba have forwarded to the Department of Justice a resolution in which it is stated that a large number of cases are awaiting trial and cannot in ordinary course be tried for some time to come.

3. The subject is receiving consideration.

SLEEPING CARS ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Has the Intercolonial Railway Company any sleeping cars now under construction? If so, how many?

2. Are they being built under contract? If so, by whom and at what place?

3. If they are being constructed under contract, were tenders asked for such work? If so, when and in what manner were such tenders asked, and was it by public advertisement in newspapers, or how otherwise?

4. How many tenders were received, what were the figures of each tender, and what was the lowest tender for each car?

5. What was the cost of each car? If the work is not being carried on after tender and contract?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Yes, two sleeping cars.

2. They are being built, under contract, by the Silliker Car Company, at Halifax, Nova Scotia.

3. Tenders were invited by circular letter dated Tuesday, November 9, 1909.

4. Three tenders were received as follows The Dominion Car and Foundry Company, of Montreal, $23,500; the Preston Car and Coach Company, Preston, Ontario, $19,000; the Silliker Car Company, Limited, Halifax, $20,800. The Preston Car and Coach Company, though submitting an offer which was the lowest for the first-class sleeping cars, were unable to make delivery at a date to meet the requirements of the railway, viz., by the 1st of July, 1910. The Silliker Car Company, who made the next lowest offer, undertook to deliver these cars by the 1st of July 1910, as entered in their contract, therefore it was recommended that their offer for two first-class sleeping cars at $20,800 be accepted.

5. The cost of each car, as per tender, is $20,800. The work is being carried on as per tender, contract and specification.

Mr. A. HAGGART.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. KING moved that the House go into committee to-morrow on the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, by providing for the payment to the chairman and members of a Board of Conciliation and Investigation, of an allowance at the rate of twenty dollars for each day's sitting of the board and for each day necessarily engaged in travelling from or to their place of residence to attend or after attending a meeting of the board.

Motion agreed to.

ZINC AND ZINC PRODUCTS.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved that the House go into committee to-morrow on the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to enable the Governor in Council to authorize the expenditure of a sum not exceeding fifty thousand dollars for investigating the processes used in the production of zinc, for making experiments, and for any other purpose that may be deemed advisable for the promotion of the production and manufacture in Canada of zinc and zinc products from Canadian ores.

Motion agreed to.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. A. LACHANCE (Quebec Centre). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it may be boldness on my part to address myself to the subject which has been under discussion for the last month in this House; but I rely on the good will and courtesy of hon. gentlemen, even if only to the length of protesting against the contemptible charges of servility and graft preferred against the Liberal members from the province of Quebec by certain public men of that same province, who at all times, and always out of season, pose as unappreciated and uncompromising patriots, and take occasion of that to slander us in the press and on the hustings; or even if it were only to satisfy the opprobrium mongers that our support of the government and vote, are in no way inspired by venality, but as the result of study, of reflection, of common sense, of true patriotism. Such is my object in addressing the House.

When a few months ago, the question of the defence of Canada was first submitted

to the public, many were surprised at it; in some quarters even it resulted in a scare, while elsewhere it was a matter of serious alarm; a few, on the other hand, took occasion of the circumstance to indulge in over-statements. One might have inferred that the matter was a novel one, unheard of until then, suddenly cropping up in the political arena.

It did occur to most people that the defence of Canada was initiated on that very day when Champlain founded Quebec in 1608 and built the 'Abitation,' which was destined to be used both for residential purposes and to be a bulwark against the attacks of aborigines; the fact was lost sight of that, later on at various points, forts had been built which have become famous in our annals, and in the defence of which Frenchmen have distinguished themselves while warring against the Indians, and later in repulsing the British troops sent to conquer Canada. Regiments of French troops and after the conquest, British troops were quartered there. Was not that paving the way for the country's defence?

What numerous stages have we not gone through since the days of those early armaments! In the course of years, and in quick progression, the military equipment of Canada has developed, its organization has been perfected, its efficiency increased. As evidence, I may mention that the militia estimates which at the time of confederation reached about the million mark, aggregate to-day $6,000,000. Nevertheless, it is not to my knowledge that at any time this circumstance has been considered a matter for alarm; nobody has raised his voice to protest against the principle of progressively increasing our military forces, so natural it appears to protect the country against invasion.

What would have become of Canada without troops at the time it was invaded by the American forces in 1812; what would have been its fate, had not the Fenians been repulsed in 1866 and 1870? Who will assert that we would to-day be enjoying that constitutional system under whose protection individual liberty is in full bloom like flowers under the bright June sun?

Nobody will contend that there is no need of an army to ensure the maintenance of peace, to quell serious riots, unwarranted uprisings which might break out among our people, and also to protect our trade and defend the integrity of Canada's possessions.

Up to this day, we have been the object of attacks on the part of the United States only, and the forces on both sides were about on a par. True, these old-time foes have long since become friendly to each other, both engrossed with peaceful pursuits and enjoying the benefits of an 'entente cordiale.' Unfortunately, though there is nothing stable in this world, and if hostilities were to be renewed some day—which God forbid—a possibility which should not be lost sight of, how will we manage to defend our sea coasts if we have only a land force at our disposal?

And what I say in regard to our neighbours in the south, applies just as well in the case of those countries beyond the Pacific ocean, of ancient origin, but new to civilization, a civilization, in some cases at any rate, buoyant, imbued with a spirit of enterprise and even of conquest. Barely had thirty years elapsed since modern progress had dawned over the country of the chrysanthemum, when the empire of the Rising Sun imposed its rule in Corea to the Celestial empire, and then with one prodigious leap struck to the ground, under the walls of Port Arthur, the colossus of the north made torpid by a stifling autocracy. Who can foresee the development in the near future of those other countries bordering on the Pacific, overcast just now with the gloom of ignorance, but which are bound to be overtaken by the light of progress, in accordance with what I might call the law of geography. In the earliest times, civilization developed in the east and made it famous, extending over Asia and Europe, then crossing the seas in the folds of the Spanish and French flags, and after setting foot in America, resuming its flight towards the far east. It seems as though in accordance with a decree of Providence, progress is bound to encircle the whole world, quickening with its rays the minds of men to a better comprehension of liberty and progress.

Should we have a land force? Its desirability has been recognized, as I have already said, and the principle has been long since acted upon and more energetically than ever of recent years. Would there be any sense in doing away with the principle of naval defence and its practical carrying out, now that Canada has two great oceans as its boundaries on the east and west? Would it be in accordance with common sense to take steps for the defence of the interior while leaving our coasts without protection, open to raids, to attacks from the enemy, without even being in a position to keep off the enemy, until we had made preparations or called for reinforcements.

But, say our opponents, is not England there with her powerful war navy to defend us? Yes, thank heaven, England is there; let us hope she will there remain long, I might say for ever, if earthly things were everlasting. Yes, England is there; she may even be said to be everywhere, since, as is sometimes said, the sun never sets on the British empire, so extensive are its

possessions, and so widely distributed over the surface of the world. It is precisely because that empire exists and we are part of it, that the duty of the hour is so imperative on us.

Are there very many Canadians who would willingly accept the rule of a foreign nation? I do not believe it. Whoever observes what is the condition of the average citizen of the world, cannot be but proud to live under the protection of the powerful Albion. That is not empty rhetoric, it is my earnest conviction. I am a Frenchman, and I am a Catholic; I am not forgetful of it, and I hope I shall never be. I love France as the home of my ancestors, that is to say, deeply, unalterably, with a filial love. I have reverently learned its history; I was enthused at reading of its glorious past, of its perils, of its misfortunes, and I feel it would be a cruel blow to me were the heart of my dear France to bleed under the stroke of some national catastrophe. But while that attachment remains strong, I am happy to be a British subject. Where would I find such freedom for the individual, where would I find such perfect safety elsewhere than in the folds of the British flag, and of the Canadian flag?

It is customary to say the British subject; that is wrong. In whatever domain, whether in national, private life, in public or business transactions, there is nothing carrying with it the idea of dependence. Loyalty to the king does not imply subjection, but the fulfilment of one's duty towards the head of the nation, whether he be called king, president, or by any other name. That is why I say there are properly speaking no subjects, but only British citizens.

Accordingly there should be only one heart and one voice towards maintaining unimpaired the prodigious power which the empire wields to-day, and supporting that empire at the summit of glory where it shines at present. To neglect that duty is to be one self's enemy. It means that we fail to understand that so long as we are a British possession, so long will Great Britain be strong and great, the more prestige and authority she will have, and the stronger also will Canada be, and the greater will be her prestige and her authority. And what is it that is feared? Some say imperialism, others say militarism, and after crying out these words, to frighten the people, they believe everything has been said, everything has been settled. Words are no proof at all; it is facts that convince.

An imperialist I am not, if to be such I have to sacrifice a modicum of the rights enjoyed by the inhabitants of Canada in matters of language, civil, religious and political liberty; and imperialist I am not, if to be such I have to put up with the least interference with our autonomy, or pave the way for any future restriction of it.

But if it is the part of an imperialist to put our militia in touch with the rest of the British forces, so that in case of a war in which we would be interested, there would be secured unity of action, very well, call me an imperialist. Lastly, if it is the part of an imperialist to wish to see the mother country from day to day more powerful, so that our country, as well, may become from day to day stronger, very well, call me an imperialist, because to be an imperialist in that way is to love one's country, is to be a patriot.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LACHANCE. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I stated at the outset that the first expenditure incurred for the defence of the country dated back to the foundation of Quebec, and that it was ordinary common sense to provide for the protection of our coasts just as we had provided for the defence of the rest of the country. And when you left the chair at six o'clock, I was pointing out what are to my mind the distinctive features of the right kind of imperialism as well as of the objectionable kind.

I now wish, Mr. Speaker, with your kind permission, to say a word on another subject. Some public men, some writers, have, in a sarcastic vein, dubbed these first beginnings of the naval defence a 'tin-pot navy.' All great undertakings, no matter how generous the feeling which prompted them, are bound to have their critics. All things have small beginnings. What would those bitter critics say to-day if the government had appropriated, let us say, $40,000,000, at one stroke, and neglected in consequence other branches of the public service? I fancy I hear them complaining bitterly of the government's inefficiency and of the check thus put on the government of Canada for several years to come.

Of course, ten or twelve ships are not sufficient to make the country absolutely secure against attack, at every point along the coasts. But Canada is progressing very rapidly; its revenue is increasing in proportion and will enable us to develop little by little the means of defence, until the day comes when our navy will represent a sufficiently strong unit to provide, in conjuncture with the land forces, full protection against raids, inroads, or interference by nearby or distant foes. Fortunately, for the time being, there is no reason to

suspect on the part of any one a desire of invading, dismembering, or conquering Canada. But what assurance have we that such a thing will not be attempted some day?

Up to some twelve years ago, Canada was not very much known, and its population being comparatively small, it had not attracted particularly the attention of the world. But the early years of this century have opened wide for her the gates of fame; she presents herself as a peaceful conqueror, anxious to show, as stated by our illustrious leader, that the twentieth century is really Canada's century.

All eyes are turned towards us; our chances are figured on; our future is, I might say, forecasted; our mineral, agricultural, industrial and forest wealth is estimated; and fifteen or twenty years more of progress at the rapid rate of the last decade, will make of Canada an envied and coveted country, on account of its riches, its great population, its brilliant prospects.

Who will say that at any time Great Britain may not be engaged in a war requiring the concentration of all those naval forces. That day may be remote or it may be closer to us than we expect, the natural tendency being to foresee calamities only in the distant future. Will she then be in a position to give us as much help as she otherwise would have been? Certainly not.

Then, will England always possess the power and prestige which she enjoys today? That is our ardent desire, and our sincere hope. May the British empire for ever rule on land and on sea. All Canadians entertain that fervent hope. The proof lies in the very Bill submitted to the House for the maintenance of that supremacy, inasmuch as it lies within our power.

But nothing is endowed with perpetual stability. What has been the fate of these immense kingdoms to which the British empire might be compared? What has been the fate of the empire of Alexander the Great, of the Greek republics, of the Roman empire, and in more recent times of the empire built up by the lieutenant Bonaparte?

And what then? In such a juncture, inadequately protected by the mother country, without means of defence at home, our only resort would be to run about on the ramparts and witness, desolate and powerless, the landing of the invaders, or the destruction of our own merchant navy.

Let us suppose the case when we would be called to take care altogether of ourselves. Should I not tremble in making such a suggestion, seeing that since the beginning of this debate on the naval question hon. gentlemen on the other side represent as a crime of high treason to forecast, or even suggest, the possibility of independence for Canada at any time. On the part of the members of parliament who are intent on enlightening public opinion, such narrow-mindedness is most regrettable, and warranted the proud reply elicited from my hon. friend for the Yukon, who, to better point out the foolishness of such empty rhetoric, reminded us that Englishmen, not of Canada, but of Great Britain, eminent statesmen, reputable writers, celebrated historians, have spoken of the independence of Canada as of a fact which may and must necessarily come about some time or other, adding that such an event would be in accord with the natural course of history as regards such dominions or colonies.

But that is not all, will hon. gentlemen believe that a Governor General of Canada has been found to echo such sentiments. It is nevertheless a fact. Yes, Sir John Young at an official function at Quebec on July 15, 1869, following on his arrival, expressed feelings which were construed as an invitation to Canadians to proclaim the independence of their country. He spoke as follows:

> At the present moment, Canada is in reality independent. It has its own destinies in its own hands, and its statesmen and people are recognized as competent to judge of their interests as to what course to pursue to conciliate those interests. England looks to them for her guidance, and whatever their decision may be. either to continue the present connection or in due time and in the maturity of their growth to exchange it for some other form of alliance.

The same views are expressed in the London press of the time, as witness the following extracts from the 'Thunderer':

> There is no ground for surprise, still less for indignation, if it be asked whether it would not be better for both Englishmen and Australians if the independence the latter have, in fact, should reveive a name. The Dominion of Canada is in all respects independent. It is fitted to become independent as it has the institutions of a great power. It is surely a fair subject for inquiry whether the emancipation of the adult is not as desirable to complete the manhood of the son as it is necessary from the inability of the father to understand the peculiar circumstances of his son's life.

And the 'Times' said further:—

> Incidents like these (the withdrawal of troops and the speeches of public men) coming too, in quick succession, showed that the executive government of the United Kingdom acting, as must be presumed in harmony with the imperial parliament, had resolved upon abandoning the old policy of tutelage with its pretensions and responsibilities, and urging the colonies by gentle suasion to take up the freedom of their manhood.

May I be allowed to quote another extract from that paper against the colonial system. I fear lest the hon. member for Frontenac and others whose views are not

any broader, should have a fainting spell; however, I shall take the risk; there are several medical men occupying seats in this House, and I beg of them to keep their eyes open on these likely patients in case of emergency. I shall then read the wording of the 'Times' onslaught: not only does it advocate independence for the colonies, but it sarcastically discards the expression 'mother country' as applied to England:—

Now said the 'Times,' what is meant by speaking of England as the mother country? What is to be understood by the description of Australia, Canada and the rest of her colonies? If all that is intended is to remind us of the historical fact that the citizens of Canada, New South Wales and Victoria are mainly of English origin and descent, we shall not quarrel with the accuracy of the statement, although we may doubt the pertinence of the phrases. England is in this sense the mother country of Australia, and just in the same way some other land, without committing ourselves to the quarrels of ethnologists, we may say Shleswig-Holstein is the mother country of England. Again, it may be observed that if Australia be the child of England, the United States are elder brethren of the same family. It is evident that considerations like these, though extremely interesting in their proper relations, have no necessary connection with the mutual obligations of communities, that is to say, of societies of individuals banded together for purposes of government in different parts of the world. Let us then, in the interest of truth and right conclusions, discard altogether the phrase 'mother country' in the discussions which are before us, let us even use with deliberation words apparently so innocent as 'England' and 'colony,' and remember that what we are called upon to weigh and determine is the proper relations of Englishmen, Australians and Canadians.

I do not concur in the views expressed by the 'Times' on that point. I believe that the expresion 'mother country,' in a general way, describes the status, the respective positions of England and her dominions. If I recall these facts, it is to show to those who are unacquainted with them or have lost the memory of them to what extent freedom of opinion and speech is granted out there.

If then these British statesmen and newspapers have referred to the independence of Canada in such strong terms, and even induced Canadians to turn to it, and that without even causing the slightest surprise, why should people here get angry or feign anger because the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Postmaster General and others have now and then referred to that subject in extremely moderate language, as citizens taking an interest in the future of their country? Why should these gentlemen on the other side take occasion of that to favour the House with some bits of eloquence of very doubtful quality, in regard to our so-called disloyalty. That such whinings should be agreable to them, I do not say the contrary; all tastes are in nature, though it must be admitted some of them are peculiar, but, for the sake of us, let them spare our ears and indulge between ourselves in tht kind of sport.

Moreover, I will tell them very frankly that their unworthy denunciations do not in anv way interfere with our tranquility; our past record is the best answer the turn of mind evidenced by such appeals is almost akin to mania, to a morbid state, the analysis of which may be as much a matter of medical science as of parliamentary debate. Nevertheless, freedom of opinion exists for us as for others; we propose taking largely advantage of it; but we should before all unite with all persons of good will, and broadness of mind towards ensuring the reign of peace in this country. Those whom the spirit of discord torments or that race prejudices distract are free to waste time on the side of the ditch; but we shall continue our progress onwards towards the heights.

So, then, I am quite free to state in this House, that we are perfectly, absolutely, entirely satisfied to live under the present system; but that is not a reason why I should not be at liberty to anticipate a possible condition of independence of Canada, as well as the possible settlement in some way or other of many other problems yet unsolved.

Whom are they expecting to frighten, or alarm, or intimidate, by exclaiming: In your mind, the building of a navy is merely a step towards independence. And supposing it were so, what harm to it? However, that is not a weighty consideration in this debate; the navy is not being organized to-day with a view to conquering independence, but it will be there and will be required, should at any time independence become a reality.

Besides, to be consistent, our opponents should put a stop to all future progress of trade, industry and agriculture, for all these factors help in as great a measure as the navy, and even more so, in developing that degree of wealth, of power and of expansion in Canada which would be required to make independence a possibility.

Accordingly, although this is not the subject just now under discussion, I say it is the part of wisdom to foresee the hour when possibly Canada may separate from the British Crown, and separate without any friction, on friendly terms, owing to circumstances that are still the secret of Providence. That forecast, I repeat it, does not imply any hostility towards the mother country; but since we are discussing a question of national interest, we should consider all its aspects. Events move quickly; what are mere dreams today may be actual facts to-morrow. Some will then advocate annexation to the

United States, others independence, and what not? But whatever proposals are made, wisdom demands that we should be ready, so as not to be at the mercy of anybody.

If to-morrow the tie which binds us to the empire was broken, would there be a single Canadian to deny the desirability of equipping at once a navy? But why should we await that emergency? Are we not even now in fact an independent nation? The British Crown does not take umbrage at that designation, so lightly does that Crown weigh on the British possessions. So let us speak, and especially act, as a nation; let us make the best of the present, but let us also make preparations for the future inasmuch as human forecasts enable us with the help of experience and the teachings of history, to see through that mysterious veil.

We have obligations towards the empire as a whole, but that does not mean that we should not mind doing an injury to Canada. Accordingly is it not part of the duty incumbent on representatives of the people to discover a means of being serviceable to both at the same time? To cooperate towards the upholding of the power of the empire, to defend our country, to protect our business interests which already aggregate several hundred millions and give promise of increasing fivefold in the near future; such is the treble task with which we are confronted. How will we succeed in fulfilling it?

Shall we take the advice of these academic thinkers whose only teaching on that question of naval defence, is to have nothing at all to do with it? What is their plan? To delay until danger is at hand? Unless they are gods or demi-gods capable at a moment's notice of providing a well-equipped fleet risen from the deep at the snap of the fingers, what would be the outcome of their procrastination? They should beware lest in waking up they find out it is too late.

Shall we, on the other hand, take the advice of those who favour the idea of a direct contribution? In what way would Canada and her business interests be protected thereby? To a very limited extent, in a most indirect and uncertain fashion, especially should Great Britain be at war, not to speak of the possible emergency of the mother country being crippled by her foes.

The only other alternative is that which meets all emergencies, gives satisfaction to the just claims of the Empire as well to the legitimate aspirations of Canada; that is the plan proposed in the Bill submitted to the House by the government.

Evidently the people prefer it to all others, and justly so. Through it we ensure in a still greater measure, if possible, our political and administrative autonomy. The money required for the building and maintenance of that navy will be spent here; a new field of action will be opened to Canadians; then parliament will have the exclusive control of that force which will be entrusted with the duty of protecting our territory, ensuring the safety of our trade, of our international dealings, and which may, besides, at certain critical times, act in conjunction with the fleet of the mother country, but only when the people of Canada through their representatives will have agreed to it.

True loyalism or patriotism does not consist in giving everything away blindly and rashly; it consists in giving intelligently. Since Canadians henceforth form a separate nation, and since part of its revenue must be appropriated to military purposes in such a way as to meet its requirements and those of the empire as well, let it be in such a way at any rate that Canada may reap from it the greatest benefit possible without interfering with the object in view.

It has been contended—the hon. gentleman from L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) who spoke recently is of that mind, and there are others—that is contrary to the constitution, or rather interfering with our autonomy, to put, under the circumstances laid down in the Bill, our navy under the command of the British Admiralty, and in the same way to take part in the wars of the empire. There can be no greater mistake. We have the right, I presume, to organize our land and sea forces for the defence of Canada. Well our right to put the Canadian navy under the control of the admiralty and to have it take part in the wars of the mother country is quite as evident. To deny it one must be in bad faith, or else be absolutely blind to the spirit or ignorant of the letter of the British North America Act of 1867 and of the militia Acts since passed by this parliament. Not only is that our right but even, under the law now in force, we are liable to be called upon to do so as regards the sea forces; even as regards the land forces, we were in the same position up to 1904, when the statute 4 Edward VII, cap. 23 was passed.

As a matter of fact, all our militia Acts passed since 1867, are based on the following principles:—

1. The King has the command of all the land and sea forces, and of the whole military and naval service of Canada.

2. Since 1867 and until the passing, in 1904, of statute 4 Edward VII, cap. 23, the King had the right, of his own authority, and without the interference or concurrence of the Governor in Council or of parliament, to call out to active service all our land and sea forces, either within or outside of the limits of the Dominion.

3. Since 1904 our land forces can be sum-

moned to active service only through the Governor in Council or through parliament, and solely for the defence of Canada.

4. Our sea forces can even to this day be summoned to active service within or outside the boundaries of the Dominion of Canada, by the King, of his own authority, the interference or consent of the Governor in Council or of parliament.

Section 15 of the British North America Act, 1867, gives the King command of all our militia corps.

The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

If these words mean anything at all, it is that the King is commander in chief of the militia, that he has the right to assume command of it, consequently to order it to wherever he pleases and put it under the command of whomsoever he thinks fit. That section 15 is in itself a peremptory answer to those who, earnestly or otherwise, contend that the Confederation Act of 1867, does not in principle allow our forces to take part in Great Britain's wars or to put the Canadian navy under the control of the Admiralty.

That provision is reproduced in all our Militia Acts since 1867. With a view to giving effect to the provisions of that section 15 and of subsection 7 of section 91 of the Confederation Act, which provided for the organization of land and sea forces, parliament passed in 1868, our first Militia Bill, 31 Vict., cap. 40. That Act has been revised several times since then; the provisions as amended will be found under cap. 11, of 46 Vict., in chapter 41 of R.S.C., 1886, in chap. 23 of 4 Edward VII., in chap. 41 of R.S.C., 1906. It is expressly provided in each of these Acts that the command of the militia is vested in the King, who exercises it in person and may delegate such power to the Governor General, not the Governor General in Council, but to the Governor General alone, as representative of the Sovereign. So that, basing myself on that legislation, I have the right to conclude that our militia can, without infringing on the principle of our autonomy, take part in the wars of the empire.

That construction on the other hand, is confirmed by other provisions of the Militia Bill; as a matter of fact, from 1867 up to the time of the passing of 4 Edward VII, chapter 23, the King had the right to call out on his own authority and without the interference or consent of the Governor General in Council or of parliament, the whole of our forces to active service, in or outside the Dominion of Canada.

I quote section 61 of the Act of 1868:

Her Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof, for active service either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion or insurrection, or danger of any of them, and the militiamen, when so called out for actual service, shall continue to serve for at least one year from the date of their being called out for actual service, if required so to do; or for any longer period which Her Majesty appoints.

46 Victoria and the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886, also contained that provision. So that ever since confederation the King had the absolute right of calling out on his own authority our military forces to active service, in or outside the Dominion of Canada. On whose behalf and for what object might they be called to do active service outside of Canada, if not to take part in England's wars.

In 1904, the Militia Act is revised in part in 4 Edward VII, chapter 23. Radical amendments are then effected, particularly by vesting in the Governor in Council alone the right of calling out the militia to do active service in or outside of Canada and by providing for the summoning beforehand of parliament. Thus, section 70 reads as follows:

The Governor in council may place the militia or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

So then it will not be the King alone, acting on his own authority, but the Governor in Council, that is our cabinet ministers, responsible to this House and to the people of the country, who shall henceforth have the right to call out the militia for active service. So that constitutes a radical change in our favour.

Section 70 says: 'for the defence thereof' (Canada). These words and that restriction appear for the first time in our Militia Law. What are we to infer from it, if not that, previously to that, our forces could be called out to do active service for other purposes than the defence of Canada, and for what object then could it be, if not to wage war in the interest of the British flag?

However that statute 4 Edward VII., relates only to land forces, as stated in section 136:

The following Acts of the parliament of Canada are repealed, in so far as the active and reserve militia land force is concerned, to wit, &c.

Statute 4, Edward VII., chapter 23 has been included in the Revised Statutes for 1906; but the latter have not abrogated the acts previous to 1906 in regard to the naval forces. To satisfy one self as to that, a reference to schedule A which gives the list of the acts repealed, will suffice. Accordingly, the naval militia has always been and is till to-day liable to being called out directly by the King to do active service within or outside the boundaries of Canada.

In that regard, the Bill now under consideration is a step further towards a state of more complete autonomy, since, in the future, it will be the ministers in council, or parliament, who will have the right to call out our war navy to do active service.

It has also been contended that there is no need for Canada providing armaments, as it is protected in virtue of the Monroe doctrine. That is indeed a most extraordinary statement. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), has already victoriously answered that contention. However, I may be allowed to add a few remarks. That doctrine was given expression to in 1823 by President James Monroe. It is a theory, nothing more, a theory which has not the force of precedent, if I may so expres myself, because it would be going too far to state that it has received the approval or concurrence, or even the acquiescence, of the diplomatic world, or of the chanceries, and nobody will contend that it is part of the rules and principles of international code.

Besides, even supposing it had these features, a circumstance which I would welcome, that doctrine has reference only to the intercourse of European powers with Americans, but has nothing whatever with the intercourse between one American power and another. That distinction is the essential characteristic of that doctrine; and even if it should be a means of protection for us against the peoples of the old world, it would not be a means of protection against the claims, the encroachments or hostilities of the nations which people the American continent. Therefore, I say that doctrine is not a safeguard for us against all and every one, and does not warrant us in remaining inactive without armaments.

The opposition, which in part recognizes the leadership of the hon. member for Halifax, proposes an amendment while opposition No. 2 led forsooth by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier presents an amendment to the amendment, both demanding a plebiscite but for different reasons in each case. As several hon. gentlemen on this side have pointed out, and justly so, a plebiscite is demanded in regard to an expenditure of $43,000,000, appropriated towards the building of a navy which will be our property and constantly in use by us; but all thought of a plebiscite is rejected when, as per the amendment of the opposition, it is proposed to contribute $25,000,000 to the British exchequer as a free gift. Surely that is a striking example of a breach of logic, no wonder the opposition has not yet been able to explain such inconsistency on their part.

Then, as was stated by the hon. member for Red Deer, if we repeat that contribution two or three times, it will ultimately turn out to be a direct invasion of the principle which the opposition is so prone to invoke: 'No representation, no vote.' Now, there is a matter concerning which the opposition might, with better grace to my mind, have sugggested a referendum, it would have been in regard to that proposal of a gift of $25,000,000.

The hon. member for East Grey answered: 'There will be no more contributions.' How does he know? Has he consulted the augurs, the witches, and put in motion the sacred tripod to be thus in a position to utter an oracle. At the time of the sending of the Canadian contingent in 1899, it was also stated that there would not be any more contributions; barely ten years elapsed and we are called upon to contribute once more.

The question of naval defence, it is contended, is a novel one. It cannot be gainsaid that it is before the public in explicit terms since the conference of 1902, when it was proposed to provide for that defence. General elections have taken place in 1904, a new conference was held in 1907, a further general election took place in 1908, and every time that same Liberal government was kept in power, and, inferentially, its then policy which has not been changed since, may be said to have been approved.

But, to say the truth, it was not in 1902 for the first time that the question came up, it is in 1867, when the British North America Act was up for discussion. As a matter of fact, it recurs in all our militia Acts which have been passed in the meantime, such as the Act of 1868 which provides for the organization of land and sea forces. So then, for 43 years, almost a half century, the naval defence proposal is grafted on our legislation, notwithstanding which a referendum is called for under pretense that the question is a novel one. Evidently, advocates of the plebiscite idea are lacking in information.

But I might submit a further consideration which is very peremptory to my mind. Is not this proposal concerned with the defence of Canada and her most vital interests? Now, is not providing for the defence of the country the primary right of representatives of the people a right undeniably implied in their mandate and its most essential feature? Even more, it is not only their right, it is their duty, the first, most sacred and the most imperative of duties, and if in this respect we were to accede to this plebiscite proposal, I am not very sure that we would not be a subject for wonder, nay for laughter, to the rest of the world.

Like many others, I had hoped that this country would not be called upon to assume the heavy burden of armaments, that when it would have reached its full manhood, warfare would have become a thing of the past. Accordingly, it was not without a feeling of pain, a sort of anguish, that we to-day talk on the floor of this House of the possibility of war for Canada,

a land of hope, a land of hospitality; it is not without a pang, without some bitterness, that still close to the cradle out of which our young country has just come to take its place among nations, we should have to evoke scenes of bloody warfare; and we mourn at the thought of adding to these precious jewels with which we had adorned it—civil liberty, religious freedom, political liberty, liberty of trade—the battle axe, not for purposes of attack, but for purposes of defence, direct or indirect. How much more we would have preferred to adorn it with olive and laurel blossoms, as symbols of peace.

But alas, the hour of disarmament, of universal peace has not yet come; and should we not despair at finding that even the most civilized nations have heretofore as a last resort pinned their faith to the effectiveness of their guns. What would be the use of persistently taking refuge in doctrines and theories of a very humanitarian character, and which all accept and admire, if, at a certain moment we are made to decamp at the point of the bayonet. War is abhorrent to all of us, but, if war is declared or waged against us, are we foolishly to let other people take our lives without a move, so as to express our aversion for such a scourge.

For six centuries past, humanity has condemned war, and during all that time nations were waging war on one another under pretense of rights to vindicate, of grievances to avenge. Will ever a means be found to ensure the maintenance of universal peace? We may at least hope so. But before that is found, are we justified in dispensing with means of defence? Would it not be almost equivalent to suicide?

Therefore, I say it is a duty incumbent on us to overcome that aversion, and to consider the present and the future as practical men who love their country. Since it is necessary, let us begin by providing Canada with the means of protection indispensable towards ensuring her safety, her advancement and the respect of foreigners in her national life, as well as in her business transactions; but at the same time, let us express the hope that we shall never be called upon to draw the sword against other peoples; should that be the sole result of armaments, it would be ample compensation for our sacrifices. Yes, God forbid that our immense plains should ever be moistened by anything else but the morning dews! God forbid that in our Canada the roaring of guns should ever be heard, except to proclaim the benefits of peace, to echo the rejoicings of our people and proclaim the glories of our country.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is so important that I desire to say a few words on it before the debate closes. This Canadaof ours is the greatest self-governing colony of the British empire, and so far as I have been able to judge we have received in our day and generation at least, just as fair treatment from the motherland as we could reasonably wish. In the course of the debate some hon. gentlemen have referred to incidents that have happened in the days gone by, but such past events have little concern with the issue now before the country. The United States rebelled against Great Britain for grave reasons, and Great Britain learned the lesson how to govern her colonies so as to obtain their love and respect. Now, Sir, there is no one in this House more loyal to British connection than I am. I suppose that the right hon. gentleman who leads the House would possibly refer to me as a dreadful imperialist, but that appellation has many different meanings, and the proper meaning of that word is one who believes in maintaining the British empire by all reasonable means. I am a Canadian first, I am for Canada, but I believe that it is to our interest to stay in the British empire, because to my mind it is thus that we can best ensure our peace, our security, and our happiness as a nation. I need not refer to the present day greatness of the British empire or to the noble part she has played in history. Never has the world seen such a grand empire, and the dearest wish of my heart is to see it perpetuated if that can be accomplished and in a way satisfactory to all the component nations. I believe, Sir, that our race is surely capable of finding some practical solution of imperial problems, among which this one of naval defence is now presented for our consideration. The hon. the leader of the opposition has very closely set forth in his speech my views when he gave utterance to the following language:

> It is not wise to prophesy what the future may bring forth, but I would venture to hope that a defence committee or an imperial conference having special jurisdiction over defence matters, composed of men from both parties in Great Britain itself as well as in the self-governing nations of the empire, would have some control over the organization of imperial defence, and as an outcome of such a committee or such a conference I would expect that in future Great Britain would engage in no great war without knowing before hand that she would have the support and the sympathy of every one of the great self-governing nations of the empire. This would give to these dominions a voice in the control of war, because I thoroughly agree that if we are to take part in the permanent defence of this great empire we must have some control and some voice in such matters.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this prophecy is sure to come true, if the empire is to hold together, and if we should now ask for some representation of that

kind in the empire's councils, provided we give regular and effective assistance to the imperial navy, in what way may seem best to us, is it not likely that Great Britain would grant our request. Autonomy is certainly essential to the welfare of a colony, but not absolute autonomy in everything. The whole empire must be greater than any one part of it, greater than Canada or the United Kingdom in themselves, and the voice of the empire so expressed would carry greater weight, and have more power than the voice of any single Dominion. Each part of the empire must have control over its own local affairs, but some means ought to to be found so that in future, if there is to be a war, that war will be declared by the empire, and not by the United Kingdom as at present. And, Sir, if we are to stay in this British empire, as I hope we may, then we must do our share to defend ourselves, for that is the only thing that would satisfy Canadians who are a self-reliant, and a self-respecting people. I think, Sir, that we should do our share of the empire's defence of our own free will. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and every nation must protect itself. I do not pretend to say that it is easy to declare exactly how this should be done, or how we should do our share in the empire's defence. In my view, Sir, the question has not been long enough before the people. The Prime Minister stated that the people of Canada had the question before them since 1902, but I do not agree with the right hon. gentleman in that. It is true that in 1902 the question was raised at the imperial conference of that year, but until the past year it never came up for consideration before the people as a whole. I think I am safe in saying that not five per cent of the people of Canada ever heard of or knew what resolutions were passed in 1902, and therefore, I submit that our people have not had sufficient time to consider this very serious matter. I believe that it is to the interest of all classes and races in this Dominion that British connection should be maintained, for I think I am safe in saying that no country except Great Britain has ever given to her colonies such civil and religious liberty as Canada enjoys. And, in this connection I may say that it is my belief that the great masses of the people of Canada, not only English Canadians, but French Canadians, are loyal to the British Throne, and appreciate the advantages which we have received from the motherland. In 1870, Sir George Etienne Cartier who is generally acknowledged to be as great a statesman as Canada ever produced was Minister of Militia, and in that year a question arose with regard to Canada providing a permanent militia to replace some of the imperial troops which had been withdrawn from this country.

Through his influence and the influence of others the matter was arranged, and Sir George Cartier prepared a state paper on May 19, 1870, from which I quote as follows:

> The announcement in the former despatch (from Lord Granville) of the 12th February last, that the arrangements therein contemplated are contingent upon time of peace, and are in no way intended to alter or diminish the obligations which exist on both sides in case of foreign war, is very satisfactory to the Canadian government, who receive with gladness the reiteration of the assurance conveyed in the despatch of the 17th June, 1865, that the imperial government fully acknowledged the obligation of defending every portion of the empire, with all the resources at its command, on the reciprocal assurances given by the Canadian ministers, then in London, that Canada was ready to devote all her resources, both in men and money, to the maintenance of her connection with the mother country.

This paper was concurred in unanimously by the Dominion cabinet on May 20, 1870, and it shows the feeling of Sir George Cartier at that time and the feeling of the people whom he represented.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that the first thing we ought to decide in connection with this matter at present is that whatever we do shall be efficient. I do not believe that this country should spend a vast sum of money without giving any real help to the empire. Whatever differences of opinion there may be in this country on this question, we surely all agree in that. The present proposal of the government is one of no real practical value. It seems to me that it is only a farce, and will only result in our having a false sense of security, while we spend vast sums of money, which will go on increasing year by year; and we shall not have any ships which, in case of war, will be of any real benefit to us or to the empire in helping her to defend us. I believe this government has tried to deceive the people in this matter; it has tried to make them believe that it is really proposing some effective measure, that it is doing what the British admiralty wishes it to do. Last summer there was in London a conference of the self-governing colonies. I am not going into the details of this part of the question, because it has already been discussed in this House by many of the speakers who have preceded me. But in general I would say that at that conference the British admiralty stated that as a matter of naval strategy the best thing the colonies could do would be to contribute in money; but at the same time it was recognized that that would not be satisfactory to the colonies. Then the British minister, Mr. McKenna, stated that what the admiralty would really like would be a fleet unit on the Pacific. Australia had

promised a fleet unit, New Zealand had promised the principal ship of a fleet unit, Great Britain herself was to give a third, and what the admiralty would like was that Canada should give a fourth. The Canadian representatives demurred at that, and asked that something should be suggested that would not cost so much money. Then the British government suggested that Canada might get an auxiliary Bristol, some cruisers and other vessels, in accordance with the scheme now proposed by this government. The British admiralty did not say that these ships would be of any particular service to them in time of war; yet this government has adopted this scheme and put it before the people of this country as a fulfilment of the wishes of the British admiralty. In the speech from the Throne last November there were the following words:

Two members of my government attended the imperial conference called by His Majesty's government, on the question of defence. A plan was adopted, after consultation with the admiralty, for the organization of a Canadian naval service, on the lines of the resolution of the House of Commons of the 29th of March last.

This clause in the speech from the Throne was drafted for the purpose of making the people believe that the plan suggested by this government was the one proposed by the admiralty. I submit that these words should not have been put into His Excellency's mouth when the government intended to bring down this Bill, which does not provide for any effective assistance. Moreover, the government's plan is not on the lines of the resolution of last March. That resolution has been fully discussed, and I do not propose to quote it now; but I understood it to mean that we Canadians were prepared to render effective assistance in the defence of the empire when it was required. The resolution of last March was passed under special circumstances, and was intended to show to the world that we were a unit in our desire to maintain the British empire, and to do what was reasonable to that end. At the same time, I do not argue that the exact words of that resolution are binding for ever. Circumstances change, and while our intent is the same, we may carry out that intent in a different way from what was proposed at that time. The Prime Minister has attempted in his speech to lead the country to believe that we are not ready to act up to this resolution while the government is. On February 3, at page 3035 of 'Hansard' the right hon. gentleman said:

When this resolution was moved, and accepted by a unanimous vote, we believed that it would be binding upon the other side of the House as it is binding upon this side, but in this we made a mistake. We supposed when this resolution had been voted on, gentlemen on the other side of the House who had given their assent would at least have the small merit of consistency, but in this we were deceived. It never entered our minds that men on the other side of the House would go back on the vote they had solemnly given. In this again we had made a mistake. We paid them too great a compliment.

I submit that the government itself has not carried out this resolution and that this proposal of the government is not in accordance with it. The resolution was passed unanimously by the House, but the government has taken to itself the sole right to interpret it. In that resolution are the words:

Along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference.

This proposal of the government does not follow the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference. To establish that I shall read a part of the English report of the 1907 conference contained on page 129 where Lord Tweedmouth says:

We welcome you and we ask you to take some leading part in making more complete than it is at present the naval defence of the empire. I wish to recognize all that our cousins over the sea have done in consequence of decisions of former conferences. I know that you gave to the government and to the admiralty with a free and unstinted hand, the help that you thought you could manage to give. Gentlemen, I have only one reservation to make, and in making it I ask that, as we have proved ourselves successful in the past, you should put your trust in us now. The only reservation that the admiralty desire to make is, that they claim to have the charge of the strategical questions which are necessarily involved in naval defence, to hold the command of the naval forces of the country, and to arrange the distribution of ships in the best possible manner to resist attacks and to defend the empire at large, whether it be our own islands or the dominions beyond the seas. We thoroughly recognize that we are responsible for that defence. We want you to help us in that defence, we want you to give us all the assistance you can, but we do not come to you as beggars; we gladly take all you can give us, but at the same time, if you are not inclined to give us the help that we hope to have from you, we acknowledge our absolute obligation to defend the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

In other words, the only thing that Lord Tweedmouth asked was that they should have charge of the strategical question of naval defence in case of naval war, and this proposal of the government does not so provide. Therefore I say that when the right hon. gentleman who leads this House undertook to make the country believe that we had gone back on our resolution while the government had stuck to it, he is re-

versing the true position, because this government has certainly not brought down a Bill or a suggestion of naval defence which accords with the resolution of last March. The right hon. the Prime Minister in his speech on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne on November 15 last, said:

> Need I say to my hon. friend that whether we have such a navy or not, we do not loose our right to self-government; that if we do have a navy, that navy will go to no war unless the parliament of Canada, including the hon. gentleman, choose to send it there.

Clauses 18 and 19 of the Bill provide that the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty the Canadian ships which this government proposes to build. Clause 19 provides that if the Governor in Council decides to place our ships at the disposal of the British admiralty then parliament must be called at once to consider it, but if the government decides not to place the ships at the disposal of the admiralty then nothing happens, parliament is not called together, and the ships do not go. It seems to me a curious distinction. If parliament is to decide as to what the ships shall do, then parliament should decide whether it is for or against. I do not see why this distinction has been put in the Bill. In any case the right hon. gentleman and the other members of this government must know that these clauses in the Bill are wholly misleading. In case of a war between Great Britain and some foreign country, that foreign country will be the one to settle whether Canada is at war or not, and if the country which is at war with Great Britain attacks our vessels we must then fight or haul down the Union Jack and practically secede from the empire. So I say to the government that these clauses must have been placed in the Bill to mislead somebody, or other, because it is impossible that Canada should keep out of any war that Great Britain may be in, if the foreign country which is at war with Great Britain chooses to come here and attack us.

This seems to be too important a matter for any government to have the right to decide. I do not think that any Canadian government, I do not care who might be at the head of affairs, should have it in its power to virtually decide in this extraordinary way that Canada should become independent. We know that this Liberal government arrogates to itself great powers in every direction, but surely it is for the people of this country to decide a matter of so vital importance, and not for any government.

I was exceedingly sorry to see that the right hon. the Prime Minister in discussing this question attempted to make party capital out of it. He followed the Liberal party press in trying to make out that this plan of the government had been agreed to by both parties. The Liberal press has in many cases referred to this Naval Bill as the Laurier-Borden programme. For instance I find that the Toronto 'Globe' on January 3, in an editorial says:

> The 'Citizen' virtually says that Mr. Ellis is prepared to swallow the Laurier-Borden naval programme, even to the extent of leaving the control of the fleet to the Canadian people in time of peace.

I claim that this is an unfair way of putting the case as there was no Laurier-Borden programme whatever. There was a resolution passed unanimously by this House in March last, but the difficulty regarding it consists in the interpretation which might be put upon it, and in the way in which it might be thought best to carry it out. If it was intended by the government that this Naval Bill should be a joint arrangement agreed to by both parties, then, I submit, it was the duty of the government to keep the leader of the opposition informed as to what was going on, to consult with him and to arrive at some understanding satisfactory to everybody as to what was best to do. I have always thought that that would have been good statesmanship, and that in a matter of this kind it would have been better for Canada if the government had taken the leader of the opposition into their confidence when this matter was being discussed and tried to have arrived at some programme that would have been satisfactory to both sides. Instead of that, the proceedings of the conference were kept absolutely secret, and even after parliament met it was with the greatest difficulty that we could find out exactly what the government had decided to do. When the proposal of the government in this matter did come down, it was found by our side of the House to be entirely different from what the resolution and the admiralty called for. As an alternative of this plan of the government, the leader of the opposition has suggested another, which will not only be more economical for this country, but will give a great deal more help to Great Britain than the proposal suggested by the government. When the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the second reading of this Bill, it seemed to me that he did not take the dignified course that I should have expected of him on that occasion. This question is, perhaps, the most momentous one that has ever been brought before this parliament, because the consequences which will flow from it will extend over many years and the decision taken at this time must greatly affect the course we shall have to pursue

in the future. When the Prime Minister was moving the second reading of such a Bill, it seems to me, he ought to have confined himself to a statesmanlike review of the Bill in order that every person should understand it thoroughly, and that the people of the country might have a chance to consider it carefully. Instead of that, the right hon. gentleman made a campaign speech in this House without discussing very much the merits of the Bill. He began by taunting this side of the House because, he said, we had a divergence of views, we did not all think alike. He spoke of this at some length, attempting to set one part of the opposition against the other, and to have the country know that we had some difference of opinion. The right hon. gentleman, when he discussed the question in that way, forgot that he himself had changed his mind regarding this question, and that in 1907 he had refused to do practically exactly what the government now proposes to do. In the conference of 1907, it was moved by Mr. Smartt:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

You will notice that this resolution does not call for any particular form of contribution; it may be given in the form of money, or the establishment of naval defence, or in other service. When that resolution was moved, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in our respect in that country before committing ourselves to a general claim.

So, the right hon. gentleman changed his mind since 1907, and it seems to me that, when moving the second reading of this Bill, he might have occupied his time to much better advantage than in talking of any difference of opinion there may be among members of the opposition in this House. We may have our differences of opinion; we acknowledge that frankly. Our friends opposite have as great differences among themselves, but they keep them quiet for fear they may lose control of the reins of power.

I take great pleasure in supporting the amendment of the leader of the opposition on this occasion. It seems to me that in the critical state which exists at present in Europe, we ought to do something to show the mother country and the world where we stand, and that we are willing to help the mother country in case of emergency. As to whether there is an emergency or not, I will quote the words of Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, a man better fitted than any other to understand the true position of affairs:

When the German programme is completed Germany will have a fleet of thirty-three Dreadnoughts. That fleet will be the most powerful the world has ever seen. This imposes upon us the necessity of rebuilding the whole of the fleet. That is the situation. If we were to fall into a position of inferiority we should cease to count for anything among the nations of Europe, and we should be fortunate if our liberty were left, and we did not become the conscript appendage of some stronger power. That is a brutal way of stating the case; but it is the truth.

These are not the words of a jingo or a scaremonger, but of Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary. Under these circumstances, I say, it is our duty to show Great Britain and the world that we are prepared to assist her in an emergency of this kind. This we can do of our own free will, and it would in no wise compromise our autonomy, which we are all as anxious to maintain as the right hon. Prime Minister himself. There would be no promise of an annual contribution, and the question as to what we might do in the future would be left entirely in abeyance. This would enable our people to have time to really understand this question before finally deciding what Canada ought to do. What strikes me, I may say, most forcibly in this matter, after hearing all the discussions in this House and talking it over with many people outside, is how little the people understand it. It has not been before us long enough for us to thoroughly grasp it, and there is no doubt in my mind that the ideas of the people regarding it have not yet been crystallized, although it is generally recognized that Canada should assist in her own naval defence according to her ability. The acute stage of this question has only lasted about a year, and there have been no debates or meetings throughout the country at which this question has been expounded so that the people might have a chance of hearing and understanding all sides before making up their minds. How can we possibly expect that the people should thoroughly understand this question when those of us who have studied it most carefully find it exceedingly difficult to make up our minds what method would be the best for us to follow? It strikes me that the question is one which

requires plenty of discussion, and I do not think that a plebiscite would be the best way in which to accomplish this purpose. That would give us no chance for discussion and explanation. The only real way in which the people can reach an understanding on this problem is to have it taken up in a general election. If we had a plebiscite or referendum, there would be no reason why any one should go out on the platform in the cities or the country districts to discuss this question from all sides and enable the people to understand it, whereas if we had it discussed in a general election, the fate of the government would depend on the issue, and we would be all out trying to have the people look at it as we do, and the people would really have a chance of learning something about it.

In conclusion, I would say that I have the honour to represent a county with a mixed population, in almost exactly the same proportions as are to be found in the Dominion. I firmly believe that both the French and the English would vote to protect their own homes and firesides if they only understood this question. I believe that the great majority of the people of all classes are in favour of the British empire and the maintenance of our British connection, but I am sure that they do not want to contribute regularly or annually to the defence of the empire without having some say regarding the questions of war and the methods of using their contributions of ships or money. To my mind, this is the greatest question which has been before this parliament for many a day, and consequently our decision cannot fail to be most important. It will be one which will affect the course ot events, not only in this country but in various parts of the British empire, for many years to come, and it seems to me that the people of Canada should be given ample time to thoroughly understand this question and to give it their cool and calm judgment before it is finally decided.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). I do not intend to occupy much of the time of the House at this late stage of the debate. The question has been so exhaustively discussed that it is almost impossible for one to take it up at this time without treading on ground which has already been traversed again and again. I feel, however, that I cannot allow the motion for the second reading to pass without expressing, otherwise than by registering a simple vote, my uncompromising opposition to the measure. I regard the Bill as the most revolutionary proposal, so far as the relations of Canada with the mother country are concerned, which has ever been submitted to this parliament for its approval. I have carefully studied the Bill, and can view it in no other light than that it is a direct blow, deliberately aimed by its authors, at British connection. What proof of this, you ask? I reply that barring clause 4, which nominally, and only nominally, vests the command in chief of the forces in the King, there is not a line or a word from the beginning to the end of the Bill, which, by the remotest implication, acknowledges that any connection whatsoever exists between this country and Great Britain and her other over-seas dominions. On the contrary, the whole Bill studiously ignores the existence of any connection and is framed upon the bold assumption that Canada is an independent nation, owing no allegiance to or interest in the British empire. As I have said, clause 4 of this Bill nominally, and only nominally, vests the command in chief of the proposed naval forces in the King. But for this one clause, the effect of which, as I will show, is completely nullified by subsequent clauses, the Bill is precisely such an one as might be passed by this parliament if it were the parliament of a separate and distinct republic. Clause 4 of the Bill is inserted for the reason that the constitution which the parliament of Great Britain gave this country makes it impossible to omit it. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), in the very telling and eloquent address which he delivered the other night in opposition to this Bill, quoted section 15 of the British North America Act. Let me quote that section again:

> The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces of and in Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

That provision makes it impossible for this parliament to divest His Majesty of the command in chief of our naval forces reserved to him by the terms of that section; and I firmly believe that were it not for the fact that this parliament is thus restrained by imperial enactment, the name of the King would not have appeared in this Bill from beginning to end. However, it does appear for the reason I have given, and then follow immediately clauses which completely nullify and abrogate clause 4. Let me read clause 5:

> 5. The minister shall have the control and management of all naval affairs, including the purchase, maintenance and repair of the ordnance, ammunition, arms, armouries, stores, munition and habiliments of war intended for the use of the naval service.

And clauses 6, 7 and 8:—

> 6. The minister shall have the control and management, including the construction, purchase, maintenance and repair, of naval es-

tablishments and of ships and other vessels for the naval service.

7. There shall be appointed an officer, not lower in rank than rear admiral, to be called the director of the naval service of Canada. If a suitable officer of such rank is not available then an officer of the rank of captain may be appointed, who shall have the rank of commodore of the first class.

2. The director of the naval service of Canada shall, subject to the regulations and under instructions of the minister, be charged with the direction of the naval service.

8. The Governor in Council may appoint a naval board to advise the minister on all matters relating to naval affairs which are referred to the board by the minister.

2. The composition, procedure and powers of the board shall be as prescribed.

Then we have sections 17 and 18:—

17. The Governor in Council may place the naval forces or any part thereof, on active service at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of an emergency.

18. In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service, or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen by every one who carefully examines the language of those particular sections, 17 and 18, that they are absolutely inconsistent with section 4 and with the command in chief of the navy being vested in His Majesty. Take section 18. How absurd it is to say that the command in chief of the navy is vested in the King and then immediately to follow it with the statement which appears in this section that the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of the commander in chief the naval forces of Canada? The Governor in Council may place at the disposal of the King, who is the commander in chief under section 4, the naval forces of Canada and the Governor in Council may not place this navy, of which the King is the nominal commander in chief, at the disposal of His Majesty for service in the imperial navy. The Governor in Council may withhold the navy from its commander in chief, the King, or may refuse to allow the navy which is to be established by his Bill to co-operate with the British navy in any war in which Great Britain may be involved. Under section 17 the Governor in Council, who is the government of this country and at the present time means none other than Sir Wilfrid Laurier, is authorized to send this navy to the assistance of any nation of the world without regard to the intereste of the British government. There is authority given under the terms of that section to place the naval forces, or any part thereof, on active service at any time and in any place. They are given full power, if they dare to exercise it to send this navy to the assistance of France, United States, or even Germany. These, it seems to me are powers which should not be vested in the government of this country—I do not care of whom composed. Under section 17 of this Bill, Sir Wilfrid Laurier may send the navy to the assistance of any nation in the world as he may under section 18 withhold its co-operation with the British navy and prevent its participation in any war in which Great Britain may be engaged. It is very clear to me, and, I think, must be clear to any one who has carefully examined the provisions ot these sections, that they divest His Majesty the King, of the command in chief of the naval forces in Canada, and that they are, therefore, unconstitutional. I believe that if the British government is well advised, if its members have not been duped by the constant dinging into their ears by the Prime Minister and his anti-imperialistic colleagues of this wearisome cry of autonomy, they will advise that the royal assent be withheld from this Bill until at least these two clauses which are clearly in violation of section 15 of the British North America Act are expunged. If these clauses stand and are allowed to become law it is as clear as the noonday sun that the Bill places in the hands of the Goverinor in Council an instrument in the form on an absolutely independent navy the use or non-use of which may be fraught with the most far-reaching consequences to our position as a Dominion of the British empire or as a nation of the world.

Let the right honourable gentleman, who has so often offended the British sentiment of this country, have his way, when it comes to the question of Canada going to the aid of the motherland in any war which may arise, and let him refuse to send the so-called Canadian navy, if he choose or if he dare. What of the consequences?

It is only necessary to ask the question. Beyond all doubt, his ultimatum in such a contingency would be a declaration of independence.

Is this parliament, are the people of this country willing to place such a power in the hands of this or any government or Prime Minister, especially in the hands of the present Prime Minister, who, in this parliament only a few days ago, boastfully stated that he was no imperialist, who has declared, over and over again, on the floors of parliament, in the province of Quebec and even upon the soil of a foreign country, that the goal of his aspiration was 'independence' and the severing of the tie that binds us to the motherland, who, in the imperial

conference of 1907 registered the Dominion of Canada—to the shame of every patriotic Canadian—as the only colony of the empire which was not willing to contribute in any way to the maintenance of the naval supremacy of the British empire, and who since this Bill was introduced had had the temerity to state in the loyal city of Toronto, that the King has no rights in this country except what the parliament of Canada has given to him?

Why does the government of Canada want a navy separate from, and independent of the British navy, repudiating, as this Bill does, all connection with the British admiralty? Is it that we know better how to build a navy? Is it that we know better how to man and run a navy? Is it that we can build or maintain it more cheaply or more efficiently than the British admiralty? Is it that a navy constructed under the direction of the government of Canada will be more valuable and effective for the defence of the empire, or for the defence of Canada alone, if you like, than the British navy? Not one of these questions but has to be answered in the negative—no, to every one of them. I do not think that a single hon. gentleman on the other side of the House would contend for one moment that we know better how to build or man a navy than do the British admiralty or that a navy built in this country will be more effective for the defence of the empire or of Canada than a navy co-operating with the British navy and under the direction of the British admiralty. Then, why is it that the government is determined to build and run a navy on its own responsibility? It is because and only because the government is more zealous to defend Canada against even the semblance of British connection than it is to defend Canada or the empire against the ships or guns of a foreign foe.

Autonomy, autonomy, they shout when the shores of Great Britain and the integrity of the British empire are threatened by a grave and imminent peril, and when our autonomy, so-called, has never once in our history been restrained or threatened in the slightest degree so far as the full and plenary powers which have been assigned to this parliament by the British North America Act are concerned.

Then, what do they mean by this cry of autonomy? They mean, in my humble judgment, just precisely what the word in its true signification means—they mean independence, they mean separation; they mean, in short, what Sir Wilfrid Laurier has so repeatedly declared is the goal of his aspiration : Independence and disunion, the severing of the tie that binds Canada to the motherland. That is the reason, and the only reason why the parliament of Canada is asked, when laying down its naval policy, to recognize no association or connection with the greatest navy of the world—the pride of every loyal British subject—and to own no allegiance to the greatest empire in history. This parliament may stand for that, but I venture the prediction that the people of this country will not. Certainly, as one member of this parliament, I do not propose to stand for it. In my judgment this is the paramount objection to this Bill, that it makes for disunion. But it is not by any means the only objection. No matter from what standpoint we regard it —whether we look at it from an imperial standpoint or a Canadian standpoint, or from a purely practical business standpoint—there does not seem to be a single consideration of any kind to commend it, unless indeed the huge expenditure of money for which it provides is its commendation in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. It ignores the present threatened danger to the supremacy of the British navy, which is the only reason for our doing anything at all at the present time. It does absolutely nothing to meet this emergency, in as much as the navy for which it provides cannot by any possibility be ready for action for years after the crisis has passed and Britain's supremacy has been decided, probably once and for all. It provides for a navy whose ships will be obsolete before they are ready to be manned; a navy of such puny proportions that even if it were ready for action it would be incapable of attack and incapable of defence; a navy whose only function in the event of war, according to the statement of the government's principal French Canadian newspaper organ in Montreal, will be to elude pursuit; a navy which would not only be useless but positively mischievous and dangerous. But, Sir, a navy which will entail upon the Canadian people an initial capital expenditure estimated by the government at $16,000,000 or $17,000,000, and an annual expenditure for upkeep and maintenance estimated at $6,000,000 or $7,000,000; and, if the past record of this government in the matter of financial estimates affords any criterion, these figures will have to be trebled and even quadrupled. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as was pointed out by the member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), violates all the essential principles of the resolution passed by this parliament on the 29th of March last. It completely ignores, as I have said, the present emergency. It provides for the establishment of a navy absolutely independent of the British navy, contrary to the advice of the British admiralty. It provides for a navy owning no connection or association with the Royal Navy of Great Britain, whereas the resolution of last year distinctly laid it down that if our contribution to imperial defence

should take the form of a navy to be built by Canada, it should be in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy along the lines suggested by the admiralty. For these reasons I propose to vote against this Bill.

In respect to the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) though I fully agree that this parliament should not venture to commit Canada to such a novel and far-reaching policy as the government now proposes, without first obtaining a mandate from the people I cannot support the amendment of the hon. gentleman for the reason that he has moved it as an amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, and if it were carried it would supplant the amendment of the leader of the opposition, which not only provides that the people of the country shall have an opportunity of passing upon the question of a Canadian navy, and in a more regular and constitutional manner, before the country is committed to such a policy, but which at the same time provides for an immediate contribution of two Dreadnoughts to the British admiralty to meet the present crisis. I shall, therefore, vote with the greatest confidence for the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition, and I shall vote with equal confidence against the second reading of this Bill, which I consider, as I have already stated, is the most revolutionary proposal which has ever been submitted to this parliament so far as the relations of Canada with the British empire are concerned.

Mr. D. H. McALLISTER (Kings and Albert). Mr. Speaker, this debate has now occupied the attention of the House for such a long time that I trust that my contribution to it shall be brief. I must say that a great many of the speeches delivered from both sides of the House have shown a careful study of the subject submitted for our consideration, but I agree that other hon. gentlemen have seen fit to stray very far from the question. When the memorable resolution of March 29 last was passed in this House, it appeared to me from the nature of the speeches delivered on both sides that no political bias would be imported into this very grave matter. Last year the leader of the opposition and his first lieutenant (Mr. Foster) were of the opinion that a Canadian navy would be the best means of imperial defence, and I was one of those who hoped that both political parties could agree on that. Speaking on the 29th of March, 1909, ('Hansard', page 3613) the leader of the opposition said:

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the naval defence of this country I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that. The other experiment has been tried as between Australia and the mother country and it has not worked satisfactorily in every respect. In Great Britain the contribution has perhaps been regarded as rather unsatisfactory. In Australia it, in the end, failed to meet with the approval of the people for the reason that Great Britain felt constrained to ask Australia that the field of operations of the squadron should be extended to the China and Indian seas, and if the operation of that squadron were so extended the Australians felt that the contribution which they had been making for some years past was not really being used to give that protection to Australia which they felt it should have. So that, the policy of Australia at the present time is the policy of the submarine and torpedo boats which, in case of war, would cooperate with the armed cruisers and battleships of the British navy. It was pointed out in discussing this question that although the people of Australia provided a force of that kind they would provide a force which it would be very difficult if not impossible for Great Britain to send across the seas, and that when they were protecting themselves they were providing the best possible force for the protection of the empire.

Now, this certainly was a declaration for a Canadian navy and, backing up this view, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) used these words:

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to that form of aid. It goes out further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year. After ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years, you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime; but in Canada itself there will be no roots struck, there will be no residue left, there will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product. Yet some time or other, as true as we live to be a people with a population constantly increasing, we must actually have in this country a naval force of our own for our coast and home defence.

The interest that we take in a contribution spent by another is not the interest that I desire for Canada. I want to see something grafted on the soil of Canada's nationhood, which takes root and grows and develops until it incites the spirit of defence in this country, leads to a participation in the defence, leads to that quick interest in it, its glories, its duties and its accomplished work, which after all the one great thing that compensates a people for great expenditures either on land or on sea in the way of de-

fence and of the maintenance of the rights of the country.

Again, it disjoins what has been joined together from the earliest days of the world's existence—commerce and the protection of commerce. After all, the basic ideal of a naval force is the protection of the commerce of a country. A commerce side by side with its protector, and its protector side by side with the commerce of a country, flourish best together, and are the best helpers to each other. That is the idea which is in my mind —that when we make our contributions in the way of a fixed sum and it goes from us, and we are not responsible for it, we have none of the inspiring of a growth and development and a laying of a basis for future defence in our own country. We are deprived of the larger benefit ourselves, and in the future we do no greater service to the empire of which we form a part, in this matter of defence.

Then again, I think that method ignores the necessities and the aspirations and the prospects of a great people such as the Canadian people are destined to become. We must have beginnings; these must be small; but some time, or other, as I have said, our country will have its naval force for the defence of this country if for nothing else. The point with me is as to whether it is not the greater wisdom to sow the seed at once and cultivate its growth, as best we may, in our circumstances and with our resources, until at last we arrive at that stage of expansion which we have reached in other great lines of our country's progress. You will notice that while I have tried to discuss the pros and cons in connection with this method, while I have stated reasons in favour of and others against it, my own mind tends rather towards the employment of another form than that of an out and out money contribution.

I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the speeches of both the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The hon. member for North Toronto made a remark to the effect that a little instrument, I think he said a thumb-screw, had been at work on the Liberal side of the House to bring the supporters of the government into line. Down in my part of the country we use another kind of screw, a jack-screw, for lifting buildings, and I think that must have been the kind of screw used on these two hon. gentlemen.

A great deal has been said on the other side of the House about the loyalty of the right hon. the Prime Minister. The hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) compared the Prime Minister to Admiral Sir Joseph Porter in the comic opera 'Pinafore.' Under the circumstances I might compare the hon. member for St. Anne with another character in that same opera —I allude to Dick Deadeye, whose special function was to provide amusement for the rest of the crew. I may point out, moreover, that while Sir Joseph Porter was the master of the ship, Dick Deadeye was only a clown on board. The hon. member for St. Anne followed the example of other hon. gentlemen on the opposition side of the House, notably the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) in making reflections upon the loyalty of the Prime Minister; but what might be excused in the hon. member for Vancouver cannot be excused in the hon. member for Ste. Anne, who at one time occupied a dignified position on the bench. These two gentlemen set up their opinions against the opinion of His Majesty the King of England, who, on the occasion of the birthday of the Prime Minister last year, sent him a telegram, not only congratulating him on his birthday, but paying a tribute to his loyalty to the Crown and the empire. This is the answer to those two hon. gentlemen, and I would rather accept the assurance of His Majesty the King than the unsubstantiated vapourings of two disgruntled politicians.

Now, some gentlemen have insinuated that the principal object of this Canadian navy was to cause a separation or to make a wide breach between Canada and the empire. I am quite satisfied that these insinuations are very much uncalled for. The plan of the leader of the government is good—he looks farther than the leader of the opposition. The right hon. leader of the government years ago looked forward to the time when Canada would be a great nation within the empire, but he has not forgotten that Canada did not reach her present position without a struggle. Compare the policies of the two great parties. The government has one which has not only been suggested by the admiralty, but which meets the approval of the Liberal party as a whole. The Conservative plan, on the other hand, is to hand over to the British government the money to purchase two Dreadnoughts, and then submit to the people the question whether we should have a Canadian navy or not. I do not think the people will hesitate between these two propositions. The government's policy is a truly Canadian one. It helps to build up the country, it causes money to be circulated, it means that the money will be kept in Canada; because in order to have a Canadian navy we shall require shipyards and drydocks, which will be either at Halifax or at St. John. In these shipyards a large number of men will be employed, which will mean an increase of population, which in turn will help the merchants, the lawyers, the doctors and the farmers. Then these dry-docks will be used, not only for the construction and maintenance of a Canadian navy, but for other ships and steamers of the great transportation lines. As we have now no dry-docks in the maritime provinces, any ships requiring to be repaired have to be taken to New York or elsewhere, and Canadian labour gets no

benefit therefrom. After paying out $20,000,000 or $25,000,000, the leader of the opposition proposes to refer the question of a Canadian navy to the people; but he is quite willing himself to spend $25,000,000 of the people's money without asking their consent, and send it out of the country, and give it to the British authorities to spend as they see fit. They might use the money for the erection of a dry-dock in New Zealand, or a coaling station in Honduras or somewhere else, and even though it might be spent within the British empire it would be very unsatisfactory to the people of Canada.

A great deal has been said about the loyalty of the people of the province of Quebec. I think the people of the province of Quebec are as loyal to the British empire as they need to be, and we are proud to have a French Canadian leader, who believes in equal rights and privileges, as the Prime Minister of Canada does. I do not think anybody, English or French, should be condemned or found fault with if he is not altogether in favour of either a direct contribution or the establishment of a Canadian navy. I may say that when this matter was first talked of last year, I myself was rather of the opinion that the movement was a little premature. I did not think that Canada had any need to launch out on such a project, and I believe the great mass of the people I represent were against it, and they are as good British subjects as any of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House. I was of the opinion that if Canada had any money to spend it could be just as well spent in the developing of its farming interests and mining and the encouragement of proper immigration from different parts of Europe to this country. I quite realize now that with the growth of Canada, particularly since this government has come into power, with our magnificent revenue of something over $100,000,000, with our farming lands unexcelled in the world, with our timber lands and our mineral wealth yet unexplored, we have a great heritage that is worth protecting; and as a move has been made to assist the empire either in the form of a direct contribution or a Canadian navy, I am willing to accept and advocate, as my constituents will also, the establishment of a Canadian navy.

Another point that has been dwelt upon is that there is an emergency. For my part I do not believe there is any emergency. A great election campaign has just been fought in the old country, but during its course not a word was said about an emergency, the whole election was fought out on the budget and tariff reform.

The Prime Minister of England, speaking at the Reform Club in Liverpool, a few days before the election, said:

> Let me say then, once for all, and I speak with full deliberation and after careful and prolonged inquiry, that the navy to-day is able to maintain, not only this year, but in the years that lie before us, our supremacy at sea (cheers), and should the necessity arise, which God forbid, to guarantee the integrity of our commerce and the inviolability of our empire. The sister service, the army, is reaping now in full measure the benefit of the foresight and the constructive power and the undefeated energy of Mr. Haldane.

That was his opinion just before the election. We have heard nothing from England about an emergency. We have in London a High Commissioner, a gentleman of wide experience, and with exceptional opportunities for acquiring information, and if any trouble of that kind were brewing our government would have been notified long ago of its existence. There is too much of this militarism in the world anyway; often fanatics get together and work themselves up until they suffer from hallucinations, a form of insanity. I have here a few extracts from a magazine article:

> Tre most virulent and devastating disease now raging on the earth is militarism.

What do you think of that?

> The terror of a patient who is suffering from mental derangement is often pathetic. Surround him with granite walls, ten in number, and every wall ten feet thick, and he will still insist that he is unprotected.

Like a few of our hon. friends opposite, who think we are gone, body and soul.

> So it is with the militarist. Like many another fever, militarism grows by what it feeds on, and unless checked by heroic measures is certain to burn the patient up. Men in a delirium seldom have sense of humour. The world is fearfully grim to them, and life a solemn and tragic thing. They express absurdities with a sober face, and make ridiculous assertions without a smile. It may be that the militarists are in a sort of delirium. All the great nations are to-day facing deficits, caused in every case by the military and naval experts. Into what a tangle the finances of Russia and Japan have been brought by militarists is known to everybody. Germany has, in a single generation, increased her national debt from eighteen million dollars to more than one billion dollars.

I might read more of this article, but this is sufficient to illustrate my idea that this whole thing is exaggerated.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. From what is my hon. friend quoting?

Mr. McALLISTER. The 'Atlantic Monthly.' Would you like to have it? My hon. friend's question reminds me that there

has always been a lot of suspicion, I have evidence of it myself, among hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not like to see that. It is the worst thing in the world. I do not like to see any individual member or any group of members too suspicious. You know that the fox is the most suspicious animal, and that that rascal is the first fellow to rob a hen-house.

The defence conference saw the importance of the dominions beyond the seas laying the foundations of future dominion navies of their own, which forces would contribute immediately and materially to the imperial defence if need should occur. The Canadian ministers then in the old country agreed in that, and the next step was to see what the admiralty would suggest. What did the admiralty suggest?

That certain vessels be constructed as a nucleus of a Canadian navy.

To this the Canadian ministers then in England agreed, and the proposals now before the House are exactly in accordance with that suggestion. There seems to be some misapprehension in regard to the admiralty's proposals. Conservative members and the Conservative press speak as if the British admiralty suggested a course that had not been carried out by this government. That is not so. I understand that these objections are based on the fact that the British admiralty asked first a direct contribution or the establishment of a fleet unit consisting of a Dreadnought and auxiliaries. A careful perusal of the blue-book shows how closely the present proposal harmonizes with the admiralty's suggestion. The blue-book says:

As regards Canada, it was considered that her double sea-board rendered the provisions of a fleet unit of the same kind unsuitable for the present.

The reason for this must be obvious. A fleet unit to be any good must remain intact, and how can it remain together if it is to be stationed on the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts? To divide it would destroy the object sought and the British admiralty saw the position we were in. Knowing that to create and maintain two units would be beyond the financial position of Canada, they wisely determined to adopt an alternative course:

It was proposed, according to the amount of money that might be available, that Canada should make a start with cruisers of the 'Bristol' class and destroyers of an improved river class—a part to be stationed on the Atlantic sea-board and a part on the Pacific.

The principle of making a start was here clearly laid down:

Canada and Australia preferred to lay the foundations of fleet units of their own.

The scheme now submitted to the House by the Prime Minister is exactly upon these lines. Canada is making a start, and is making that start not only with the approval of but on the direct lines recommended by the admiralty. I think this reaches the objection raised by the opposition to the non-establishment of a fleet unit. As further evidence that the admiralty approved and recognized Canada's action, I refer to page 24, where it is said:

While laying the foundations of future Dominion navies to be maintained in different parts of the empire, these forces would contribute immediately and materially to the requirements of imperial defence....A simple contribution of money or material may be to one Dominion the most acceptable form in which to assist in imperial defence. Another while ready to provide local naval forces, and to place them at the disposal of the Crown in the event of war, may wish to lay the foundations upon which a future navy of its own could be raised.

I think this should be sufficient to dispose of the suggestion that Canada's action is contrary to the wishes of the admiralty. At page 24 of the report I find:

The main duty of the forthcoming conference as regards naval defence will be, therefore, to determine the form in which the various Dominion governments can best participate in the burden of imperial defence with due regard to varying political and geographical conditions. Looking to the difficulties involved, it is not to be expected that the discussions with the several Defence Ministers will result in a complete and final scheme of naval defence, but it is hoped that it will be found possible to formulate the broad principles upon which the growth of colonial naval forces should be fostered. While laying the foundations of future Dominion navies to be maintained in different parts of the empire, these forces would contribute immediately and materially to the requirements of imperial defence.

In the opinion of the admiralty, a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war.

Then at page 25 of the conference blue-book, we find:

It has been recognized that in time of war the local naval forces should come under the general direction of the admiralty.

This clearly contemplates that the navy should remain under local control in time of peace.

Great Britain cannot go to war without the consent of the British parliament; Canada cannot go to war without the consent of the Canadian parliament. In both cases they are co-equal. Why not?

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McALLISTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I won't ask it, if he gives permission in that manner.

Mr. McALLISTER. Well, yes, Sir.

Mr. HUGHES. Can Canada declare war?

Mr. McALLISTER. She can if the cabinet says so. What more do you want?

Mr. HUGHES. She can not.

Mr. McALLISTER. Very good. That's some more information I have got. As was stated by the Prime Minister, and as cannot be denied, when Britain is at war, Canada is at war. It follows as a sequence that parliament would give the necessary authority to pass the Canadian navy into the control of the imperial power should such a misfortune occur—and I must say that I do not see that there is any need of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I announce myself as supporting the policy of the government because I am convinced that it has the approval of the imperial authorities—that is the principal thing—and also for the reason that the Bill under discussion is made with due regard to our constitutional rights and privileges, which it is our first duty as representatives of the people to maintain and protect.

I have listened, as I said, with a great deal of care and attention to the speakers who have preceded me. I am going to read you a synopsis of what I think the most important speeches made during the debate. The hon. member for St. Anne (Mr Doherty) thought that the time for Canada to establish a navy was when she had a voice in imperial foreign affairs. The hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. McGrath) would make a contribution of ten millions to Britain spread over a few years —whatever that may mean. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. S. Sharpe) wanted a Canadian navy as outlined by the government increased to the extent of two Dreadnoughts, and this should be done without delay. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) would give two Dreadnoughts at once to Britain and submit the question of establishing a Canadian navy to the people. The hon. member for Huron announced that, in view of the policy of the government, he would support Mr. Borden's amendment, though he might not be in favour of it. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the alleged leader of the Conservative party in Quebec, advocated no contribution of vessels, money or anything else. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) said he was in favour of one navy, an imperial navy, and Canada should contribute to it but have no control over it. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton advocated doing a big thing. Entering into an obligation to provide half a dozen Dreadnoughts would, he said, meet with his approval. The hon. member for Huron would give to England, would pay the interest on a sufficient sum to enable that country to spend $50,000,000 in Dreadoughts, then there would be a navy to lend to Canada in case of emergency.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. I am sure the hon. member will allow me to correct him. I never suggested hiring Dreadnoughts or anything of that kind. Perhaps the hon. gentleman misunderstood me, or perhaps he was not in the House when I spoke.

Mr. McALLISTER. I may have the wrong constituency down. What constituency does the hon. member (Mr. T. Chisholm represent?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Huron.

Mr. McALLISTER. There are two or three Hurons. Evidently the hon. gentleman does not represent the right Huron. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) believed that Canada should give two Dreadoughts at once or the equivalent in money. So I could go on and read half a dozen more. But I have read enough, Mr. Speaker, to show you the diversity of opinion on the opposite side of the House. I can assure these hon. gentlemen that there is no diversity of opinion on this side. I would suggest that the hon. gentlemen go into caucus and to sing that good old song:

> Why do we wait, dear brothers?
> Why do we wrangle so long?
> If we don't get together in one policy,
> We'll be hungry ever so long.

But we on this side, join with sweet accord, under the wise and ever-seeing eye of the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, in favour of a Canadian navy built in Canada; we are in favour of a Canadian navy, built in Canada by Canadian people; of a Canadian navy, built in Canada by Canadian people with Canadian money; of a Canadian navy, built in Canada by Canadian people with Canadian money, under local control in time of peace and imperial control in time of war.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Macleod). The hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. McAllister) accused hon. members on this side of favouring a navy for imperialism and protection. I am prepared to admit that hon. members on that side have no desire for protection or they would not put faith in this Canadian tin-pot navy they propose. Rising at this time to address the House on this important question, I feel that I owe the House an apology for taking up

time at this stage of the debate. I would not do so but for the fact that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) alluded to myself, with some other hon. members on this side of the House, in his first speech after the opening of parliament this year as having gone back on our position of last March as expressed by the resolution passed by this House unanimously at that time in regard to helping the British empire in what seemed at that time to be a crisis in naval supremacy. I did not altogether approve of that resolution when it passed the House, but I was present when it was passed and am prepared to take my share of the responsibility for anything that was wrong in that resolution, even of anything I objected to at that time. The reasons why we let that resolution go through unanimously have been very well explained by previous speakers. This matter has been dealt with very thoroughly by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and several other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. So I will not take up time to discuss that phase of the question. But, having been present, I am prepared, as I have said, to take my share of responsibility. I would have stood by that resolution, and intended to stand by it, and did stand by it until after our delegates returned from the imperial conference last summer. But at a reception tendered to them on their return to this country the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) gave a synopsis of what had been done in the old country, and expressed great faith in this idea of political autonomy. In stating what had been done at the conference he said they had agreed upon a Canadian navy. I gathered from reading his address that it was either by extraordinary strategy or else by threats or force that Canada had wrested from Great Britain her political autonomy. This idea of political autonomy seems to me a mania with hon. members on the other side. They talk about it, and how we have practically wrested it from Great Britain by force or otherwise. I have never heard of Britain trying to prevent us from exercising the full powers vested in us under our constitution, until I heard hon. members on the other side talk as they did. As I have said, I intended to stand by that resolution, and would have done so but for the reasons I have stated. They compare their Naval Bill with the resolution of last March and accuse us of going back on the resolution which we unanimously supported last session. According to that resolution a navy was to be built, but it was to be built immediately, and to act in co-operation with the British navy, whereas the navy proposed by this government is not to be any part or parcel or to have anything to do with the British navy, so that on that score I do not think that this Bill in any way attempts to carry out the resolution unanimously passed last March. The navy then contemplated was to fly the British flag, but I understand there is quite a question to-day as to what flag we are to fly on our navy when built.

As regards employing our own labour and our own material, while I admit that we have the material in this country to build a navy and the brawn and the brains, while we have mechanics and labouring men just as capable, if properly directed, as any in the old country, our experience in the past has not been such as to give our people any confidence in the capability of our Marine and Fisheries Department to build a navy with any efficiency or economy. The report of the investigation into that department has not been assuring in any degree to the people, and consequently we may well hesitate in trusting that same department with the building of a Canadian navy. There is another assertion which I am prepared to make regarding the administration of that department. The other day I listened to a debate on the estimates between my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the Minister of Public Works with reference to a dredge which was built last year, in which the Minister of Public Works denied a statement made by the hon. member for East Grey, although I think the minister only cleared himself by a technicality. For my part, I am going to make this statement on a rumour which I believe to be well founded, and if it should turn out to be untrue, I am prepared to apologize to the House and withdraw. Within the last year or year and a half, the Marine and Fisheries Department built a dredge in the docks at Sorel, which cost in the neighbourhood of $200,000. After it was launched, they started putting in machinery and anchors and chains, and the vessel would have sunk to the bottom of the river, before even a pound of coal was put into it, if she had not been taken hold of with grappling irons. She was returned to the dock, and is there now getting a false bottom put into her. I have that statement on good authority, and I would like to have any minister, speaking for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, state whether it is true or not. Things of that kind and the other things we all know of that department are not reassuring to the people and not calculated to give them confidence in entrusting the building of a Canadian navy to that department. Not only would there in all likelihood be a great waste of money, but the lives of the crews, British subjects and Canadian citizens would not be safe in a navy built by these gentlemen.

As regards the cost of construction, that

has been estimated all the way from $11,000,000, up to $16,000,000 or $17,000,000, and the cost of maintenance has been estimated at any amount by hon. gentlemen opposite from three to seven million dollars a year, but I doubt very much whether these estimates come any way near the probable cost of this navy. If the estimate of the Prime Minister is not any closer to the actual cost than was his estimate of the cost of the Transcontinental railroad, we may safely say that within the first five years this navy will cost us $100,000,000. In all probability in the first five years it will cost this country as much as would build the Hudson bay railway, and within fifteen years we shall have spent more on it than would build the Hudson Bay railway and the Georgian Bay canal combined. And if we were to spend the money on these two enterprises we will have them completed and doing most useful work for Canada, whereas the Canadian navy, when completed, will be but a very useless piece of machinery.

We have heard a great deal regarding whether there is an emergency or not, especially at present. It is pretty hard for us here to give an accurate estimate of the conditions in the old world, and we have had quotations read to us from speeches made by the British prime minister and members of his cabinet during the recent election. Well, I have not very much faith in statements made at elections in the old country any more than in this country, but the leader of the home government and Sir Edward Grey, the Colonial Secretary, and I think the Chief Lord of the Admiralty, made statements before the colonial conference last June contrary to those made during the recent election campaign. I have far more faith in the statements they made before the imperial conference. They impressed the delegates with the idea that there was an emergency, that Britain was strained to the utmost to meet them, and they called most emphatically on the colonies to give any aid they could to the empire. I would not hesitate to say that it is right for this government to build dockyards.

I know nothing about a situation of that nature, but I believe it to be perfectly right for the government to encourage mercantile ship-building, employ our own labour and use our own materials. In two or three years, say after a general election, after the people have had time to consider the building of this navy, after calm and cool reflection, and after we have the dockyard ready, let us then decide whether we shall have a Canadian navy or not. When the people have had a chance to pronounce upon the question, if their verdict should be favourable, and if we find that we have the men, material and capacity necessary to such an enterprise, I would say: Go on and build the navy. But, by all means, give the people who are going to pay for this navy a chance to express their opinion with regard to it. No one party or government should determine whether we should enter into this enormous expenditure for the building of a navy, but I think that the people who are going to pay for it should have the right to a voice in the matter and should be given the opportunity of saying whether they are going to have a navy or not. If this navy that we are proposing to build was going to be part of the British navy and was going to meet an emergency, I would be prepared to make any sacrifice and take the responsibility upon myself of voting for it, but at the present time I do not feel like doing so. With reference to the cost, I mentioned what the government figures are in connection with the navy that they propose to build. I noticed that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat said that what is proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in his amendment is to contribute $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 to Great Britain as the price of two Dreadnoughts. I listened with a great deal of interest to the statements of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who went to a great deal of trouble to establish the correct figures, and their estimate was that the price of two Dreadnoughts would be about $19,000,000. I would be prepared to say that if we could build them for $19,000,000 or $20,000,000, or even $25,000,000, I would be in favour of the proposition, because I would like that whatever we do for the British navy may be well done, and that if we build Dreadnoughts for Britain we will build ships that are able to go into the front of the fighting line. With reference to the question as to whether an emergency exists or not, I would like to read to the House a portion of a letter received by me from one of my constituents last November, just after the House met. If the House will allow me, I would like to read the extract from this letter and to withhold the name of the man who wrote it. If any one on the other side of the House wishes to see the letter, I will be pleased to hand it over to him. The writer of this letter is a German by birth and served as an officer in the German army. He says:

Now, as you know, I came from that nation which has caused that justifiable scare in England, and, therefore, I know something of my old Fatherland, its spirit of patriotism and also its coasts along the North Sea. Should the time ever come when the German people felt strong enough and felt that they had a justifiable cause to attack England at sea, the attack will be so swift and so sudden and the results so decisive, either one way or the other that it would be childish to think of sending for the 'political fleet' of Sir Wilfrid

Laurier. You must be aware that owing to the natural conditions around England, should she lose this first battle, and her ports blockaded, starvation and surrender would be the end of this war, while on the other hand, Germany is far more favourably situated. So in face of these facts it is the merest hypocrisy for any honest Canadian to talk of having a navy of our own for the purpose of helping England. The Monroe doctrine up to now has been the fighting asset to which the Liberal government has pointed with pride to defend our shores. Why now a Canadian navy? Time and again in the past Britain has sent her cruisers to protect single individuals in foreign countries, and we, up to now, have not paid one cent for this protection (more shame to us). We should now make a start to maintain this fleet. If the utterances of our public men, of loyalty and devotion to the flag are not a screen behind which they pick the rate-payer's pockets, then by all means let us send our contribution in cash. Then we will know our money is spent in an honest and efficient manner, which we could never expect under the government proposal.

These are the views of a naturalized German. How much more strongly should a born Briton feel on the subject.

I would commend this opinion to those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have been so emphatic in the declaration that there is no naval scare and no need of Canada doing anything at the present time. I promised that I would only speak for a few moments and I am about done. I would like to see the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition put through, the Navy Bill thrown on the scrap heap for the present, and an appeal made to the people, whom you will find British to the core. 'One King, one flag and one British navy,' is good enough for me.

Mr. JOSEPH TURCOTTE (Quebec County). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to participate at any length in the debate that is now in progress and I intend to be as clear and methodical as possible in the few remarks I have to make. When the time comes, after the speeches have been delivered, to read the resolutions or the motions which are before the House, you will first take up, Sir, the resolution brought down by the government and then the amendments moved by the two factions which sit at the left. This will bring us back to the sitting of February 3rd last, over a month ago. You will then read No. 43 of the Votes and Proceedings, which contains the following:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved, That the Bill No. 95, An Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada, be now read the second time.

Mr. Borden moved in amendment thereto, That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following substituted therefor:—'the proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty and in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from of the empire in time of war are ill-advised and dangerous.

'That no such proposals can safely be accepted unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

'That the said proposals while necessitating heavy outlay for construction and maintenance will give no immediate or effective aid to the empire, and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

'That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditure of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

'That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.'

And a Debate arising thereon;

Mr. Monk moved in amendment to the proposed amendment, That all the words after the word 'That' be struck out and the following substituted therefor: 'this House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion that the Bill now submitted for its consideration, changes the relations of Canada with the empire, and ought, in consequence, to be submitted to the Canadian people, in order to obtain at one the Nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.'

And the Debate continuing;

As will be seen, there is first the main motion in connection with the second reading of the Bill and then the two amendments. As under the parliamentary rule, the vote has to be first taken on the amendment to the amendments, I am going to consider it first.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says in his amendment that the Bill now under consideration changes the relations of Canada with the empire and that is the reason why he is of the opinion that the question ought to be submitted to the people.

Sir, there is in that phraseology something incomprehensible. It is stated that this Bill changes the relations of Canada with the empire. What is the empire referred to by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, and how could you submit in such a shape to the Canadian people a question so imperfectly worded? Canada is part of the empire and how could the

relations of Canada with herself be changed? After the resolution of the 29th of March last had been adopted, the public press took hold of the question and discussed it, not from the standpoint of the Bill now under consideration, which is of purely administrative order, but in order to determine the course which the government should adopt as to future armaments with regard to their naval forces. I conceive that, strictly speaking, a question worded could be submitted to the people for consideration. But the Bill under discussion contains no clause which suggests more orders remotely, that the government has the intention of modifying the existing order of things with regard to Great Britain; or if there exists any change, it tends not to increase the responsibilities of Canada to England, but on the contrary, to restrict them. This is precisely what I wish to point out in a few words, by comparing in a summary way the proposed Act with the Act now in force.

Before going to the bottom of the question, I wish to remind the House that after the resolution of the 29th of March, 1909, had been adopted, the public press started an agitation in a small way and criticisms came out gradually. A series of articles on the question have appeared on the matter in a magazine called 'Revue Franco-Américane.' Those articles were later on published in pamphlet form under the title of 'The naval defence of the British empire. The gentleman who wrote that phamplet is the founder, the creator of the so-called nationalist party, a party whose field of action does not extend over the whole of Canada, but is restricted to the province of Quebec. His name is Oliver Asselin. That gentleman is now campaigning with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). They share the same ideas and are identified with the same work, their aim being to compel the government, if possible, to grant a plebiscite. Sir, that pamphlet, dated May, 1909, I find (page 10) the following:

I know very well that newspapers of different political shades disagree or pretend to disagree on the true bearing of the vote in the House of Commons. According to some, Canada would have once more evaded her duty as a British colony, owing to the attitude taken by the French Canadian who is now at the head of affairs. Others pretend that with the agreement and practically on the invitation of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Canadian parliament has completely changed the directing principle of our relations with the mother country.

The same writer adds this commentary, after having expressed the latter view.

The second interpretation is not absolutely fair either. As early as 1884, Sir John Macdonald made, in London, in the name of the Canadian people similar declarations to those just adhered to by our parliament. He said:

I vouch for the loyalty of Canada. I believe that her best interests depend on her union with the greatest empire in the world. I think that the policy of Great Britain is opposed to any offensive war, and I am satisfied that the people of Canada are ready to assume their share of the responsibility and of expenditure in any other war.

The writer quotes also another opinion advanced in 1886 by the same statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald, as follows:—

As to imperial federation, says the 'Times' he agrees that it is necessary.

He believes that, owing to the growth of the sister-nations of Australia, Canada and South Africa, the present relations, however smooth and agreeable they may be, could not continue indefinitely. As these auxiliary nations grow in the wealth and population, they will have to assume heavier responsibilities. In the name of the Canadian conferation, he may state that Canada is ready to join with the mother country in an offensive and defensive league; that she is ready to sacrifice her last man and her last shilling, for the defence of the empire and of the British flag.

When it is known that in any quarrel or conflict with England, ten million Australians and ten million Canadians will have to be reckoned with, who increased every year in number, the other nations will think twice before declaring war.

As will be seen, this is no new policy. It was already in vogue under the Conservative régime. It was the doctrine preached by the leader of the Conservative party over a quarter of a century ago. Consequently, there is very little change.

Let me now substantiate those statements by comparing the provisions of the Act now in force and those of Bill* (No. 95) which we are asked to adopt and which is destined to be substituted to the former.

Here is in brief the history of this Bill. The first Militia and Defence Act passed in 1868, deals with the organization and control of the land forces and the naval forces. That legislation was revised in 1883 and now forms chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1886. In 1904, they extracted from chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes all the provisions relating to the land forces and the Department of Militia and Defence was created. The moment that such portion of the provisions concerning the land forces has been abstracted from the Revised Statutes of 1886, chapter 41, this Act and the economy of this measure tend to create the constitutional order of things, as concerns the naval forces exclusively. But there is this strange anomaly, that in order to find out anything relating to the organization of our naval forces, you have to look for it

in that Act which deals mostly with the organization of our land militia. That accounts for this fact, that after the imperial conferences of 1902 and 1907, when the question of naval defence was brought under discussion, the Canadian government deemed it their duty to themselves and to the public as well as to the representatives of the sister-nations gathered in London and to the mother country itself to pass a new law, applying exclusively to the navy. Consequently, one of the hon. ministers who was then taking part in that conference and whose absence we all deplore to-day, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was authorized to prepare a Bill which is the very one we are discussing. When I say that we regret the absence of the hon. Mr. Brodeur, I do not mean simply to refer to the illness which, through a decree of Providence, removes him from our midst, but I say so, in the interest of the House itself and of the whole country. I sincerely believe that it is a misfortune in the debate that is now going on, that we should be deprived of the presence of the man who, by his clear sightedness, his science and his experience could have enlightened and guided us in the discussion of a measure which he had himself prepared and on which he had bestowed the best of his intelligence and of his soul.

Compelled as we are by circumstances, we have to do ourselves the work which the minister himself, no doubt, would have done. Therefore, I have tried to compare the two Acts in order to find out anything that might be new, from the standpoint of principles, and even of the letter of the law, between the Act existing in the Revised Statutes which is in force to-day and the Bill under discussion. I may say that, to my mind, there is no difference, except as to the form, and there is none as to the substance itself. I think I may prove it in this way

Of course, the title of the Act is changed. It was formerly the Militia and Defence Act; it will be in the future the Naval Service Act.

Clause 2 contains the definition of 'emergency' is but the reproduction of clause 79 of the Revised Statutes, the terms are absolutely similar; 'emergency' in this Bill, meaning war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended. The word 'deputy minister' in the Bill, section 2 (c) is but the clause of the old Act.

The expression 'active service' or 'duty' is used in the same sense as in clause 79 already quoted. And so forth.

Clause 3 is the same as paragraph 2 of clause 2 of the old Act. In short, under the heading 'definitions' in this Bill the terms used are similar to those of the old Act, except that the word 'navy' is to be substituted to the word 'militia,' as may be seen by comparing the clauses of both Acts.

Interpretation.

2. In this Act, and in any regulations made hereunder, unless the context otherwise requires,—

(a) 'Active service,' as applied to a person in the naval forces, means service or duty during an emergency;

(b) 'Department' means the Department of Marine and Fisheries;

(c) 'Deputy Minister" means the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries;

(d) 'emergency' means war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended;

(e) 'general orders' means orders and instructions issued to the naval forces by the authority of the Minister;

(f) 'Minister' means the Minister of Marine and Fisheries;

(g) 'naval establishment' includes officers' quarters, barracks, dockyards, victualling yards, naval yards, factories, rifle and gun ranges, naval colleges, and all other buildings, works and premises under the control of the minister, constructed or set apart for the naval service;

(h) 'naval forces' means those naval forces organized for the defence and protection of the Canadian coasts and trade, or engaged as the Governor in Council may from time to time direct;

(i) 'naval service' includes His Majesty's service in respect of all naval affairs of which by this act the minister is given the control and management, and also the fisheries protection service, hydrographic survey and wireless telegraph service;

(j) 'officer' includes commissioned, warrant and subordinate officers serving in the naval service of Canada, but not petty officers so serving;

(k) 'prescribed' means prescribed by this act or by regulations made thereunder;

(l) 'regulations' means regulations made by the Governor in Council under the authority of this act;

(m) 'seaman' includes petty officers, seamen and all other persons engaged in the naval service of Canada, other than officers;

(n) 'on service' means when called upon for the performance of any duties other than those specified as active service.

3. The interpretation act and section 2 of this act shall apply to all regulations, orders and articles of engagement made or entered into under this act.

Clause 4 differs from clause 3 of the old Act in this that to-day it is the King who, by the force of circumstances, has the supreme command, instead of the Queen, as under the old Act.

The word 'minister' in sections 5 and 6 of the new Act, means the Minister of Marine, instead of the Minister of Militia, as formerly.

Section 7 provides that there should be appointed an officer, not lower in rank than rear-admiral, to be called the director of the naval service of Canada. A similar

provision is found in section 37 of the old Act.

Secton 8 provides for the appointment of a naval board. This is a new provision.

Section 9 is similar to clause 28 of the Act of 1886, and provides for the appointment of a permanent naval force.

Section 10 is a reproduction of clause 22.

Section 11, concerning the rank and authority of officers of the naval force is similar to clauses 48 and 49 of the old Act.

Section 12 relates to the commissions of officers. It is similar to article 42.

Section 13 refers to relief from duty and retirement from the naval force. It is clause 15 of the old Act.

Section 14 relates to conditions of discharge from the service at the expiration of the time of service. Similar provisions are to be found in clauses 79 and 80.

Sections 15 and 16 deal with the uniforms and equipment of officers of the naval service. This section is similar to clauses 51 and 52 of the old Act.

Section 17 is a reproduction of clause 78, while section 18 is similar to clause 79 of the old Act.

In connection with this section 78, which provides that in case of an emergency, the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service or any part thereof, it is proper to remark that the new section restricts and lessens the obligations and responsibilities which devolved on Canada under the old Act.

Although under the Milltia Act of 1904, the land militia is not to be called out to serve beyond Canada, section 70, which is now the law in force, enacts that the Governor General may place the militia on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency, in case of war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended, and the militiamen called out for active service are required to serve at least during a period of one year. Doubtless the present law, in empowering the Governor in Council to place at the disposal of His Majesty the naval forces or any part thereof, improves considerably the nature of our obligations; for, according to the theory developed by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Lachance), who has thoroughly mastered this question, the Act of 1886 clearly gives to the King, without the participation of the Canadian ministers, the right of directly, commanding the Governor General, his representative, to place the navy at the disposal of the admiralty, while the proposed Act requires the intervention of the Governor in Council and the ratification of parliament. Such is the essential difference between the old Act and the proposed legislation. Therefore, there is no change in the relations between Canada and the mother country, or rather I should say that the proposed legislation constitutes a material improvement.

Section 19 is new. It provides that if parliament is not in session, a proclamation shall issue for the meeting of parliament within the fifteen days following the action taken by the Governor in Council, should he, in case of an emergency, place the Canadian fleet at the disposal of the admiralty.

The other night, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was not in his seat, I asked the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Paquet) what he meant to do, should the people be called upon to express their opinion by a plebiscite, approve of the proposed legislation including section 18. He told me, not without some hesitation, that he would consult his conscience and that if he could not make up his mind to vote in favour of this Act, he would bid adieu to public life.

I may here remark that the very same gentlemen who in this House and outside of it, advocate a plebiscite, have already decided, as shown by their statements and their acts, to undertake a campaign in the rural centres in order to inflame public prejudices and induce the electors to vote against this legislation. They are acting very unfairly and they remind me of those misers who, when you ask them to contribute to some good work, plead as an excuse that they have nothing to do with such work and then they refer you to their wives. But before the solicitor has had time to see the wife of the miser, he has already directed her to give nothing. Such is the rather mean position taken by the advocates of a plebiscite. They only aim at embarrassing the government, in order to climb into power.

Sections 20, 21 and 22 of this Bill, concerning the naval reserve, are an exact copy of clauses 12, 116, and 80 of the old Act.

Section 23 is a modification of clause 69.

As to section 24, it is declaratory, in so far as it enacts a principle of common law, namely, that the King is the owner of everything that is appropriated to the use of the navy.

Sections 25, which provides for the notice of all general orders issued to the naval forces in a copy of clauses 119 and 120.

Section 26 is textually clause 121.

Section 27 gives the Governor General the discretionary power to transfer to and from the naval service, any vessel belonging to His Majesty. The old Act contained no similar provision, as there were no fighting ships.

The provision of section 28 is taken from the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1906, chapter 111, which was itself borrowed

from chapter 71 of the Revised Statutes of 1886.

Sections 29 and 30 provide for the creation of a naval volunteer force. It is a condensation of sections 12, 26, 27 and 30 of the Act of 1886, with this improvement, that enrolment or drafting by ballot, that scarecrow of Canadian families, is done away with.

Section 31 enacts that the Governor General may make regulations. It is a copy of clauses 116 and 117.

Section 32 which is a condensation of clauses 13 and 14 of the Act of 1886, provides for the engagement and discharge of naval volunteers.

Section 33 contains a provision analagous to the provisions of clauses 56, 60 and 81. This section 60 of the Act of 1886 calls for special consideration. It reads as follows:

Her Majesty may order officers and men of the naval militia, or of any detachment of such militia, to drill or train for a period of not more than sixteen days and not less than eight days in each year.

That is proof conclusive that the fathers of confederation, since that clause is found in the Militia Act of 1868, had already in contemplation the organization of a naval department for military purposes.

Section 34 is a reproduction of clause 79 in its first part, and a copy of clauses 80 and 81 for the second part. It refers to active service in the case of an emergency.

Section 35 should be read in conjunction with clause 13 of this Act. By comparing both clauses, one finds that the Governor in Council, under section 13, may at any time relieve from duty any officer or seaman, and that under section 35, the minister is given a similar power. It may be supposed that, under certain circumstances, it would be desirable that the minister should exercise that right, in a case of emergency.

Sections 36, 37, 38 and 39 are new enactments. They are printed in italics and show that the government is anxious to reward the brave servants of the state, the maimed soldiers, the old seamen, the invalids who are entitled to the protection of the state which they have faithfully served. I do not suppose that our hon. friends opposite would feel like insisting on a plebiscite before voting such pensions.

Sections 40, 41, 42, 43 and 44 provide for the establishment of a naval college, with similar provisions to those governing the military college of Kingston.

Sections 45, 46 and 47 are almost an exact copy of clauses 116, 117 and 126.

Sections 48 enacts that the provisions of the Acts of the United Kingdom shall apply. Its wording is similar to that of section 82 of the Act of 1806.

Section 49 enacts certain penalties for desertion. It is the old article 109.

Sections 50, 51 and 52 provide for the execution of warrants and sentences and for the incarceration of prisoners sentenced to imprisonment in the common jail, in the penitentiary or any other prison or place of confinement, as the case may be.

Finally, section 53, which is the last, repeats chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes of 1886.

Such is the analysis which I deemed it my duty to undertake, to show that there is nothing new in this Bill 95 which is but copy, with slight changes, of the Militia Act now in force; whence I infer that the statement made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that this Act aimed at changing the relations of Canada with the empire is not grounded on facts and exists only in his imagination.

But this Act, we are told, you are not going to be content with placing it on the statute-book; you are going to enforce it by creating a navy. True, we are going to create that navy, in spite of the criticisms of the hon. gentlemen opposite. But let us see what is to be the immediate effect of that lgislation. If I look at the estimates for 1910-1911, what do I see as the outcome of this legislation? I find that we are invited to vote a sum of $3,000,000 for the naval service, including the purchase, construction and maintenance and upkeep of dockyards at Esquimault and Halifax and the establishment and maintenance of training schools.

Granting that the proposed legislation which hon. gentlemen wish to submit to the electorate entails this immediate consequence provided for in the estimates a vote of $3,000,000 for the naval service, I confess that I do not understand the objections raised by those who oppose the Bill. I should like to know where is the man of common sense who could pretend that this legislation, even with the consequence I have just pointed out is going to modify the relations of Canada with England? I do not think that any man endowed with an average intelligence would find that even the practical enforcement of this Bill could warrant such a statement as the one I have just referred to, namely, that our relations with the mother country would undergo a change.

I have shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that those three million dollars could be voted and spent for the same purposes, even should we not pass this legislation. All we should have to do would be to invoke the provisions of the Revised Statutes of 1886, chapter 41, which is the law in force. Both Acts produce the same effects; the Act in force and the proposed legislation are identical as to the power conferred.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are no doubt going to say that they do not oppose the

passing of this Bill, seeing that it is, with a few slight changes, similar to the Militia Act, but that they are opposed to voting these estimates. Well, my answer is: that 'Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.' Wait till the estimates are voted and then you may urge objections as you see fit, and so each question will be settled in the proper time.

They will urge all the same, that the people is entitled to have a voice in the matter, although we have the power to pass this Bill and these estimates. In my opinion, Sir, we should not at this moment, hold such popular consultation as suggested. It is neither our right nor our duty, as representatives of the people who are here, not as holders of an imperative mandate, but of a general mandate.

I say that we have neither the right nor the duty to try to elude, so to say, our responsibility and our oath of office and to saddle with such responsibility the electors of this country who are not in a position to investigate those questions. If, as representatives of the people, we have not the power to legislate, even when we are satisfied that we are acting in the interest of the people, then I say that, in many circumstances, we should have to abdicate our rights and privileges and what is the very essence of constitutional government, and all that, in the sole view of creating an agitation in the popular mind.

In this connection, I may say that other important issues have come under discussion in the past, but the most considerable debate was the one that took place, at the time of confederation. If I trace this question back to its origin, in 1865, I am but quoting a page of history well worth reading and which affords as good food for thought as the one we are now writing. To-day, we have the honour and the privilege of being called upon to solve a question of vital importance, which was already foreshadowed at the time of confederation.

When they met together in view of bringing about the federation of the province, the fathers of confederation aimed at remiting those scattered provinces, so as to create a common entity and a great empire, a powerful nation on this American continent; they foresaw that such an agglomeration under one government, would result in developing the wealth and all the resources of the country, in increasing the nucleous of population and in making the people contented, happy and respected not only in America but in the whole world.

It was on the 3rd February, 1865—and there is here a coincidence of dates, since this debate was opened on the 3rd of February—that the debate on confederation began. Consulting the 'Debates on Confederation' I find that Sir Ettiene Pascal Taché, who was then prime minister, proposed that great union of the British provinces and colonies. There was an amendment moved by Mr. James S. Currie. But let us first read the resolution moved by Sir Etienne Pascal Taché, who was also Minister of Militia and a French Canadian prime minister, as the present leader of this House. It was Taché who moved in the legislative council the motion I am going to read:

That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the imperial parliament for the purpose of uniting the colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island in one government, with provisions based on the following resolutions, which were adopted at a conference of delegates from the said colonies, held at the city of Quebec, on the 10th of October, 1864.

On the 17th of February, Mr. Currie moved the following amendment:

That upon a matter of such great importance as the purposed confederation of this and certain other British colonies, this House is unwilling to assume the responsibility of assenting to a measure involving so many important considerations, without further manifestation of the public will than has yet been declared.

Here then, we have our legislative councillors of 1865, under United Canada, moving on such an important issue, an amendment involving an appeal to the people, as to-day, and what was the result? The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived by thirty-two against nineteen.

On the same day, the 3rd February, in the legislative assembly, the Hon. John A. Macdonald, attorney general, moved the following:

That an address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the imperial parliament, at its next sesion, for the purpose of uniting the colonies in one government, with provisions based on the resolutions which were adopted at the conference held in the city of Quebec, on the 10th of October last.

There was an amendment moved by J. H. Cameron as follows:

That all the words after 'That' be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: 'an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General praying that His Excellency, in view of the magnitude of the interests involved in the resolutions for the union of the colonies of British North America, and the entire change of the constitution of this province, will be pleased to direct that a constitutional appeal shall be made to the people, before these resolutions are submitted for final action thereon to the consideration of the imperial parliament.

The House again divided on the above amendment asking for an appeal to the people and the result was: 35 for and 84 against.

Let me quote the opinion of Sir John A. Macdonald, who was then attorney general for Upper Canada, stating the grounds on which he was opposed to such an appeal to the people. He said:

> And no man who values representative government would consent to sit here under a less extensive commission—no man will get up and disclaim the possession of such powers. But my honourable friend says we can only pass resolutions, and cannot change our constitution, except by addressing the Sovereign, praying Her to give them effect through the imperial parliament; and he argues from this that we ought to go to the people and have a new parliament to do it. A new parliament can, however, do nothing more than we can do. Sir, I believe in my conscience that this House, more than any House since 1841, represents truly and faithfully the people of Canada. If the members of this House do not represent the country—all its interests, classes, and communities—it never has been represented. I believe that all classes and interests are represented here; but if the House votes for this motion, it declares that it does not represent them. If we represent the people of Canada, then, in the words of constitutional Act, we are here to pass laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the country. But if we do not represent the people of Canada—if we declare so by passing this resolution—then what great criminals have we been in the past! If we do not represent them, then we have no power to pass one single Bill and declare it to be law, even although it be a Bill to establish a saw-mill. If we do not represent them, we have a right to see for them, to think for them, to act for them; we have a right to go to the foot of the Throne and declare that we believe it to be for the peace, welfare and good government of the people of Canada to form of these provinces one empire, presenting an unbroken and undaunted front to every foe; and if we do not think we have this right, we are unworthy of the commission we have received from the people of Canada.

Such was the opinion of a man who has played an important part in our political world.

I think that upon that occasion, as on every other occasion, the principle which was laid down, agreed to the members of the day, and ratified at the subsequent elections, was the true principle of constitutional government under which we live.

Mr. Speaker, I have but a few words to add. As to the appeal to the people, I say that it is uncalled for, because the proposed policy is not new; because there is no change in the relations of Canada with the empire; because an appeal to the people is at variance with the principle of representative government. And I say further that this motion lacks sincerity.

When you read the debates on confederation, you find that several legislative councillors and members of parliament made it clear that they were favourable to the principle of confederation, but that they deemed it their duty to have their opinion ratified by the people itself, and that is the reason why they were in favour of an appeal to the people.

I think I know sufficiently, by their deeds and their words, the intention of the hon. gentlemen who have made up their minds to vote for an appeal to the people, to say that there is not a single one among them who is favourable to this legislation. Not a single one has stood up here and stated that, while approving of this measure, he would vote in favour of a plebiscite. If a single one of these gentlemen have declared, as was done by several members in 1865, that he was in favour of this legislation, there would be consistency in his conduct. But by asking for an appeal to the people, their only aim is to prejudice and excite the people against the government, in order to climb again into power, after having been expelled by the people a few years ago.

I now come to the main amendment moved by the leader of the opposition, and I have only a few observations to make. It is stated in that amendment that the proposals of the government do not tally with the suggestions of the admiralty. Well, I have in my hand the reports of the imperial conference, and here is what I find at page 24, which is a summary of the result of meetings:

> It was represented on the part of the admiralty that it would be difficult to make any suggestion or to formulate any plans, without knowing approximately the sum of money which Canada would spend. The Canadian representatives then suggested that two plans might be presented:—one incurring an annual expenditure of £400,000, and the other an expenditure of £600,000, omitting in both cases the cost of the present fishery service and hydrographic surveys, but including the maintenance of Halifax and Esquimalt dockyards, and wireless telegraph service, estimated at some £50,000 a year.
>
> Taking, first, the plan for the expenditure of £600,000, after discussion, the admiralty suggested that the Canadian government might provide a force of cruisers and destroyers comprising four cruisers of improved 'Bristol' class, one cruiser of the 'Boadicea' class, and six destroyers of improved river class. As regards submarines, it would be advisable to defer their construction because they required a highly trained and specialized complement.

Well, in view of this summary of the result of the meetings, a summary adhered to by the admiralty and by the Canadian delegates, it seems to me that this first part of the Borden amendment in which it is stated that the government proposi-

tions do not follow the suggestions of the admiralty, contains an unwarrantable error in point of fact on the part of a jurisconsult like the hon. gentleman. And he continues:

The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty, and so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire, in time of war are ill-advised and dangerous.

I have to say right here that this is a false statement of facts, the more so as the proposition made by the government tallies with what I read at page 38 of the report of the proceedings of the imperial conferences.

Let us read the statement made in the sub-report of the conference on military defence:

The representatives of the self-governing Dominions at the Imperial Defence Conference having signified their general concurrence in the proposition—'That each part of the empire is willing to make its preparations on such lines as will enable it, should it so desire, to take its share in the general defence of the empire.'

It is expressly said, granted and agreed to by all the interested parties, by the representatives of the various sister nations that participation in the wars of the empire is to take place only in so far as each party should so desire. Therefore, the participation of each colony and particularly that of Canada, will be determined and defined by the competent authorities, by parliament, prior to such participation.

In view of those facts, how can the leader of the opposition assert that this Bill empowers the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war.

The third paragraph of the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition reads as follows:

That no such proposals can safely be accepted, unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action, without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

Well, I think that the resolution of the 29th of March last fully answers that objection when it states that parliament cordially approves of any expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with the imperial navy, whenever the need arises.

Paragraph 4 reads:

That the said proposals, while necessitating heavy outlay for construction and maintenance, will give no immediate or effective aid to the empire and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

Mr. TURCOTTE.

Such is the opinion of the leader of the opposition, but the admiralty is of a different mind and I think the people of this country will share the latter opinion.

Paragraph 5 reads:

That no permanent policy should be entered upon, involving large future expenditures of this character, until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

The leader of the opposition also favours an appeal to the people, but not on the same grounds as advanced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and his small group of followers. These gentlemen clamour for a plebiscite, in the hope of smothering this Bill and preventing the passing of any legislation concerning the navy. The leader of the opposition is also trying to kill the Bill, but with another object in view, he aims at coming into power, in order to saddle the people with much heavier expenditure. That is what he says in paragraph 6, which reads:

That, in the meantime, the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities, as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purpose of naval defence as, in their judgment, may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

That is what we should have, Sir, were the leader of the opposition to change sides —which is altogether impossible—and sit at your right, Mr. Speaker, in order to shape the future policy of the Canadian government concerning the creation of a naval service.

I have now to point out a somewhat extraordinary statement in the first part of his amendment. He says that the proposals of the government do not tally with the suggestions of the admiralty. It would be quite easy to retort the argument and say that his offer of two Dreadnoughts is absolutely at variance with the suggestions of the admiralty. In fact, the following statement is found at page 24 of the report of the imperial conference:—

The fleet unit to be aimed at should, therefore, in the opinion of the admiralty, consist at least of the following:—

1 armoured cruiser (new 'Indomitable' class, which is of the 'Dreadnought' type.)
3 unarmoured cruisers ('Bristol' class.)
6 destroyers.
3 submarines.

With the necessary auxiliaries, such as depot and store ships, &c., which are not here specified.

The admiralty wants an armoured cruiser and the leader of the opposition offers two

Dreadnoughts. Why should he try to substitute his opinion to the wisdom and experience of the British admiralty?

The hon. member for Ste. Anne's, Montreal (Mr. Doherty), after having carefully weighed and computed everything, told us that the cost of two Dreadnoughts would not exced $20,000,000. Now, $20,000,000, that's a pretty round sum of money, and before voting such a sum methinks we should first consult the people. That money is not going to come out of the pocket of the leader of the opposition, but out of the people's pocket. It is the ratepayer who would have to pay those $20,000,000, an expenditure by no means extraordinary, in the opinion of the leader of the oposition, but which will prove absolutely useless, as it is expressly stated in his resolution that the admiralty is given full discretion to spend the said sum as they think best, and without consulting us, even without defending our territory. For, supposing that such an emergency should arise in England and in Canada, and that our two Dreadnoughts should be in English waters, do you believe that the admiralty would detach a squadron to come to our rescue.

All this, in my opinion, is altogether irrational and illegal. There is in the position taken by the leader of the opposition and by his assistant leader, a concatenation of contradictions and of absolutely illogical statements which one is astonished to find simultaneously in the speeches of a jurist and those of a professor of constitutional law in one of our great universities.

I think we had better abide by what we have now, namely, the proposition moved by the leader of the government. As circumstances would have it, the Minister of Marine was denied that honour and the leader of the government was called upon to introduce this Bill. Now, the Prime Minister has the assistance of the Finance Minister, who, for the last fifteen years, has held that important portfolio which he has always found well filled with money to supply the needs of the country. Do you believe that previously to submitting this Bill to the House, there have not been held many contradictory meetings of the cabinet and that the Prime Minister did not ask the Finance Minister how we were going to meet those responsibilities? We have the guaranty that the new liabilities will be met without a single cent being added to our public debt and without our taxation being increased. The experience of the last fifteen years shows that the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister, as well as their colleagues in the cabinet, made no mistake in the past. In my opinion, that is a guaranty for the future, and we who represent here the people, relying upon the experience of those fifteen years, may loyally and honestly discharge our mandate in the interest of the people and of the greatest good of the country.

Mr. DAVID MARSHALL (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, two questions in this discussion are being confused. The question of beginning the foundation of a Canadian navy, and the question of rendering immediate and effective aid to Great Britain are not the same. It is with the latter that we are called upon at this juncture to deal. The government declares its readiness to assist the mother country, but the proposal contained in the Bill outlined by the right hon. the First Minister provides for the creation of a war instrument which cannot be made effective for many years to come, until the present emergency has been met by Great Britain, and its consequence to Canada as part of the empire already determined. This is not a question which should be decided one way or another for party political profit. The question is a simple one, a question of determining what is our clear duty to the empire and of our readiness to do that duty. We must look first of all to the question: Is there an emergency? That question has been answered. I am within the mark in saying that were it not that a crisis was known to be impending the government of Canada would not have considered itself compelled to take even such meagre action as is contemplated in this Bill. The right hon. Prime Minister has given good evidence that he appreciates the futility of this navy scheme as an instrument of immediate and effective aid. That proof is to be found in a speech made to his own political followers only a short time ago in the city of Toronto, in which to make this project if possible more acceptable, he declared his conviction that no such thing as a German peril existed.

Is there in the great German preparations now being carried on, a menace to the naval supremacy of Great Britain. We are told that within two years Germany as a sea power may have caught up to Great Britain or surpassed her. The London ' Times ' a few days ago declared that if the present way of construction resulted in a German triumph, no blood need be shed, that Germany would simply impose her will upon Great Britain as she has done it upon various European countries within the past decade. German preparations are unquestionably directed against Great Britain. We cannot read the preamble of the German Naval Bill of 1900 without reaching that conclusion. It says:

> Germany must possess a battle fleet so strong that a war with her would, even for the greatest naval power, be accompanied with such dangers as would render that power's position doubtful.

The 'greatest naval power' is Great Britain, the British empire, of which Canada is a part.

Why did the British admiralty's whole plan of defence change a few years ago? Why were the most powerful of her fleets concentrated in home waters? What compelled the withdrawal of the British fleet from the Pacific? It was not because no fleet was needed there. The British admiralty to-day is anxious to see a fleet upon the Pacific flying the British flag. Why then were these ships withdrawn? The answer is already history. They were placed in waters adjacent to Great Britain to guard the shores of England from a threatened descent by a hostile European army, a German army. The statement that we cannot have a navy in commission for many years to come even if we start to-morrow, is one that cannot be attacked. We have not the yards in which to build the ships, nor the men to build them. Moreover when you have built your ships you have only begun the work. The task of arming them is still before you, and this cannot be done in Canada. The creation of a navy, however small, involves years of building and years of training, and an outlay of which no man can see the end. We are told that the fleet will cost eleven millions. We were told that the Grand Trunk Pacific would cost thirteen millions, and it has already passed the hundred million mark. We may take it then that the creation of a Canadian navy is not intended as an aid to the mother country in a crisis present or immediate. I say then that this navy scheme stands by itself and must be decided without regard to the question of immediate peril to the empire, with which question it has nothing to do. There is no hurry then, about it. That being so, I believe that no action should now be taken in regard to it, but that it should be submitted to the people of Canada to be decided by them.

What, in view of these things, is the best for Canada to do? The duty of Canada, I take it is to render such aid to the mother country as will meet the demands of naval strategy, because upon this the safety of the empire and the supremacy of Great Britain at sea must depend. What that aid should be is set out within the four corners of a short paragraph in the memorandum of the First Lord of the admiralty, submitted to the naval and military defence conference in August of last year. That paragraph reads:

> If the problem of imperial naval defence were considered merely as a problem of naval strategy, it would be found that the greatest output of strength for a given expenditure is obtained by the maintenance of a single navy, with the unity of training and unity of command. In furtherance, then, of the simple strategical ideal, the maximum of power would be gained if all parts of the empire contributed, according to their needs and resources, to the maintenance of the British navy.

The principle is laid down by a man whose business it is to know. If that is generally a sound principle, it is equally sound as applied to the emergency which undoubtedly exists. It is 'the maximum of power' upon which the safety of the empire depends, and that 'maximum of power' would be best obtained, so far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned, by a cash contribution for immediate use in augmenting the strength of the British navy. This is the new view taken, I believe, by a majority of the people of Canada. It is the view held by a great majority of the people of the constituency which I represent.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I mailed to every voter in East Elgin, a circular letter inclosing a slip covering three questions. asking the electors to indicate their views by answering these questions. Between five and six thousand was the number of these sent out, and I had replies from about 75 per cent. I would like to give the House an idea of the result of this work.

In answer to the first question, which was:

> Are you in favour of the establishment of a Canadian navy, to be under the control of the government at Ottawa?

To this question 269, or six and one half per cent, of the replies were in favour of a Canadian navy; 3,836, or ninety-three per cent, were strongly opposed to it, and twenty, or one half per cent, were quite different.

The second question was:

> Are you in favour, as a Canadian, of taking any part in the naval defence of Canada and the empire?

To this question 430 answered they were not in favour of taking any part in the defence of Canada or the empire, while 3,570 were willing to do their share.

The third question was:

> Do you believe that the time has come when Canada, should, in answer to the call of the motherland, and in answer to the threats of the enemies of the British empire, perform her share toward ensuring the continuance of British naval supremacy, by the direct contribution of a Dreadnought or its equivalent in money?

The result of this is that: 430 were not willing to take any part; six and one half per cent or 269 were in favour of a Canadian navy; one per cent or 41 were in favour of a Dreadnought being contributed; one and one half or 61 per cent were indifferent as to what means were adopted, though they were opposed to a navy being

established; 91 per cent or 3,754 were in favour of a money contribution.

These replies come from a people who are in a position to give voice to sensible ideas, for with the present improved rural mail facilities, they are in receipt of the daily papers and the vast majority of them keep in touch with the doings of the outside world, and know as much of what is going on as do people residing in our large cities, and in that way, they are quite capable of judging and giving opinions on matters of this kind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would consider this a fair criterion of the sentiment of the Canadian people. Judging from the results which I have laid before you, it is my opinion that were the entire electorate of Canada called upon to answer questions similar to the above, the result would be very much the same, and, therefore, I am strongly of the opinion that a national question of such wide importance, involving as it does such large expenditure of money, should, before being undertaken by the government, be submitted to the people and, therefore, I will support the resolution moved by the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher). Mr. Speaker, I have no hope that I shall be able to add anything new to what has been said in this debate, which is now worn threadbare. I might remark that it appears to me strange that on a subject so well threshed out, some hon. members should see fit to speak for two hours, three hours, and three and a half hours, covering ground which has already been well covered, adding nothing to the debate but adding something to the expense of the country. In view of what has occurred here, I believe that whenever the question of the amendment of the rules may come before us, I will vote for closure; I will vote for what may be called the gag; I believe I would vote for a chloroform chamber for some of the hon. members of this House. One reason why I speak at all is that it appears to be fashionable, but whether that be so or not, I believe that every hon. member has a right to speak his thoughts briefly on this question. I would not for a moment advocate that hon. members should not be at liberty to express their opinions on every subject that comes before the House, but I believe that something should be done in some way to shorten the debates, even on such momentous a question as that which we are now considering. As a Manitoba man I desire to say a few words on this question also, because when the local government will have time to act on the Bill sent to them by this government about a year ago, and the boundaries of the provincce are extended, Manitoba will become a maritime province; and then it will have more interest in the question of a Canadian navy than it can have, so long as it remains an inland province, for it will be on the line of a new and shorter route to the motherland.

Another reason why I speak on this question is that we have in the province of Manitoba the greatest naval experts to be found on the continent of America, at least in their own opinion. They care nothing for the opinions of the British government, the admiralty, Lord Charles Beresford, or any of the other British naval authorities. A year ago they put forth their policy, which was simply a policy of direct contribution. This is as near as I can see the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; and I compliment my province on having in the Conservative party men strong enough to practically force their policy on the opposition in this House. At the same time, in putting forward their policy, they have taken every opportunity, in the belief that they were making it stronger, to attack the loyalty of the leader of this government and the loyalty of everybody who sees fit to support a policy different from theirs.

On the whole, Mr. Speaker, the issue between gentlemen on this side of the House and the bulk of the gentlemen on the other side of the House is one merely of terms. I am willing to give credit to those on the other side who honestly believe that the policy of a contribution would better answer the situation, so far as Great Britain is concerned at the present time, than the policy of a Canadian navy. I am always willing to give to those who honestly believe, even if they are wrong, credit for the opinions that they hold. I am also aware that there is in the ranks of the party opposite a third party, or a separate party; I refer to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and those who support him; and I wish to say this for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that, judging by some of the press reports, he, as well as the leader of the government, and the members of his cabinet, and his followers, have been charged with disloyalty. I hold that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is just as much within his rights, and is just as loyal in expressing his opinion, whatever that may be, so long as he believes that he is putting forth a policy in the best interests of Canada, as any other member of this House. Therefore, I for one, will never charge the hon member for Jacques Cartier with disloyalty.

On this question the Canadian people are handicapped through lack of experience. We have never been called upon to have anything to do with a navy, in spite of our enormous sea-board, bounded as we are by the ocean on three sides. The only experience Canadians have had with a navy has been in the war of 1812, and

that was so long ago, and was fought so entirely by British ships that from that we gained nothing in the way of experience —only this, that from that time the American people and the Canadian people have been at peace, and I believe that it is the hope of the whole Anglo-Saxon race that they shall for ever remain at peace. There are some who say that we are building a tin-pot navy for the purpose of fighting the United States; but I believe that nobody expects that that will ever happen, while the people of both countries hope that we shall never settle by force any differences between the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race.

It is not necessary for me to deal with the origin of the so-called German scare. About a year ago the premier of England made the announcement that Germany was outstripping Great Britain in building battleships. That was before the British elections. I do not charge that that statement was made for the purpose of influencing the elections. But since that time the British elections have been held, and the same man and his party have been returned to power. The same peril that faced England then is facing her now, but we do not hear anything since the election in regard to the German scare. In fact, one would judge by the reports that the scare has completely disappeared. Allow me to quote in this connection the following despatch:

Berlin, March 6.—Chancellor Von Bethmann-Hollweg made a strikingly pacific speech on international relations, during the course of a debate on the naval estimates in the Reichstag yesterday. Replying to the arguments of Herr Sudekums, the Socialist member, that Germany's great fleet was not called for by commerce or the colonies, and that Great Britain was justified in the belief that it was directed against her, the chancellor spoke shortly, but vigorously, saying:—

Our relations with Great Britain lie clear and open before everybody's eyes. It is not necessary to repeat that our fleet is not for aggressive purposes, but for the protection of our coasts and commerce. The limits of our naval programme are known to every one, with the dates for the completion of our ships. Nothing is secret about the programme and nothing is done in such a way as to arouse suspicion or belief that a threat is intended against anybody.

Finally, it is our wish to cultivate unprejudiced, straightforward and friendly relations with Great Britain. (Cries of hear, hear.) I do not see why the existing friendly relations should be disturbed between Germany and Great Britain, with whom we are so closely connected, both economically and in culture. No nation on earth can divert or suppress free competition of other nations. We must all proceed on the same lines as an honest merchant, and on this foundation I am convinced that the relation of confidence existing between Germany and Great Britain will develop favourably, and that public opinion of both countries will be influenced in the same way.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say there is an emergency. Perhaps they may say it for political reasons, in their desire to force their policy upon this government. We on this side have just as much right to say there is not an emergency. It is now a year since we first heard of it, and we are no nearer to a crisis to-day than we were then. For my part I do not believe that an emergency exists, and if it did, Great Britain would be as well able now as she has been in the past to take care of herself and defend her sea-board against all comers.

With regard to the question of control, I wish to quote the London 'Times,' a good Conservative paper, and surely hon. gentlemen opposite will not charge it with disloyalty. The London 'Times' says the Canadian government is taking the proper course in keeping control of the Canadian navy, and adds:

In principle the proposition is indisputable. It applies to all and every form of co-operation of contribution towards imperial defence.

Now, allow me to quote Mr. Balfour, the leader of the Unionist party in the British House of Commons. In speaking last year, before the Imperial Press Conference, he said:

I think it was one of the speakers from Canada yesterday who said in my hearing that there was a certain jealousy existing—I am not sure I have got the exact words—a certain jealous anxiety amongst sections of the population in Canada lest there should be any attempt on the part of this country to accept any organization which would interfere with the complete control by Canada of everything that Canada desires to do. Well, in the earlier days of the colonial empire that fear might have been justifiable. There was a time when the relations between this country and the offshoots of this country were like the relations between parent and child. But let every man who hears me, who comes from any colony, understand that no politician of any party in this country holds that view any longer. (Cheers.) On that let there be neither doubt nor hesitation. Everybody recognizes, so far as I know, that the parental stage is over. We have now reached the stage of formal equality, and nobody desires to disturb it.

What did Mr. Haldane say on the same matter:

If the empire is to become one it will not be by the imposition of any outside will or of any one part of the empire; it will be with the evolution of the will of the empire as a whole under these unwritten constitutions which represent one and the same spirit, which took their origin in the mother country, but which mean absolute freedom for every constituent part of the empire.

Mr. Balfour spoke of the difficulties of the old war-office notion of controlling the forces

of the Crown overseas, of the self-governing dominions. I agree with him that that is an absolutely impossible enterprise, although one quite sees the reason why from the military point of view it was desirable.

This policy was the policy of the opposition as well as of the Liberal party. From the opposition we first heard it argued that Canada should in some way assist the empire, from the resolution passed unanimously in this House last year it is evident that the intention was to establish a Canadian navy. It is well for the opposition that this is their policy, for 15 or 20 years from now, when these gentlemen will be entrusted for a time with administration of the affairs of Canada, this policy will have been initiated and developed by this government and yet these gentlemen, having supported that policy in the first place, will be able to carry it out without prejudice, justly, and in the interests of Canada and to the credit of their party.

I view this policy from two standpoints, from an imperial standpoint and a Canadian standpoint. It must be a good policy from the imperial point of view because it has the support of all parties in Great Britain. There are grave practical difficulties in the way of giving Dreadnoughts. For instance, we are told to-day that Britain experiences great difficulty in manning the ships she is building, that there is a shortage of experienced A.B.'s. Therefore if we should accept the policy of the opposition, the policy of money contribution, and should send that money to England, could she to-day build and man those Dreadnoughts? I rather think not. We know that the British shipyards are now working overtime and no matter how many ships you might order or contribute to the main battle fleet of Great Britain, they would be of little assistance to the imperial navy if they could not be properly manned. Therefore the manning question itself is of great importance in considering this matter. Each Dreadnought takes from 800 to 1,000 men, who are taken in as youths and trained up. In that way the British seamen have become the most proficient in the world to-day.

Again, the British navy must be at all times strong enough to seek out the enemy in his own harbours or waters and crush him by sheer weight and strength. To do that it is well that the main battle fleet should be as strong as possible, and that is a problem that has never been solved by the British admiralty. In other words, the main battle fleet has always been short of cruisers that would guard the trade routes. The immense strain, the financial burden of keeping up the main battle fleet, and the demands of the moment has always caused the fleet to be short of cruisers or river craft to protect the trade routes and commerce of Great Britain. Therefore by the establishment of a Canadian navy, the interests of Canadians in time of war in place of being protected by ships from the British navy, we will in time have ships to protect our own trade routes and our commerce in our own waters without in the least weakening the main battle fleet of Great Britain. From the Canadian point of view the mere giving of a sum of money, $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 and that borrowed money, would not be relieving the Canadian people of their responsibility to the empire. Would it not be the vain-glorious, the easy, the selfish way of doing our part as Canadians towards the defence of the British empire? Would it not be only a temporary gift, the gift of a Dreadnought, no matter what it cost, because the life of a Dreadnought is only a certain number of years, 12 or 15, and then the Canadian part of the British navy would disappear. What is to be done then? As far as I have followed, no member of the opposition has answered the question of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Lake). How many Dreadnoughts are you going to give, how often are you going to give them? On the other hand, will any man argue that the giving of two Dreadnoughts, if we are going to take part in the building up and strengthening of the British navy, is all that we should do? I say no. Then, let us give something as soon as we have built it, as we must pay for it, something which we will control, which will become stronger year by year, and will increase in cost year by year, at the same time becoming of greater importance to the British empire.

I say that the policy of the government in building a Canadian fleet is the one that I believe will be most acceptable to the Canadian people, and to the British people, and in the years to come will certainly be more acceptable than the policy of simply giving one or two Dreadnoughts. As time goes on, as our commerce increases as it will increase, hundreds of fold in the next score or two of years we would be taxing the British navy for its protection, adding to the burdens of the British taxpayer, and doing nothing to protect ourselves. As the country grows and cities of wealth and importance spring up along our coasts, it will be a greater burden to the British people than it is now to protect us, if war takes place either between England and Germany or England and any alliance Germany may form with any other power. Therefore we will have our navy, a Canadian navy on the ground to protect our own coasts, our own commerce, because it is bound to increase, and whether the navy is built now or later, the Canadian people would in time be compelled, as I believe they are now compelled, to do something in that direction. We know what can be done by one

ship. For instance, in the war between the north and the south the 'Alabama' destroyed untold millions of commerce. The same thing might happen to Canadian commerce, and no doubt would be attempted in the effort to starve out the British people in the British Isles. In that case who would suffer? The Canadian people generally, the farmers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the farmers of eastern Canada. Wheat would be seized, and destroyed, beef, butter, cheese, eggs, hogs, the products of east and west alike, would meet the same fate, so it becomes the duty of all of us to defend our own commerce in our own waters, and England in time of war would have enough to do without convoying Canadian ships. Therefore I say as every man says, although we differ as to the means, that Canadians must do their part—so long as Canada is under the British flag, and I hope it will always be under the British flag, Canadians must do their part, and must do it manfully. That I believe is a patriotic, a sentimental, and at the same time a sensible view of this question.

Any contribution in money is so much money sent out of the country that will be expended in England employing labour there. If the money is expended here on a Canadian navy it will mean that in a short time we will be employing ship-wrights, joiners, fitters, platers, plumbers, boiler makers, electrical workers, and other mechanics, and in that way tend to the prosperity of the Canadian people. It will mean the building of docks, and the maintenance of shipbuilding yards. It will mean that the men who build our ships will be Canadians. If the Canadian people are contributing to the British navy, let us be represented by Canadian flesh and blood, and not by money contributions towards our own defence. It means that in time we shall build our own guns and projectiles. This will not be in the beginning —nobody expects that it will. This is a great undertaking, and a national question. It is bound to enlarge, and, as time goes on, the Canadian people expect that this parliament will decide upon a policy that will mean that ultimately Canadians shall build, equip and man the Canadian navy. This will give opportunity to Canadian brains and muscle. It will bring into use our own coal, our own steel, the minerals and metals with which we have been so bountifully supplied, and in that way it will develop the resources of our own country, and tend to the prosperitv of our own people. Let me give briefly seven reasons why this policy of the government should be supported:

1. Because the imperial authorities approve it, and they are the best judges.

2. Because for imperial reasons the protection of trade routes is the most difficult part of the British navy's work, and it can better be done by home squadrons in home waters.

3. Because as Canadians we should be proud to bear our own burdens and not pay others to bear them.

4. Because though we may never seek war ourselves we incur dangers all the while we are under the flag, and we want to prepare to defend the flag.

5. Because it is true that much of the money spent on warlike equipment is wasted in times of peace, but if we have to spend this money we might as well be utilizing Canadian resources, and building up Canadian industries with it.

6. Because in this work of protecting our own commerce and our own coasts we need only the light, small and speedy craft which are known as third-class cruisers and river craft, and we can in a short time put ourselves in a position both to build these and train our own men to man them.

7. Because we Britishers beyond the seas should feel ashamed to think that the Britishers at home have to worry about the protection of our thousands of miles of coast line when we can do it ourselves.

I cannot speak of this matter from first knowledge. But I believe that, in spite of the expressions of the more fanatical party organs, no man doubts the loyalty of the Prime Minister or of any member of his government, no man doubts the loyalty of any man on this side, no man doubts the loyalty of any hon. member on that side of this House. Future generations will say that the men of our day and time builded wisely and well when they decided upon this policy, a policy which I believe will be of great benefit to Great Britain and a policy worthy of Canada.

Now, I desire to say a few words with regard to certain remarks made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when speaking on this question. As usual, he was unkind and ungenerous. He tried to lead the country and hon. members of this House to understand that every man on this side had to do simply what he was told—in other words, that he was a slave. Mr. Speaker, I would have the hon. member understand this, that there flows in my veins the blood of the Irish Canadian, and I will not submit to the 'composing room,' the thumb-screw or the rack. The hon. member should let charity begin at home. When this question was before the Canadian people, as it has been since last March, it happened that the hon. member was in Winnipeg, where was moulded the policy which I believe hon. gentlemen opposite have accepted, because it is one and the same. There was held what might be called a political powwow. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) was

to be the chief speaker. Did he utter one word in defence or advocacy of the policy which he himself advocated on the floor of this House last March? Not one word did he say, though everybody expected it from him. Why did he not speak in the way expected? As we understand the situation, those of us living in Manitoba, explain it in this way: The premier of Manitoba and the gentleman who is now acting premier of that province, saw fit to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that, in the city of Winnipeg at least, no matter what his leader might say and no matter what he himself might say in other parts of the country, they would not submit to his putting forth the policy accepted by this House a year ago this month. Instead of the 'composing room,' instead of the thumb-screw and the rack, it seems to me the hon. gentleman was introduced to the garrotte, and that he got the Spanish twist, so that he dared not say a word because these men were in absolute control. They believed and he believed, and I believe, that they were strong enough and powerful enough to make him accept, so far as they were concerned at least, the policy that they had promulgated, and that their organ, the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' has advocated since its introduction a year ago.

I should be remiss, as representing the greatest number of French electors in any constituency west of the great lakes if I did not say a word with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). I would have that hon. gentleman understand that, from what I have seen and what I know, the French Canadians do not have to go to him or his seed, breed or generation, for lessons in loyalty. The French Canadians are a loyal people. It is but a short time ago, in the province of Manitoba, when the Tory party was catering to the French electorate in that country, that orator after orator—they had some then and they have some yet—declared that we should not forget that, in the war of 1812, four hundred French Canadians saved to the British empire this Canada, the brightest jewel in the British Crown. So, I resent the remarks of the hon. member for Frontenac, and I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty) practically repudiate everything he said. If the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) thinks, or any other gentleman thinks, such remarks as he made are in the interests of the Canadian people, they are welcome to their opinion so far as I am concerned. The French Canadians are loyal; they are loyal to their families, they are loyal to their country, they are loyal to their church, they are loyal to the sovereign and they are loyal to their God; they are a brave, proud and brilliant people, and do not need to make apologies to anybody or to any section of the country.

Mr. LENNOX. On behalf of the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare), I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. Shall we continue the Navy Bill debate to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 8, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS

Bill (No. 157) for the relief of Cecelia Marie Pringle.—Mr. Price.

Bill (No. 155) to amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—Mr. Fielding.

Bill (No. 156) to incorporate the Weyburn Security Bank.—Mr. Turriff.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Neely.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. GEORGE A. CLARE (South Waterloo). Mr. Speaker, for reasons known to you and to many members of this House I have not for some time taken part in the discussion of any of the important questions which have come before us; I have contented myself on each occasion with giving a silent vote, so that at least I would be on record in reference to the various matters dealt with by this House. I would prefer to do this even now, but the question before the House is so momentous, and so far reaching in its effect that I consider it a duty to myself, to my

constituents and to Canada to say a few words in it. I beg of you to bear with me for a few moments while I explain my position.

Before doing so I would like to say a few words of the people whom I have the honour to represent in this House, the people of South Waterloo. They are composed of many different nationalities, the English, the Scotch, the Irish, the German, the Hollander, the Russian, the Austrian, the Swiss, and many other different classes of Europeans. We have in the southern part of my riding, the intelligent and sturdy Scotchman, who has settled the township of North Dumfries, and made of that township a veritable garden of beautiful homes and beautiful farms. We have the tenacious, enterprising Englishman, we have the brave and open-hearted Irishman, we have the peace-loving, honest, and thrifty people who speak the German language, whether they be German proper, Pennsylvania Dutch, Amish, Mennonite, Hollander, or Bohemian, people who have asked no special privileges from the legislature of this country, who have adapted themselves to the conditions in this country, and who obey its laws. Besides all these people, we have the admirable young Canadian who can hold his own anywhere in the world. Through the assimilation of all these nationalities, there are to be found in the county of Waterloo—and I hope the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) will pardon me if I speak of the county as a whole—a population unexcelled, yes, I believe, unequalled, in this Canada of ours. They work together, they are friendly with one another, they assist one another, and they have made Waterloo county a hive of industry. Their manufactured goods are to be found throughout the length and breadth of Canada, so that the name Waterloo is a household word with the people throughout this country. There are no better farmers, and no better tilled farms. But, above all, these people of different nationalities, who have made this country their home, are loyal Canadians, and, as such, proud of the great empire to which they owe allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, my parents were born in Germany. They were proud of the country from which they came, but I believe they were prouder of the country which they made their home. They instilled into me a feeling of love, affection and attachment for the great country of their birth. Forty years ago the German empire was a number of scattered provinces. By uniting, these became a great nation. Through its educational system, through its technical schools and through the policy of protection inaugurated years ago, Germany has become a great manufacturing country. They are a business people and in their state-owned utilities they have shown what a nation can do. The state-owned utilities of Germany, run and managed by the civil service there, have brought in immense revenues to the country and have reduced taxation accordingly. The imperial government of Germany and the governments of the several states of that empire, through their various state-owned business, cleared for the people in 1908 no less a sum than $277,385,095. Here are some of the items:

The leased lands of Germany are worth $198,122,725, and they produced an income for the people of $7,925,309.

The forests of Germany, worth $730,898,200, brought in, over and above all expenses, $29,235,938.

The mines of Germany, worth $128,907,725 brought in $5,116,309.

The German state-owned railways, worth $4,706,904,750, have shown the enormous profit for the people of $189,916,190.

The state-owned telephones, telegraphs and express and mail services within the German empire worth $694,816,650, earned for the people $27,792,666.

Other state-owned utilities worth $435,184,900, showed profits of $17,407,476.

Bavaria, one of the provinces of the German empire, pays 39 per cent of the cost of administration from the profits of its state-owned utilities; Saxony, in the same way, pays 31 per cent; Wurtemburg pays 38·7 per cent; Prussia, which forms five-eights of the empire, pays 47·36 per cent of its public expenses from the profits of state-owned utilities. The state of Prussia enjoys an income from its state-owned utilities of no less than $176,000,000, which is more than twice the amount of all taxes of that state, amounting to only $85,000,000.

The German empire and its people, in the management of their public utilities, are an example to the people of Canada. They are, above all, an example to the Minister of Railways of this government who is managing a state-owned railway at an enormous loss. The German people excel in literature, in art and in science. The population of Germany is over 65,000,000, and, as has been stated before in this debate, it is increasing at the rate of over 1,000,000 people a year. They have a large and growing foreign trade. Their merchant vessels are seen on every sea. And, like the people of Great Britain—for they are in exactly the same position—the German people with this immense foreign trade must have a navy to protect that trade. As the trade increases, the number of merchant vessels must increase, and as the merchant vessels grow in number so must the war vessels grow in number. But do the people of Germany want war? Do the people of

England want war? I say, no. For these great business and manufacturing countries, these peoples who compete in the foreign market there is no danger of war except it be a commercial war, a war which might occur through competition. This might lead to actual conflict. In the past, these two great nations, Germany and England, have never warred against each other; they have been firm allies in many wars for the upbuilding of humanity.

I have had the pleasure of visiting both Germany and England several times. As a public man I have tried to find out the views of those people upon the question of war between these two great countries. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure the people of this country that as far as the educated and working classes go in Germany, they have a perfect respect and love for the English nation. This may not be universal, there may perhaps be exceptions in their army and navy of which I do not know. I say again and I cannot help it, I have a feeling of attachment to the great empire of my forefathers. If you do not love your country either you, or your country, are no good. You, Mr. Speaker, and your compatriots, have a feeling of love and veneration for the great country of your forefathers. You are interested in the traditions of France, you are proud of its marvellous people and the wonderful good that they have done in the world, but being proud of that country, being proud of the country of your forefathers, does not prevent you from being proud of your adopted country; in fact, I believe it makes you feel prouder of Canada, the country that you have made your home. The French and the Germans will always stand for Canada and its interests. The majority of the people of this country will do their duty to Canada, to the empire and to His Majesty King Edward VII. We are one people and one people only, and the only way in which we can differ is as to how we can best do our duty to the great empire to which we belong. The Prime Minister, when introducing this Bill, charged the opposition, and I was sorry to hear it, with having differences of opinion on this great question. He charged that in the ranks of the opposition there are differences of opinion. I want to say to him that there are. No great question has ever come before the two great parties in this country without differences of opinion. I am rather proud of the fact that in the Conservative party, amongst eighty loyal citizens of this country, there were differences of opinion as to how best we could serve our empire. On the other side of the House they have differences of opinion too. But they must do as they are told, and I believe that when the vote is taken every hon. gentleman opposite will support the government in its policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARE. Yes, you can cheer, but I believe what I tell you. While the Prime Minister can make you vote as he pleases, he cannot make you think as he pleases. There have been no two speeches delivered on the government side of the House which have not shown greater differences than have been shown on this side of the House. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) has told the Prime Minister and his supporters what he thinks of England. He said that we owe them some respect, but we owe them nothing else, because they have not paid us more for our grain or our produce than they have paid to the people of the United States. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Huron says that we owe nothing to England. There is no loyalty in him. He says: I must say nothing for England, and then he turns around and says to the people of Canada: I will vote for a large expenditure for a navy which will be no good to this country, which will be no protection to this country and no protection to the British empire. What is this navy going to be for? Is it going to protect us against Patagonia or Uruguay? This navy will never protect us against any self-respecting nation. I have stated, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the majority of the people of this country are loyal citizens of Canada and the empire. I want to say the same thing about the members of this House. I believe as a whole that the members of this House are loyal Canadians and if there is a doubt on this question, if there is a doubt that there may be a single man who may be disloyal to his country, that doubt has been forced upon me by the Prime Minister himself, in speeches in the United States in which he said he preferred the American dollar to the English shilling. I do not like to talk of these things and in spite of these statements I am ready to believe the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is an honest man, is loyal to this country and is loyal to the empire. While I admit that he is loyal, I claim that he has made many, many mistakes in his public career, and I wish to recite a few of them so that we can afterwards decide whether we are right in accepting his judgment on the Navy Bill. When the great statesman, Sir John Macdonald, introduced a Bill for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, providing for the building of a road from the Atlantic to the Pacific, where did we find the present Prime Minister? Why, Mr. Speaker, he was opposed to the policy, he did not believe in it. He and his party said the road was going through a sea of mountains. The Conservative party and Sir John Macdonald lived in hope and they believed that this enterprise would be a good thing for this country. They carried it in spite of the opposition of the then

Where do we find the Prime Minister now? He is following in the footsteps of that great Conservative leader, and he is imitating him in the building of a railway across the continent. The right hon. gentleman had no opposition from this side of the House on the question of building that railway, but we differed with him as to the manner in which it should be built, and events have proved that the Prime Minister was all wrong, because we have all seen how woefully he was mistaken in his prophecy as to what that railway would cost. Then, there was the movement for commercial union, and the right hon. the Prime Minister persuaded the greater part of his followers to support a policy of commercial union as between the United States and Canada and against the empire. I do not know whether that was disloyalty or not, but I do know that it was sailing mighty close to disloyalty. But, I thank God and I believe the Prime Minister to-day thanks God, that his policy did not prevail.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I am very sorry to have to point out any defects in the great leader of the Liberal party in this country, for no one admires him as a man more than I do. But, Sir, I feel it my duty to point out these defects and I cannot help saying further, that in this naval policy of his he has made the greatest error of all the errors in his political life. The navy which this government is going to build will not be effective, it will not protect our Canadian shores, and much less will it be of any assistance to the British empire. This navy will be no protection to Canada; it will be an expensive luxury. We have no guarantee from the right hon. gentleman and his government as to what the navy will cost, because, judging by past experience, any estimate they may give is not reliable. In addition to all other defects in the policy, this navy may lead us into difficulties with countries nearer home in a way which we now do not foresee. I read in the newspapers since this Bill was introduced that an application had been made to the government by some of the states bordering on the great lakes to have the privilege of building warships, and the probability is that this is suggested by the example of Canada. I believe, Sir, that if the greatest care is not taken there may be danger of complications between these two nations, and in that way the navy proposed by the government is a menace to us. As to the cost of the navy, we have the statement of the government that in the initial stage it will amount to $15,000,000 for construction, and that the up-keep will cost us $7,000,000 each year. Of course, this cost must increase enormously; Canada will have to keep on building ships and opening shipyards, and there is no knowing where our financial liability is going to end. We know that some fourteen years ago we expended on the militia of this country only one and a half million dollars a year, but to-day we are spending seven million dollars annually, so that for the up-keep of our militia and onr navy we will have an annual charge at the lowest calculation of $14,000,000, which, of course, is bound to increase as the years go on. I do not think there is any man on the government side of the House who will deny that in a very few years the expenditure of Canada for warfare will be at least $25,000,000 per annum. And, Mr. Speaker, what does $25,000,000 mean? It means that if we placed $25,000,000 per annum at the disposal of the Minister of Finance he could go to the money markets of England and borrow between $800,000,000 and $1,000,000,000, which would represent enough money to rebuild the whole British navy. That is what we are going to expend in this country. It would mean that the Minister of Finance could take that money and build the Georgian Bay canal, and deepen and extend the Welland canal, and build the Hudson Bay railway, and two or three transcontinental railways, and still have some money left in the treasury. I am opposed to this navy. As I have said, it will be no protection to Canada and no protection to the empire. And, Sir, the people of Canada, the voters of this country, the people who make and unmake governments, should be treated fairly in this matter and should be consulted. I appeal to the Prime Minister of this country that he should in all fairness withdraw this Bill and consult the people of Canada first, and if the people say: we want a navy——

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CLARE. Yes.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman propose to transmit $25,000,000 to Great Britain——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CLARE. The hon. gentleman cannot put words in my mouth that I did not utter.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. I did not put words in the hon. member's mouth; I simply asked him a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman answer my question?

Mr. CLARE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am entirely opposed to that enormous expenditure. Is that what the hon. gentleman wants to know; I could not hear his question?

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Did I understand——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Clare) has the floor and cannot be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. I am simply asking a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Waterloo cannot be interrupted when he has the floor.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. I simply wish to ask——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member for Waterloo——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Mr. CLARE. Mr. Speaker, I would have been pleased to answer the question put by the hon. member for South Huron if I could hear it, especially as it comes from a man who says that he knows of no duty that we owe to the empire, and who is prepared, Mr. Speaker, to vote $15,000,000 now and $7,000,000 a year for all time to come for a navy which is no good to the empire, but that does not matter much to him.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member for Waterloo cannot be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Well, I am asking for his consent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already told the hon. member that the hon. member for Waterloo has the floor and cannot be interrupted.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CLARE. I have never yet, during the ten years that I have occupied a seat in this House, interrupted any gentleman, and if an hon. gentleman was not in good health, I would do my utmost to assist him. Mr. Speaker, how can we best do our duty to our empire? You know my position now with regard to the navy which is to be constructed in Canada. You know that I do not believe in it. You know that I do not believe that it will be a protection to Canada, or of any assistance to the people of this country. But we should consider and weigh carefully every step that we take in this important matter. The first step is to consult the people of our country; but there may be another duty that we owe before that, and I believe there is. A great many of the people from Europe who have come to this country appreciate the freedom they enjoy in this country from military restrictions and burdens which they experienced in their own countries, and their anxiety is that their adopted country may not repeat the mistakes that those European countries have made. This does not mean that they are not prepared to defend their homes and their country.

Now, is there a way to help the British empire, and do what she asks us to do without committing this country at this time to battleships and to war? I believe there is such a possibility. The Finance Minister of this country should put into the estimates at once a sum sufficient to build on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, dry-docks for the accommodation of our own shipping trade and large enough to accommodate the largest warships of the British empire. That is what Lord Tweedmouth at the colonial conference in 1907 asked the colonies to do. He spoke as follows:

> Then I would like to say a single word on the further point of the provision of docks and coaling facilities in the colonies. The enormous development of the modern warship entails important consequences. These great modern warships require large docks to contain them. I think we are getting on well with the provision of docks. At this moment in our own country and abroad, we have, I think, thirteen government docks which will take in our largest ship, the Dreadnought. I think in the course of the next two years, we shall have four more, which will make about seventeen altogether. But it is very desirable that we should have, in all parts of the world, docks which could take such great ships, supposing they were to meet with an accident or were to receive damage in war.

I ask this government to provide sufficient funds to commence immediately the construction of these great docks, which will no doubt cost a good deal of money, but which will do more for the defence of the empire than the money which the government to-day propose to expend and will at the same time develop our own material resources.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would direct our energies in such a way as to secure for ourselves a foremost position amongst the nations of the world and build upon this half of the continent an active, manly, industrious, intelligent and progressive people, ready to protect their homes, and ready and willing to join with Britain

in the defence of the empire. I believe that the best way of preparing for our defence is by steadily, and rapidly, developing the arts of peace—by peopling the almost boundless virgin lands of Canada with a teeming population, of the best agricultural classes, ready at all times to defend their altars, their institutions, and their homes; to encourage and to build up immense manufacturing industries, which will not only supply the wants of our agricultural population, and afford them a profitable home market, but which will also use up our rich resources of raw material, and export abundant quantities of fully manufactured goods to every quarter of the globe. To this end would bring the wide borders of Canada into closer communication with each other, and with the world, by improving and multiplying our avenues of intercourse—our transportation facilities —by land and water, internally, and by the sea until we should have not only an unrivalled internal transportation system (for which nature has in such generous measure endowed us) but a merchant marine, as well, carrying the products of our farms, our fisheries, our mines, and manufactures, to the markets of the nations, and successfully competing for a share, and a large share, of the carrying trade of the oceans. To this end, I would especially encourage the development of our mines and the industries incidental to mining, increase harbour and transhipment facilities, build dry-docks, and restore to Canada again in ships of steel, the ship-building industry she enjoyed in the days of wooden vessels. In a word, I would develop the material resources of Canada all along the line, maintaining as far as may be, peace within her borders, and food, and raiment, and contentment, within all her homes. Canada within the empire, and of the empire, pursuing peace and giving no ground of offence, but still ready to protect our homes, our country, and our empire.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House has listened with interest, if not with considerable surprise, to the new doctrine just laid down by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare). That hon. gentleman seems to consider it a crime for members on this side to express their united approval of the Naval Bill proposed by the right hon. the leader of the government. My hon. friend seems to consider the opposition position a most happy and fortunate one—a position in which every man thinks as he pleases, in which every one has a policy of his own, and the conclusion of which is anarchy. Well, if the position of members on this side, who are unanimous in their support of the government proposition, be slavery, then, I say, give me slavery.

Mr. CLARE.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. NEELY. And if the position in which hon. gentlemen on the opposite side find themselves be freedom, then, I say, I want no such freedom. It is rather singular to hear from hon. gentlemen opposite expressions of approval of their divided position on this question. They seem to think there is some merit in it. That certainly was not the stand they took a year ago when this matter was discussed on the motion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It certainly was not the position held by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) at that time, for I have his words here as reported in 'Hansard' of March 29 last:

> I come now to a consideration of the resolution moved by the right hon. gentleman, and I will say that with many portions of it I am in entire sympathy. But I would like to make one or two suggestions to the right hon. gentleman, and I do not make them in any party or carping spirit, because if there is one thing more than another I would desire, it is that the policy of Canada on this great question and the resolution announcing it should meet with the absolute and unanimous approval of this parliament and country.

That is the position which the leader of the opposition took with reference to the necessity for unanimity, and that expressed apparently the general desire of the House last year when the question of defence was first introduced. The general opinion then appeared to be that the parliament of Canada should present a solid front on this question, not only to the people of Canada, but to all the nations of the world which might be interested in what Canada should do in this matter of imperial defence. I want to ask a question—and I think it is one we have the right to ask and demand an answer to—who is responsible for the receding from the position which the members of this House took last year on the resolution of March 29? Who is responsible for the receding from the position of unanimity, which then seemed to be the desire of hon. members on both sides? I am sure that I am stating what cannot well be gainsaid, when I say that among hon. members on this side, when the House prorogued last year, as we wended our ways to our several homes, there was in our hearts a feeling of contentment and satisfaction that on this great national question, this question as to what Canada should do in the way of assisting in imperial defence and towards maintaining her own integrity as a nation and defending her own coasts, both sides of the House had been unanimous in supporting the resolution we had adopted. Have the Liberal party in this House, have the members of the government receded from the position they took last year on this question? I say they have not. The right hon. the leader of the gov-

ernment has introduced a Bill exactly along the lines suggested by that resolution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. NEELY. And exactly in harmony with the conclusions arrived at by the delegates of this government who were sent to consult with the imperial authorities as a result of the passing of the resolution of March 29 last. Why, then, do we find this change of attitude on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite? What is the reason? Some of them tell us that the proposals of the government are not in harmony with the resolution passed on the 29th March of last year. But, Sir, the insurrection had begun, the defection from the resolution of March 29 had been completed, before the government brought down its Naval Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. NEELY. This House had hardly risen last year when from various political quarters there were murmurs of dissent, which gradually rose to clamour and then became a storm of disapproval on the part of certain political gentlemen who occupy seats opposite, against the resolution they had agreed to unanimously last year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. NEELY. Then, to crown it all, there came the announcement from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that, so far from continuing to support that resolution, he was opposed to Canada doing anything whatever towards the defence of Canada or the empire. That is the situation to-day, and it is one these hon. gentlemen cannot get out of. As I have listened to the debates in this House from day to day, I have not yet heard any good or valid reason advanced for this political somersault which these hon. gentlemen have performed. So that, so far as unanimity is concerned, I think that we on this side have decidedly the best of the argument. What was the position when this House rose last year? We had passed a resolution calling for the speedy construction of a naval service for the defence of Canada and to aid in the defence of the empire; but certain gentlemen opposite, after they had taken a little further time to consider, evidently came to the conclusion that they had made a political mistake, or a mistake of some kind, and revised their views, and came out in favour of another policy—the policy of a direct contribution to the British admiralty. It is useless for hon. gentlemen opposite to try to mislead the public as to what they understood by the terms of the resolution of March 29, 1909, because we have the statement of the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) after the House rose, not on one, but on many occasions, as to what he understood the terms of that resolution to be. On July 1, in London, the hon. the leader of the opposition, addressing the Colonial Club, used the following language:

> Some feeling was created in the British islands owing to the fact that Canada had not by resolution or by speech from the Prime Minister vouchsafed the offer of one, two or three Dreadnoughts. He (Mr. Borden) thought the resolution in the form in which it was passed, while its terms might not upon their surface seem as significant at the moment as the offer of one or two Dreadnoughts would have been, laid down a permanent policy for the Dominion of Canada, upon which both parties united, and which would serve a more practical purpose than any such offer of Dreadnoughts.

That is the position taken after the House had risen last year by the leader of the opposition. But this was not the only occasion. Speaking at different places throughout this country the hon. gentleman, and also the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) took exactly the same stand. So I say that these hon. gentlemen must not attempt to lead the country to believe that they did not understand the effect or the intention of the terms of the resolution of 1909.

We all know the history of the question of defence in its relation to the resolution passed by this House last year. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) introduced a resolution relating to the defence of Canada. This was on the order paper month after month, and was finally brought to the point of discussion, amended in a form that was finally agreed upon by the Prime Minister, and the leader of the opposition, and adopted by the members of this House unanimously. That is, briefly, the history of the introduction of the question to this House. There can be no question, but that the members of this House understood the purpose and intent of the resolution passed on March 29, last year. What is the position taken by these hon. gentlemen to-day? It was of great interest to members on this side of the House, and I am sure to the people of Canada generally, to watch the movement in the various political quarters, after the House adjourned last year, that movement which was ultimately to lead to an absolute reversal of policy on the part of the opposition. My personal sympathies were very largely with the leader of the opposition, because I could see the enormous pressure that was being brought to bear on him from various sections of his own political camp. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy) in his speech last night, gave us an indication of where this insurrection in the ranks of the opposition party commenced, and the position of the leader of the opposition in this political

crisis in the history of his party was one that certainly commanded, I believe, the sympathy of every member on this side of the House. He was something like the leader of the Israelites in the days of old when he brought his people up to the banks of the Red Sea, hedged in by the terms of the resolution of 1909, confronted by a cold sea of dissent as represented by the attitude of his political allies in Quebec, and behind him, Sir, an insurrectionist horde, who shouted out at the tops of their voices: Give us Dreadnoughts, or, as patriots, we die. That was the position in which the leader of the opposition found himself a few months after the close of this House last year. That was a crucial moment in the political career of the hon. the leader of the opposition. The eyes of all Canada were attracted towards the hon. gentleman to see whether or not he had the strength and the stamina of the statesman, the strength necessary to resist this tide of insurrection. Sir, it seems apparent from the attitude he has taken on this question that those instruments of torture so feelingly and lovingly referred to by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the rack, and the thumb-screw, and the composing-room were too much for the strength of the hon. gentleman, and I say it advisedly he was compelled to strike his colours. The result to-day is that we have two policies—shall I say two, more likely two dozen—because while we have on this side of the House one policy, and one policy alone, a Canadian navy, to be constructed in Canada, to be operated by Canadians as far as possible, to be under the control, and jurisdiction of the Canadian parliament, we have on the opposite side of the House almost as many different policies as there are members on that side. Is it a crime to be unanimous in support of the policy of the government on this question? Just consider what the position of the Dominion of Canada would be to-day with a great question of such vital moment to this country before the government for their decision if, instead of the present government, we had on the treasury benches the hon. gentlemen who are now sitting, to their very great regret, in the cold shades of opposition. Where would the country be, where would this House be on this great question of national defence? One policy by the leader of the opposition, another by his chief lieutenant in the province of Quebec, and still other policies from his other lieutenants from the other provinces of Canada. I say, Sir, it would surely not be a happy position for this country or for this House if these gentlemen had the settling of the question of Canada's policy on this great subject of national and imperial defence.

The policy laid down by the House and the government last year was intended to be the permanent policy of the Dominion of Canada on the question of her contribution to her own and to the imperial defence. I submit that this new departure, the doctrine of a plebiscite, the doctrine of submitting this question to the people of Canada as to what shall be done, has no bearing whatever on the question now under our consideration. We did not hear a word about a plebiscite in March of last year—not a single word. Hon. members who spoke from the opposition benches seemed to consider it a national duty, seemed to consider it a responsibility of which we, as the parliament of Canada could not divest ourselves—namely, the duty of policing the seas for the protection of our own marine, our sea commerce and the coast line of this Dominion. They then represented not a question for reference to the people but a question lying wholly within the authority and competency and responsibility of this parliament. In view of the attitude of the two parties on this question, in view of the attitude taken by the leader of the opposition and his followers, and the attitude of the government in support of the Bill which has been introduced let me ask the question: What good do hon. gentlemen opposite expect to result even supposing the question of defence were submitted to the people? Hon. gentlemen opposite have a policy of their own, a policy of contributing $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 at once to the British admiralty to be used in strengthening the British fleet. Surely, they do not expect us to take the position that, if the peope are not willing to support the proposition of a Canadian navy they are willing to support the proposition of a direct contribution. For, in one case, we are interpreting the national duty, or what this House last year unanimously declared to be the national duty. These hon. gentlemen propose to take $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 of Canada's money and send it across the sea where it shall be spent absolutely regardless of the voice of the people who sent it. I say that is a new proposition—that there should be a plebiscite on the question of a Canadian navy and no plebiscite on the question of a contribution. Now, if it be conceded that, if there is a plebiscite it should cover the whole ground of the question of what course this parliament should pursue on the question of defence, the ballot paper presented to the people of Canada would certainly be a very complex document. We should have a series of questions:

1. Are you in favour of a Canadian navy, or are you opposed to a Canadian navy?

2. Are you in favour of a direct contribution to the British admiralty for the strengthening of the British fleet, or are you opposed to such a direct contribution?

3. Are you in favour, or are you against, both the establishment of a Canadian navy and the giving of a direct contribution?

4. If in favour of a direct contribution, how often should we give it?

Then, we might throw in a question for the benefit of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) who seems to have grave doubts as to the loyalty of a large section of the people of Canada:

5. Are you in favour of the empire, or are you against the empire?

That would settle in that hon. gentleman's mind the question whether a large section of the people of Canada are or are not loyal to the British flag and the British Crown.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member might submit that to the leaders of the Liberal party. That would answer my purpose.

Mr. NEELY. I have not heard the leaders of the Liberal party ever express any sentiments similar to those expressed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). And I want to say, as a Liberal, that I resent the imputation made in this House in a speech of that hon. member when he undertook to insinuate that the followers of the Prime Minister in this country in the province of Quebec were not loyal to the British Crown.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule of the House is well known. No hon. member can be required to answer any question. Nor can he be interrupted except to order, or for a personal explanation by his consent. Otherwise, he has the floor.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member (Mr. Neely) consents to a question being put to him—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself to you.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) raises a question of order, he should be heard.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am rising to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman has said that—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Edwards) must be allowed to state his point of order.

Mr. CARVELL. He does not say it is a point of order, but a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER. He must be allowed to speak.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member (Mr. Neely) has misrepresented me as stating that the people of a large section of this country are disloyal. There is nothing in my speech to justify that statement, and I have the right to ask the hon. member either to substantiate this charge by quoting the words I used, or else withdraw his charge.

Mr. NEELY. I think I have a fair understanding of the ordinary words of the English language. I have listened to the hon. member's words, and I have read and re-read his words in 'Hansard,' and I cannot come to any other conclusion than that I have stated. If the hon. member states that he did not mean that, that he was not trying to cast a reflection on the loyalty of a large section of our French Canadian people, I shall be compelled by the rules of the House to accept his explanation.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would simply refer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) to my own remarks in answer to the statement he has made—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) refers to his own words, he must be allowed to state his own interpretation of them. If he wishes to give his words a meaning, he must state what that meaning is.

Mr. EDWARDS. I emphatically declare ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has risen to a point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have asked the hon. member (Mr. Neely) to withdraw his statement to the effect that I charged the people of a large section of this country with disloyalty. I never made such a charge, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Edwards) says that he has made no such statement. His statement must be accepted

Mr. NEELY. I said, before the hon. gentleman rose, on this question of privilege, that if he repented of the apparent meaning of his words—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. NEELY. I was perfectly willing to accept his statement.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you. I contend that the hon. gentleman must withdraw his statement, and I ask your ruling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. NEELY. Well, when I was interrupted——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Withdraw first.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask your ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the House wishes the rules to be observed. I have tried this afternoon to have them enforced. When a statement is made by an hon. member that a certain meaning was attached to his words, his statement must be accepted. The hon. member for Humboldt will have to submit to the rule.

Mr. NEELY. With all deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I do not see in what respect or particular I came under the rule of the House which you have quoted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. NEELY. As far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, I made the statement that if I understand the ordinary meaning of the English language, and I think I do, my interpretation of the hon. member's words, and the hon. gentleman's words as recorded in 'Hansard,' is that they impute disloyalty to a large section of the people of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask your ruling again.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I have stated what the rule of the House is, and I presume the House wants the rule observed. The moment an hon. member states that he meant or did not mean a certain thing, the interpretation placed upon his own words by himself must be accepted. That is the rule of the House. The moment the hon. member for Frontenac has made that statement, his statement must be accepted.

Mr. NEELY. I stated before——

Mr. SPEAKER. The only thing is to accept the statement.

Mr. NEELY. I stated I was quite willing to accept the hon. gentleman's interpretation. I am still free to take the position that the hon. gentleman chose the wrong words and the wrong phraseology altogether to express his intention.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I submit that I have the floor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Humboldt has accepted the hon. gentleman's statement, I understand.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not so understand it.

Mr. SPEAKER. He certainly can proceed to discuss the speech of the hon. member.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not so understand him.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. member for Humboldt to accept the statement made by the hon. member for Frontenac.

Mr. EDWARDS. Very well, if you so understand it, I will accept your interpretation.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think that the hon. gentleman has accepted it. He accepted it in the first place and then immediately afterwards reiterated his first statement. I do not regard that as——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was stating——

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker has decided the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman will take his seat until the point of order has been discussed and settled——

Mr. NEELY. It has been discussed and settled.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, it has not. I was raising a point of order to this effect, that although the hon. gentleman did make a pretense of accepting, he, nevertheless, immediately afterwards reiterated his first statement, and I do not think, with all deference, that that is the way in which an hon. member's statement in this House with regard to the meaning of his words ought to be accepted.

Mr. NEELY. Where is the point of order? The hon. leader of the opposition insinuates

that I made a pretense of accepting the statement of the hon. member for Frontenac. I submit that his words are out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no use of trying to evade the rule of the House. A statement of the meaning or intent of his own words made by an hon. gentleman must be accepted.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, having got round this somewhat difficult point of order—

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the hon. member permit me a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. NEELY. If the hon. member for Frontenac expects me to make any further statement on this question he has my statement now, and that is the only one that I shall make with respect to the matter. I have told him that I am perfectly willing to accept his interpretation of his own remarks. I also make the statement that that was not the interpretation put upon his words by myself and a large majority of the members of this House.

Mr. EDWARDS. You dare not quote my remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. NEELY. When I was interrupted by the hon. member, I was referring to the complex situation that would be brought about in this country, if we submit the many policies which have been propounded in this House to the people of Canada for their decision, and I was proceeding to mention that one of the questions that would have to be inserted would be the question as to whether or not we were against the empire, to meet the point raised in this discussion as to the interpretation to be placed upon the speech of the hon. member for Frontenac. I submit that it is a fair proposition that if anything is to be submitted to the people of Canada every phase of this question ought to be submitted, and how much further ahead would this House or this country be by a referendum of the whole question of imperial defence? The only reason at all that I have heard from the benches of the opposition as to their complete reversal of policy on this question was the somewhat novel statement made by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) who told the House, as his speech was interpreted to me, as I unfortunately do not understand French, that he voted last year for the resolution passed by the House because the Prime Minister said that there was a German peril. But this year he would vote against the establishment of a Canadian navy because he understood that the German peril was over. While that may be a very novel explanation for the hon. gentleman to make to this House, it does not meet the case as far as other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are concerned, because the only reason that has been advanced by the opposition why they have made this right about face on the question of Canada's defence is that they claim there is an emergency in the affairs of the empire, and that Great Britain is subject to imminent peril by the construction of an enormous fleet of battleships by the people of Germany. Suppose we take the position of the hon. gentleman for granted, that there is an emergency, that there is a crisis in the affairs of the empire? Do these hon. gentlemen undertake to tell us that a contribution of $20,000,000 is going to materially affect that crisis or that emergency? Do they mean to tell us that a single gift of $20,000,000 is the margin of safety between the British empire and the power of the German navy? It seems to be the position taken by these hon. gentlemen that the margin of safety for the empire is a gift by Canada of $20,000,000.

If they do not hold to that position they must take the other, viz.: that if $20,000,000 is not a margin of safety we must continue this contribution periodically. I submit that not a single member of the opposition has answered the question asked by the member for Red Deer early in this debate: What is their future policy on the question of Canada's part in the defence of the empire? The other day the member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) told us that we on this side were raising a fictitious objection to a contribution when we said that a contribution savoured of tribute to Great Britain. Now, I want to press home this question to hon. gentlemen opposite: if the policy of a direct contribution is adopted as the permanent policy of this country, then these contributions must become periodic, and in that light I do say that they become a tribute on the people of Canada for the support of the British navy. We will either make this contribution as a duty, or as a matter of charity, and I do not think any man in this House will say we are doing it as a matter of charity. Then, if we do it as a matter of duty it certainly becomes a tribute from the people of Canada, and as such it is a case of taxation without representation. Now, suppose for argument sake we take it for granted there is an emergency as hon. gentlemen opposite have told us, where was that emergency in March, 1909? Were there not the same conditions existing in the affairs of the empire in March, 1909, as at the present time? And, if there is a peril, or a menace from the growth of the German navy, and if that peril becomes greater as the years go by shall Canada be called upon next year, and the year

after to furnish further sums of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 by way of contribution to the British fleet? My very strong objection to the policy laid down by the leader of the opposition is that in order to be effective—and these hon. gentlemen are very handy with the word 'effective' in declaring that the Canadian navy cannot be made effective—my objection to the policy of the leader of the opposition is that if a contribution is to be made effective it must become the permanent policy of the country to contribute periodically a certain sum. Mr. Speaker, my very strongest objections to the policy of direct contribution have already been stated and restated to the House, but I may say that the very strongest arguments advanced against the policy of contribution have come from hon. gentlemen opposite themselves. When the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) introduced his resolution last year he took very strong ground against the policy of direct contribution by Canada to Great Britain, and I shall quote from his speech one or two brief sentences merely to emphasize the position I now take. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in discussing the policy of a contribution said:

> The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself.

Further on he said:

> The interest that we take in a contribution spent by another is not the interest that I desire for Canada.

And Sir, I want to say that the last objection taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) against the policy of contribution appeals very strongly to me. The member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) at the conclusion of an able address on this question expressed very eloquently his feelings of loyalty and patriotism towards the motherland, and he said:

> I have unbounded faith in my King and country, and undying belief in the empire to which I belong. Let the British navy continue to be the floating bulwark of our land and her parliament our guiding star. The most effective contribution we could make, and one which may never need to be repeated, would be to give to England's navy two Dreadnoughts. Then if you must build a navy, submit the whole question to the Canadian people. I am prepared to assist in maintaining the splendid inheritance received from our forefathers. I love my country, I believe in her, I honour her, I am prepared to work for her, to live for her, and, if needs be, die for her.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentleman advocates a policy which would absolutely prevent himself or any other Canadian dying for his country. His policy is: give your money to Great Britain, have no Canadian navy, give the young men of Canada no opportunity to take up this life on the sea. And yet he would die for his country. I submit, Sir, that the only dying the hon. gentleman could do under the policy he lays down would be to die by proxy. But, that is not the kind of sacrifice which we as loyal Canadians and British subjects owe to the empire which is the protector of our liberties. The objection taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to a contribution is that it does not foster in the hearts of our Canadian people sentiments of patriotism and loyalty as would the establishment of a Canadian navy in which the young men of Canada could enter on a career which might ultimately lead them to lay down their lives for the defence of Canada, and for the defence of the empire. That is the position which I also hold on the policy of a direct contribution.

On the other hand, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have very serious objections to the proposal for the establishment of a Canadian navy, and they attack that policy on various grounds. The member for Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty) spent three mortal hours in an evident effort to convince himself that it was his duty to vote against the Naval Bill proposed by this government. And his final conclusion of the whole matter was that because Canada had no voice in the foreign policy of the empire, therefore, the Naval Bill as proposed by the government was subversive of the rights of autonomy and self-government possessed by the Canadian people. Is that the position taken by the ultra-loyalists from the city of Toronto or other parts of the province of Ontario? No, Sir. They attack us from another quarter. They call the navy proposed by this Bill a separatist navy. I do not know who coined that word. I think probably it was coined in the columns of that apostle of yellow journalism, the Toronto 'Mail and Empire,' which is making extensive use of it—which calls the Prime Minister of Canada a separatist and the proposed navy a separatist navy, simply because the control of that navy is to be in the hands of the Canadian parliament. And yet the hon. member for Ste. Anne comes along with another story, that the establishment of that navy is subversive of the autonomy of Canada. Why, Sir, it is just the old thing over again—one story for the French-speaking people of the province of Quebec and another story for the English-speaking people of the province of Ontario. That is the old game; we are used to it; we had lots to do

with it in the last election. I came across an interesting pamphlet during that election. I represent a constituency one part of which is inhabited by a large Roman Catholic population and another part by a number of staunch and influential Orange lodges. One day when I was visiting in the neighbourhood of these Orange lodges, a friend of mine passed me a pamphlet which I had not come across before. On its back was printed in large letters, 'Pass this to a friend,' and on the front was printed the name of the pamphlet, 'The Duty of the Hour.' I did not find that pamphlet in the other part of my constituency; but I am free to tell my hon. friends opposite that I had a couple of thousand copies of it struck off and sent all over the constituency. I will not say that it did me any good or any harm. My view is that on all these great public questions there should be but one policy: it should be a Canadian policy, and it should be adaptable to the people of the English-speaking provinces and equally adaptable to the people of the province of Quebec. Sir, I am always a little suspicious when I see hon. gentlemen on the opposition benches beginning to wave the flag. There has been a lot of waving of the flag in this debate; there has been a great deal of talk about loyalty and disloyalty. Now, loyalty is one of those virtues that do not need to be proclaimed from the housetops in order to convince people that it reposes in our breasts. I think loyalty is evidenced far more by deeds than by words; and while these hon. gentlemen waved the flag and talked about loyalty so much, I failed to find any sufficient evidence to lead me to believe that there is any more loyalty in their ranks than there is on this side of the House, even among my friends from the province of Quebec.

Now, Sir, it is not my intention to discuss at any great length my reasons for supporting the Bill before the House. I am a Canadian, and love my country. I believe that as Canada has reached her present status in wealth, in material resources, and in population, the time has come when we should contribute something towards the defence of our coasts, and towards maintaining the integrity of the empire. But I believe in doing what we do in our own way. I think that is a fair, and a right position, I think that is in accordance with the great body of sentiment on the other side of the Atlantic. I read the other day a clipping from the London 'Times,' a good Tory newspaper, one of the most influential in Great Britain, and that paper strongly endorsed the measure of this government now before this House. It claimed that the principle laid down in this measure, that the Canadian navy should be subject to the control of the Canadian parliament, was the right principle in every particular. But our friends on the opposition benches must out-Tory the Tories; they must be stronger in their expressions of loyalty to the British Crown than even the people across the water, who ought to know more about questions of defence than we in this country, who have had so little experience in matters of this kind.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I am strongly in favour of the proposition of the government, representing as I do a constituency of western Canada. We have in Canada a cosmopolitan population. In my own constituency, while there are a great many English-speaking people, there are also many people from various countries all over the world. These people have come to our shores to become Canadian citizens, and I am firmly convinced that the great majority of those who have come from foreign countries, and have taken the oath of allegiance to the British Crown, after three or four years of residence under British institutions, are as loyal to those institutions as are the people who are born and bred under them; because by contrast they have been led to see the great superiority of British institutions to the institutions of many of the countries of continental Europe. I tell you, Sir, that I would not like to go back to my constituency and face these people on this question of naval defence, and have to admit to them that the parliament of Canada, who the people of Canada have elected to do their duty, came to the conclusion that Canada was not big enough, had not brains or resources enough, to work out for herself the question of her own national defence. I say that, particularly in the case of our American cousins who have crossed the borders, and become Canadian citizens, it would be perfect folly to tell them that we had adopted the policy of sending Canadian money out of the country simply because we had not the confidence in ourselves to carry through this project on our own behalf. In the west we are just at the beginning of our prosperity. Thanks to the policy of this government, thanks to its transportation and immigration policy, the last few years have certainly witnessed very great developments in our western territories, and we are glad to know that this government proposes to do a great deal more. We are glad to know that it proposes, in the very early future, to construct a railway to Hudson bay. That in itself will be a great contribution to imperial defence, because it will shorten the route from our western grain fields to the markets of the world, and provide a route which will, from its northern situation, be one of the safest by which the

products of western Canada can be shipped to the British market. On behalf of the people I represent, I shall support the policy of the government, which means the development of Canada's own resources by Canadian money, and the giving of an opportunity to the young men of this country to follow a career on the sea in the defence of Canada and the empire.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I shall only take up a few minutes of the time of the House, and I would not do so except for the reason that I do not care to give a silent vote on this great question. But, although this debate has taken some time, that time has been well spent, in my opinion, because it has brought the question before the people in a way in which it never would have been brought to their attention had this discussion not taken place. I believe the question should be discussed on a broad principle. So far as the question of loyalty is concerned, I do not think that should be brought into the debate at all. I believe that our people, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, are all loyal and anxious to do what is best in the interest of Canada and the empire as a whole; and for that reason I would have liked to have seen a Bill brought down which would have secured the unanimous support of both sides. I think, myself, that it would have been much better had the right hon. the Prime Minister submitted his Bill to my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in which case they might possibly have come to an agreement on some measure, and thus have secured its unanimous approval. However, as that has not been done, we must discuss the matter as we have it before us.

A great deal has been said about the resolution of March, 1909. My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Neely) claims that we on this side are not carrying out the policy which was enunciated in that resolution. Well, so far as I am concerned, if circumstances have changed since then, I can see no reason why we should not meet them as they exist. At that time, an emergency was believed to exist, or to be on the verge of existing in the empire, and we were unanimous in the opinion that something should be done. The Prime Minister, and every hon. gentleman on that side, agreed that something should be done, and so did we on this side, and to-day we are here with two propositions as to what should be done—that of the Prime Minister and that of the leader of the opposition. In these propositions we differ, but so far as the resolution is concerned which was passed in March last, we all agreed that there was an emergency and that something should be done. But at that time also, there were differences of opinion concerning that resolution. The Toronto 'Globe' then took a different position from the one it takes to-day, so that the Toronto 'Globe' has changed its front on this question. The right hon. the Prime Minister has also undergone a change of view, because at that time, in March last, he had no intention or expectation that a Canadian navy would ever be built. He simply wished us to pass a resolution but did not intend to build a Canadian navy. It was only when he found that the sentiment in this country was such that something had to be done, that he brought down this Bill. My hon. friend (Mr. Neely), who has just spoken, has told us that great pressure was brought on the leader of the opposition in order to induce him to submit the policy he has laid before us. Sir, it was not necessary to bring any pressure on the leader of the opposition, because the policy he has submitted is the one that he always advocated. But what about the Prime Minister? Pressure was brought on the right hon. gentleman to bring down the present measure. I am convinced that had he consulted his own wishes, he would not have proposed to build a Canadian navy or even offered a Dreadnought.

We may take it for granted that England is not building these Dreadnoughts or increasing her navy simply for her own gratification, but because she feels bound to do so in order to maintain the position on the high seas which she has had for hundreds of years. It is because other nations are building Dreadnoughts and threatening her supremacy that England has to follow suit. Her people have to pay the extra expenditure to maintain this increased navy, and surely it is time that Canada should do something to assist the mother country in the great strain which has been put upon her?

The right hon. the Prime Minister has told us that this proposition which he has brought down has been before the people since 1902. Well, so far as I am concerned, I never heard of it until this session, and I cannot recall any speech, either by the right hon. gentleman or those behind him, in any part of this Dominion, in which any intention to build a Canadian navy was expressed. The first time I heard of this policy was when the proposition was submitted to this House, and I certainly think that, in deference to the people, they should be given an opportunity to pronounce upon this great change in the future of Canada before we undertake to put them in the position in which they will be placed once this navy is built.

So far as the protection of this great British empire is concerned, let me ask this question. Of what use has the British navy been to Canada in the past, and what use may it be to us in the future? Have we had any profit or benefit as Can-

adians from this great navy? Let me give two or three instances, and I could mention many, to show what use this British navy has been to us in the past. A few years ago, in 1886 or 1887, the Canadian sealing vessels with their cargoes, were seized and confiscated by the United States government. The people of British Columbia immediately reported the matter to the Prime Minister of Canada, who at once sent word to England that our Canadians were being injured in British Columbia, that their sealing vessels had been taken and the catch of seals confiscated. England at once notified the United States that they were doing wrong and, on account of the protection of the British navy to Canadians, the poor men in British Columbia were paid $465,000 for the goods that had been taken, the vessels were returned, and $49,500 compensation given to their crews. Had it not been for the protection of the British navy does any hon. gentleman suppose that the people in British Columbia would have got a dollar? The United States knew that we had the protection not only of the British navy, but of every British soldier, that every soldier of the king was prepared to shed his blood and die for these men, Canadians as they were, on the coast of British Columbia.

Two years ago an illustration was afforded from the Atlantic coast. The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and Mr. Roche, then member for Halifax, informed the House that three Nova Scotia fishermen had been arrested in Uruguay, that they were in prison, and that something should be done by this government to secure justice for them. The Prime Minister at once cabled to England, and without another word a British Dreadnought was sent to Uruguay, the men were released and publicly apologized to, and were recompensed for the wrong done to them. Remember that that Dreadnought was sent there at the expense of the British taxpayer.

Then we remember that a man named McGee, of Montreal, was arrested in Guatemala. The question was brought to the attention of the Prime Minister, and it was with delight that our Prime Minister immediately cabled to England, saying: One of our British subjects, a subject of your king, has been arrested in Guatemala, and justice should be done. A British war vessel was sent to San José, in Guatemala, and the man was released at once. The British commander had him apologized to, and on asking the man what had been done to him, he was informed that the prisoner had been given fifty stripes. The commander said: Pay $500 for every stripe, or off go the guns—and they paid $125,000. These are instances where the navy has been of use to Canada in the past. Then what about our Canadian missionaries in China, when they were threatened with murder? The very fact that they were under the British flag was enough to save them from being murdered. We have had many such cases in the past. What use will this navy be in the future? It may indeed happen that some other Canadian may get into trouble. Will it not be with delight that the Prime Minister can stand up and say: I shall cable to England and say: Send another Dreadnought to protect this Canadian. There is no danger of his sending our Canadian navy because if he sends a vessel from our navy the chances are that any war vessel of any other country will destroy it before it reaches its port of destination. Thus, so far as I am concerned, I say that in the future this Canadian navy will not be of any benefit or assistance in protecting Canadians abroad, and we must appeal to our great British navy in order to obtain protection.

Supposing we were to send to England an amount sufficient to build two Dreadnoughts, call them Ontario and Quebec if you like. Then we would feel under no obligation whatever if anything should happen to Canadians, and we should cable over to England asking that a Dreadnought be sent to protect Canadians, who might get into trouble because, if they could not send one of those Dreadnoughts we had built ourselves, any other would do. Would we not also feel proud in case of war to know that Ontario and Quebec were at the head of the great navy and would probably be the ones that would destroy or assist to destroy any enemy that might attack the British empire? The last speaker (Mr. Neely) laid great stress on taxation without representation. We have had many cases since I have been in this House of the payment of contribution, but we never heard the question of taxation without representation raised. This session we cheerfully remitted an amount to help those who suffered from the floods of France; we sent that aid with delight and pride, but we did not ask to have representation in France because we had sent that contribution. We did the same thing in the Crimea, and there have been other instances in which we sent contributions. We sent money to San Francisco, but we did not ask representation in the United States.

Canada is going to be a great country. We have great resources, we have great minerals, we have a great agricultural country, and we are advancing very, very fast. Surely it is time that we were doing something in order to do our part in the defence of the great British empire. If we intend remaining in the empire, we should not stultify ourselves by remaining there at the expense of those in England, and

ask them to protect us. I am, therefore, proud to be able to support the amendment of the hon. the leader of the opposition, because that resolution states that we are willing to do something right now, we are willing to say that we will have in that great navy two Dreadnoughts, and that as soon as we can get the young men trained we will man those Dreadnoughts with Canadians who will take their place in the front ranks of the great battle, should war occur. It is my hope and wish, as it is that of every Canadian and of every man in the British empire, that war should not come. But the very fact of having a great navy will preserve peace in the future as the navy has preserved peace in the past. I shall not take up more time; I simply rose to make these few remarks and to explain why I did not wish to give a silent vote on this question.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, with regard to the many services which have been rendered to Canada by Great Britain, some of which have been mentioned by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid), I shall not say much, as I agree with that member on that point. I agree also that Canada owes a debt of gratitude to England for these services that have been rendered her in the last hundred years. With regard to the third question which has been raised by the hon. member, the question of the kind of contribution that Canada should give to England, I ask the hon. member for Grenville to agree with me in the position I take and which I shall explain as I proceed. Canada, as I shall show, is ready to grant to England the kind of aid that has been agreed upon between Canada and England. With these few remarks, I proceed to explain the vote that I intend to give on this Bill (No. 95).

Mr. Speaker. I took a great deal of interest, in the debate which took place in this House in March last, upon the resolution concerning the aid to be given to Great Britain for the strengthening of the British navy. It is now proposed that Canada should take a step further in that direction, and the government asks parliament to crystallize that resolution, and give it effect by the passage of this legislation entitled 'an Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada'; and a subsequent resolution providing for the expenditure necessary for the establishment of that service. By the 53rd clause of this Bill, the government will be empowered to organize a permanent volunteer naval force, at its expense, the ships to be built in Canada, manned and commanded by Canadians, or commanded by officers appointed by Canada, to defend Canada, first, and assist England in its defence, in case of need, under the command in chief of the King, as is required by the political status of this Dominion.

Sir, let me explain some of the many reasons for which this Bill should be passed:

During the recess of parliament a rather lengthy conference between the representatives of the British government, and of the self-governing colonies was held in London to determine the kind of aid that should be given to England. This conference was the natural outcome of previous meetings held between some of the British ministers and the representatives of the most important of the three classes which we find amongst the 80 colonies or possessions under the sovereignty of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The universal policy of the world is shaping itself towards the supplanting of territorial, or local, or internal trade, by a general or universal trade, or in other words a maritime commerce.

The government is to-day, asking the representatives of this country in this House assembled, to declare themselves on the programme which they are presenting for the creation of a naval defence in connection with the large maritime trade which Canadian merchants are building up. As a representative of the most important city of Canada, the commercial metropolis, and the greatest national port of the Dominion, I cannot give a silent vote upon this great issue.

I owe it to my constituents of the city of Montreal, and I owe it to myself to explain, through what process of personal reflection, through what conception and reasoning, I have, freely, independently from all passing pressure and unlinked to any superior influence, formed my opinion upon the plan which the government has submitted to us.

I do not expect to satisfy the expectations of everybody with my declarations and my vote, but, I at least, hope that, those who after mature reasoning, while not thinking as I do, will feel bound to admit that, in so doing, I have nothing in view but the welfare and greatness of my country.

Allow me then, Sir, to indulge in a brief retrospect of the work and progress of some of the great empires of the past, and the greatness of which was based on their maritime trade. Some of my hon. friends have already quoted from the lessons of the past, and I have listened to their statements with great pleasure; because the past will always be for mankind the best teacher. In anything we do, whatever may be our differences, divisions and strifes, we are nevertheless bound to seek, in the past, for our safest methods to solve the problems of the present. History

there teaches us that the greatest and the richest and the happiest nations have been those which gave the best of their energies and wealth to the building and maintenance of a great maritime commerce, through the equipment of both a merchant fleet and a war fleet. Allow me to remind you briefly of the best illustrations, which occur to me, of the soundness of my views. Athens, Lacedaemon, Crete, Lesbos, Chios, and all the Greek cities and colonies, were nonentities in the political world until, through a skilful and costly combination of forces, money and ships, and under the guidance of an Athenian admiral (if I am permitted to use a modern term to designate its commander) they put to sea a fleet, powerful enough to repulse Asiatic barbarians and other foes. So long as, but not one minute longer, than they had the most powerful fleet, the Greeks were the governing political leaders of the ancient world. Greece was at its political zenith between the time of the battle of Salamis, and that of Aegos-Potamos, which are the Alpha and Omega of their political and commercial pre-eminence. Rome was a second-class power before the battle of Antium, or, so long as the Romans could not send vessels to conquer Carthage and Asia Minor, and could not rule on the sea as they did on land. During the feudal ages, Venice and Genoa were the supreme arbiters of politics in Europe, just because they were the undisputed masters of the Mediterranean. The most prosperous cities of Europe, during the 400 years from the 12th to the 16th century, were the eighty free towns, holding meetings of their delegates, every three years, either at Lubeck, or Cologne, or Hamburg, for the purpose of assessing the contribution of each town, of securing new trading privileges, and of better defending both old and new ones. Neither a monarchial state, nor a polyarchial state ever enjoyed a greater amount of respect, of prestige from the other monarchies or republics, than those eighty cities composing that quasi-state known, as the Hanseatic League. I contemplate with wonder the enormous waste of human energies and wealth which went to create, upon the ruins of the empire of Venice, that other great Portuguese empire, which was the ruler of the world during the 15th century, just after the discovery of the route to the orient via the Cape of the Tempests, to use the description of Camoens. And then, upon the partition of the unknown world by Pope Nicholas V, in 1454, and Alexander VI in 1493, Spain reached out for America, and astonished Europe by the vastness and richness of her new discoveries. Spain reigned supreme in Europe, during the 16th century. The Netherlands got the monopoly of the trade of the world, during the 17th century, through the audacity, activity and devotion of its mariners. France, during the 18th century, was the arbiter of the maritime destinies of the world, and it was not until then that she was recognized as the dominating political power in Europe.

England came, after Trafalgar, to become as she remains to-day, the ruling state of the world, just because of the indisputable supremacy of her fleet. But, to-day, other states are organizing merchant fleets, and as a direct consequence, war fleets. Our age will witness the competition of a number of maritime states for the trade supremacy of the world. There are to-day thirty states out of forty-eight going into the maritime trade, and the destinies of the world can no longer rest under the power of a single state. The world's richness is no more to be the easy field of exploitation by a nation having a few thousand daring mariners protecting a great many more thousands of thrifty factors, merchants, traders and shippers. Every state seems ready to send its young men and even its older citizens to conquer the wealth of the unexplored, or undeveloped countries. A universal thirst for business and its profits, for gold, is manifest in every quarter. And in every state there is—and it is quite natural—a tendency to equip on the seas, a fleet of both merchantmen and warships to defend its interests; the one cannot go without the other. States of to-day are getting more and more commercialized and are preparing themselves to compete for the partition of the universal wealth of the world. But such competition, while it may be friendly at the start, must prove eventually hostile. After the tariff wars, one may easily foresee the wars in which predominance is to be determined by the guns of warships. England is confronted to-day with such a condition of affairs, and Canada cannot longer ignore the situation. The so-called German war scare is but one of them, though I must remind you, Sir, that amongst German officers to-day it is customary to offer a toast to ' The Next Meeting,' meaning on board of the first captured English battleship.

It is at this turning point in the life of England and Canada, that we are invited to consider the possibility of future political difficulties. To make Canada ready for any emergency, several policies are proposed. What are they? The first is: the presentation of two Dreadnoughts now, and then, resting on our oars to await adequate results from an unknown policy of defence. The exponent of the policy is the honourable the leader of the opposition. The second is: Canada is to play the 'manly part,' and very naturally its sponsor is the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The third proposed is to do nothing until a plebiscite is had, with a declaration of unalterable devotion to the

British Crown as an assurance policy; and, according to the words of that official publication of the late Mr. Hansard, its father is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who, after a six months' canvass, has found a few thousand persons, mostly youths, out of 2,000,000 in the province of Quebec, to support his views. Under the fourth head may be classified ten or twelve other varied and variable policies, that I beg leave not to expound, as they are mostly founded upon newspaper quotations, poetical recitations, and historical misapplication. Are all those plans as clear and terse and patriotic as that of the government? I venture to say, Sir, they are not. The first two policies are undefinable, impractical and, therefore, negligible. The third one is illogical and illegal, as it is a denial to this House, acting upon a five-years' mandate, of the right to spend one-thirtieth of the revenues of Canada for its defence, when this House might if it chose waste the whole revenue in buying peanuts. The cabinet, in order to meet the wishes of England, now proposes to this parliament to vote an expenditure of $12,000,000 to build ships once and for all, and to pay for their maintenance yearly, something less than $4,500,000. This, therefore, means a yearly expenditure of one and one third million dollars for maintaining and manning ships, the construction of which has cost $4,000,000.

The purpose of the government plan is obviously to provide a plan of defence for Canada and of help to England, according to the wishes, amounting almost to demands of the latter, which I take to be expressed, conclusively, in the reports of the Naval Defence Conference of 1909, and the circumstances surrounding the same.

Now, Sir, should we resist these desires of England? I have waited, a long time, before giving my very modest view about the solution of this problem, for a great political and economical problem it undeniably is. I say at once, that it is a question to be decided, not according to race, nor religion, nor historical prejudices, but according purely and simply to the teaching of reason, of law, and of devotion to the best interests of our dear country. To begin with, I must, according to my mind, explain the political status of Canada, in relation to the foreign states of the world, and to England, and the definition of that status will go a great way to show that Canada is not free to reject the requests of England. I must say, that I do not agree with most of the speeches, writings and editorials, which have been written, during the last half century about the great amount of independence enjoyed by Canada. I admit that England has been good enough, during that long period, to let our authors, newspapermen, and orators, tell the people of Canada that they were perfectly free and independent of England, and that they were their own masters, both in regard to England, and the other states. This, according to my mind, has been a rather equivocal statement of the position which Canada occupies to-day, both in relation to England, and to the other states. I know it is rather hard and humiliating to say those things to my fellow-citizens, but just the same I feel bound to say it for the purpose of pointing out what is the duty of Canada to-day with regard to the request which is being made upon her by England to assist her in the coming commercial battle. I venture to state that Canada, in this year of 1910, according to the teaching of international law, is simply a province of the British empire, having no status whatever with regard to foreign states. Our country does not possess any of the characteristics (which number eight or ten altogether), of what is called state, and which make an aggregation of people irresponsible to any human power, but—to use a phrase of the fifteenth century—' Responsible only to God.' If I examine the classification of states, I am forced to admit that our country is neither a sovereign state, like England; nor a semi-sovereign state, like Bulgaria was; nor a neutral state, like Belgium, nor a state under protectorate like Tunis; nor even a tributary state like Egypt. Comparison of conditions is here of a great benefit to teach our citizens the truth about their reduced political rank in the eyes of the world. With a political organism subject to the caprices of the parliament at Westminster; without power to make its territories productive by foreign trade; without jurisdiction to pass undefeasible laws; unable to protect its citizens abroad before judicial or administrative authorities; unable to ask for marks of respect; unable to send diplomatic agents; unentitled to foreign recognition; incapable of making treaties, unable, unless authorized to do so, to issue letters patent of command either to army officers or to navy officers even to defend her own territory; here stands Canada to-day, calling herself a nation. By telling my fellow-citizens what we really are, I hope I may convey to them the aspiration of being what they might be. While I am making a rather poor picture of the personality of Canada to-day, I am bound to think that this naval move will tend to increase tremendously the importance of our country, and that is why I am in favour of the passing of this Bill.

Canada to-day has not even the right to speak to a minister of foreign affairs, even through her Prime Minister, unless the latter has been clothed with a letter patent issued by the British Minister of Foreign Affairs. So much so, is this, that during the negotiations of the Franco-Canadian

treaty, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, and the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, had to be authorized very minutely by England to speak to the Minister of Trade and Commerce of France, and had to be introduced to the latter by the British Ambassador, in Paris. Let me cite, as the only fact which gives to Canada, what may be styled a recognition by a foreign power, that clause of the Franco-Canadian treaty which allows an employee appointed by Canada to certify bills of lading, or certificates of origin of goods, which may have a legal value. That is about the limit of the action of our country in relation to foreign countries.

I apologize for reminding the House that but a few weeks ago, the Canadian agent in Antwerp had to haul down his sign marked 'Canadian Agency' at the request of the British consul in that city, under the pretense that such action on behalf of the Canadian agent would create possible confusion in the minds of the citizens of Belgium as to the political status of Canada. Canada has no flag, if we do not accept as such the emblem which our merchantmen were some years ago empowered to unfurl at their mastheads. And I do not need to argue very long to show that of international status Canada has none, because the very name of our country 'Dominion,' which our French translators have very proudly, but improperly, translated into the word 'puissance,' should remind us that we are but a domain of the Crown; to use the language of the Act of 1834, defining the powers of the Privy Council of England, and giving to that final tribunal an unlimited jurisdiction over any judgment given by any court in any colony, 'Dominion,' or plantation of His Majesty. In a general way, I could point out many other cases of deception arising out of our political and administrative terminology.

If we examine now the status of Canada under the light of the public law of England, what do we discover? One finds that, though a delegation of powers, a federal legislative body, and nine provincial legislatures are supervising private intercourse between our citizens, the application of the civil laws of France, or the common law of England, the appointment of judges to decide litigations arising out of about 20 contracts, and finally looking over the administration of municipal affairs. No constitutional guarantee, in the constitutional Act of 1867, is to be found limiting the power of Great Britain to impose taxes upon its citizens in Canada. If we look at sections 91 and 92 of that Act, we find that even our power to naturalize British subjects is very limited, because our naturalized British subjects are considered as such exclusively within the territory of Canada, and they are not British subjects within the British Isles, nor even in any British colony outside of Canada. If we examine the statutes of England, we find quite a number of Acts applicable to Canada, and no concern is taken whether they be repugnant or not to the wording of our Canadian statutes. Let me quote, for example, the Colonial Prison Act, the Colonial Offenders' Act, the Colonial Marriage Act, the Colonial Fortification Act, the Colonial Courts Act, the Colonial Clergy Act, the Colonial Attorney' Act, the Colonial Laws Act, the Naturalization Act, the Merchant Shipping Act, the Bills of Exchange Act, and last but not least, the Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865, 28-29 Victoria, chapter 63, which declares that any law passed by any legislature which is repugnant to the interests of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is ipso facto, null and void. It is to comply with the requirements of that Act, that clause 18 of the Bill before the House has been inserted. Our fleet must remain at the disposal of England in case of emergency or otherwise this Bill will be ultra vires and null and void. Let me quote from the Act of 1865:

> The term 'colony' shall in this Act include all of Her Majesty's possessions abroad in which there shall exist a legislature. . . . The term 'legislature' and 'colonial legislature' shall severally signify the authority other than the imperial parliament on His Majesty in Council, competent to make laws for any colony. Any colonial law which is or shall lie in any respect repugnant to the provisions of any Act of parliament extending to the colony to which such law may relate, or repugnant to any law, order or regulation made under authority of such Act of parliament, or having in the colony the force and effect of such Act, shall be read subject to such Act, order or regulation, and shall to the extent of such repugnancy, but not otherwise, be and remain absolutely null and void.

Let me quote section 15 of the British North America Act:

> The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

After reading this Bill and the Acts of 1867 and 1661, every one must admit that this extends rather than restricts the autonomy of Canada. The famous question about the meaning of 'shall' or 'may' in this legislative enactment is reduced to naught.

Let me quote also clause 18 of Bill (No. 95) in which the interpretation of the word 'may' has given rise to such debate:

> 18. In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

Should this Bill now before us be passed without clause 18 it would be repugnant to section 15 of that imperial statute, the British North America Act, 1867, conforming to chapter 6, statute 1, Charles II, 1661, intituled, 'An Act declaring the sole right of the militia to be in the King and for the present ordering and disposing the same,' and also to the regulations made thereunder, and for that very reason our Bill would be null and void. It is not also the proper time to remind this House that nobody but a pirate, and with all the due consequences thereof, can run a warship unless her commander is the bearer of a state patent since the declaration of Paris in 1856. Bill (No. 95) without its clause 18 would be enacted in violation of international law.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GERVAIS. Mr. Speaker, in continuing my remarks before recess, I may say that many other facts and Acts of parliament could be quoted to show that Canada, after all, and in spite of the Act of 1867, is still, in the eyes of England, one of its 80 provinces. I say this, although Canada has a responsible government, having the right to spend the money of its citizens for their benefit generally without too much interference on behalf of the sovereign authority. I say this although Canada is a British colony of the first class, and is not in consequence a Crown colony, which later is ruled by a governor and a council appointed by England. I say this, although Canada is not a privileged chartered colony, that is, a colony governed by a commercial company. I say all this, Sir, though I am ready to applaud our distinguished leader when he proclaims that Canada is a nation.

While helping England, I prefer to see Canada doing so as a British dominion, realizing thoroughly her present status, than to see Canada rendering such service as a so-called member of an empire, composed of one state and a great number of conquered but statuteless provinces having no representatives in the imperial parliament. It is only by knowing what his present condition is that one may think of reaching a higher condition. I like the idea of Canada entering into a maritime league with England, such as would be in process of creation through this Bill, and which would tend to bring to Canada a larger amount of true autonomy, which would redound to the benefit of England and of Canada.

By the passing of this Bill, Canada is promoting herself to a higher place in the eyes of the world, and that is a very good reason for me to give it my cordial support.

I admit that the status of Canada as a British colony is far better than that of any colony of France, Germany, Portugal, Holland, or even of the United States of America, for in the case of all of those colonies the sovereign state deals with their municipal or local affairs from its legislature without consulting the people of the colony. England alone allowed her colonists to tax her exported goods; to produce goods similar to her own; to sell goods to foreigners or buy from them; to ship them even in non-English bottoms; to be governed by the rules of metropolitan justice. But, it is true, just the same, that Canada is bound, whether it pleases her or not, to do what England may require her to do. Should England wish to tax Canada there is nothing in the public law of England to prevent her. I may be reminded that we have the precedent of the Boston merchants; but let me tell you, Sir, that those merchants, at that time, were probably equipped to accept the inevitable consequences of resisting the new tax on their tea. Such is not the condition of Canada to-day. Are we to follow the teaching of a certain portion of the press and the speeches of certain of our orators who have been preaching that Canada should have no army and no navy, but should remain as it has been for 150 years, completely without defence, and exclusively inhabited by farmers, merchants, lawyers, and ward heelers, depending solely for protection on the application, for the benefit, of that fiction or hallucination known as the Munroe doctrine.

I know that Canada is not, to-day, governed, as she was upon the arrival of Lord Durham at Quebec. It would be rather difficult for the colonial office of to-day to send to our Governor General instructions similar to those which they sent to Sir Poulett Thompson, and to tell him to govern his country against, or without the advice of his responsible ministers. I know that a radical change has taken place. I know that now the Prime Minister is much more than a sub-officer of Downing street. I know that Canada, since 1791, or to be more accurate, since 1840, has passed from the status of 'Crown' colony to that of responsibly governed colony. I admit, also, that this has been done in consequence of the new policy adopted by England, by which she feels herself in duty bound to grant her colonies autonomy in matters municipal. I am ready to proclaim, that England alone has stood the first, and perhaps will stand the last, in the history of the colonial regimes of the world, for the establishment of such colonial autonomy as our own,

but on the other hand, if I scrutinize the text of our constitution, without taking into account our de facto position towards England, but exclusively our de jure relations with her, I venture to affirm that I make no misstatement of law when I declare that Canada is, legally, but a British colony, and not a nation, in the sense implied by the authors of international law. Sir, we know the meaning of the word 'race', of the word 'people', of the word 'nation', of the word 'state'. Too often, have we in this country lost sight of the true definition of each of those words. Let me define a nation: A nation, Sir, is the union into a society of the inhabitants of one country, having the same language, governed by the same laws, banded together by identity of origin, of physical conformation and of moral propensities, by a community of interests and of feelings and by a merger of existences brought about by the passing of centuries.

I am mentioning all this to show that though England has not been pressing hard upon us to give her help, and has been trying to veil the exercise of her rights upon Canada, she has without any question authority to command Canada to come to her rescue, willingly or unwillingly. But, Sir, not only our status forces us to build up a navy, but own own interests, both political and commercial, impel us to do so, as I will try to show later on.

Sir, are there any real reasons for Canada not doing anything to comply with the wishes of England? A few of our citizens are trying to raise, or rather, to invoke the question of neutrality. Let me explain what is neutrality, as defined by Martens, Kluber, Heffter, Wheaton, Hubner, Hautefeuille and Ortolan. Neutrality is for a state the right or the duty not to take any part in a war. Under internationl law, neutrality is permissible in favour of any state. One of the most celebrated cases of neutrality was that urged by the United States of America in 1795 when, France being assailed by quite a number of European powers, the United States answering Mr. Genest, the French minister, told him that they were not bound to do anything for France, which had been very recently the most potent instrument in bringing them into the society of states. That resort to neutrality has been invoked, for 150 years, quite a number of times. But let me say, Mr .Speaker, that behind the most of the instances of optional neutrality, you find national suicide, or national cowardice.

If we look at the relations between Britain and one of her provinces, there cannot be any question of neutrality, and the reason for this statement is rather obvious. Every law student knows it. Every one knows that so soon as war is declared between England and any of the 48 foreign states of the world, composing the society of states, any inch of the British territory, whether within the British Isles, or in any of the British provinces, is on a war footing. Therefore Canada is at war whether she wishes to be at war or not. England's war is Canada's war, so much so that the minute war is declared all our goods and vessels and citizens become hostile in the estimation of the country at war with England, and all things Canadian become ipso facto seizable by the belligerents against England. Is it not by applying those well-known doctrines, that during the eighteenth century, England saw her way clear to destroy the colonial dominions of France in every part of the world, and to conquer even Nouvelle-France? Those same doctrines stand just as good to-day as in the past, Sir, and it is against the revival of this doctrine to our detriment, that I wish to have my Canadian fellow citizens keep themselves prepared. A state may be neutral; a British province cannot. More especially do I not wish to see Canada standing neutral towards England for the sake of not building a navy. Neutrality is a word which only states can use, but never a colony when addressing its metropolis. But if such a condition of affairs from the point of view of international law and of the public law of England exists, is it not better that Canada should willingly aid England, and do it in the happiest way?

After all, what is asked from Canadians? If we take for granted that the total population of Canada is about 8,000,000 we figure that the contribution of each citizen for the maintenance of our fleet (an accomplishment which will satisfy our national pride, and at the same time please England), will not exceed 60 cents per head annually, plus one dollar and a half per head for the building of the same. If we take into consideration the population of the province of Quebec, and make certain allowances for contributions made more especially for creating banks, insurance companies, loan companies, railway companies, all of them mostly organized and kept in existence by British capital, we have to conclude that, estimating the population of that province at about 2,000,000, each inhabitant of Quebec would not pay more than one shilling per year for the maintenance of that fleet, though so useful both to Canada and England, as well for defence as for commercial purposes.

But, some one may say that this creation of a war fleet will tend to diminish our rank both amongst the colonies of Great Britain, and in the esteem of foreign countries. Nothing can be more fallacious.

I do not see in what way the status of Canada will suffer depreciation because she enters into somewhat of a maritime lea-

gue with other colonies, and the parent state. No one can imagine for a moment that Canada can alone protect her vast seashores. Let me give you an illustration. I will once more go to the ancient world to get my example. You know that it was the fundamental maxim of Athens that she should remain the ruler of the seas. Athens was the greatest sea power of the 300 cities of Greece. Sparta was the largest military power on land. Nevertheless, Athens, with its 30,000 soldiers, its 30,000 mariners, and its total male and female population of 200,000 inhabitants, managed to form a confederation which was called the confederation of Delos, composed of 300 cities, each one of them sending its delegates, furnishing ships, money or men, and later on paying a fixed sum of money, the whole to equip and maintain a fleet strong enough to secure the supremacy of Greece over all other powers, at any time. The federal treasury which was established first, at Delos, where the delegates met, was later on transferred to Athens, and set up in the Temple of the Acropolis. This is, I think, a shining example to our citizens. Imagine a city like Athens, with a total population of but 200,000 citizens, having its two ports of Piraeus and Phalerum, and its shipbuilding yard of Munychia, and contributing half of the thousand talents, that is $5,000,000 for the equipment and manning of the confederation fleet. And, you know, Athens did the right thing in regard to that; as long as the maritime league was maintained, her glory was unbounded, as soon as it was disrupted all her power vanished. Neither Athens nor Lacedaemon felt depreciated by going into the confederation of Delos. For Athens had not then forgotten the teaching of Themistocles and Aristides, realizing that their country needed not only magistrates and leaders, but also, instruments of defence such as an army, a fleet of war, and a revenue. Athens has given to the world of to-day the most vivid example of national energy. With a small territory, and a limited budget, through the efforts and ability of its public spirited citizens (the greatest lovers of liberty known to history) Athens was able to make first class harbours, build the strongest navy of the day, erect the most marvellous temples and palaces that art can inspire and architecture construct, and through its fleet, and its naval defence demonstrate her capabilities in repulsing invasions much more terrible for her than would be an invasion to-day of England by the Germans.

After this short glimpse of the past, let us come to the question of the protection of our thousands of miles of seashore and territorial boundary. First of all, we have to consider the proposal of those who wish a Canada unarmed, both on sea and land, but who hope to substitute for them the British protection which it has enjoyed for years; the protection which is called by those who are not farsighted, the Monroe doctrine, and which is in a concrete form the recognition of the United States of America as the protector, the tutor, and the guardian of the twenty-one states of North, Central, and South America. The establishment of that Monroe doctrine, as a settled fact is contrary to the best interests of the world, as well as to the teaching of the society of states. There is but one, there can be but one, universal society of states. The Monroe doctrine has not proved itself, as you know, Sir, very useful to the lesser states of America. Mexico, which sought for the application of the Monroe doctrine to dethrone the Emperor Maximilian, lost through it, the best part of its territory. The application of the Monroe doctrine too, in the case of Cuba, has proved very detrimental to the richest island of the West Indies. The secret conspiracy to destroy the sugar crops and the tobacco crops of Cuba and to create revolution against Spain, all things inspired by Monroe doctrine advocates, has brought, as its natural consequence the reduction of Cuba to a state of humiliating protection, and Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands to a still more inferior condition.

The intervention of our neighbours in the private affairs of the states of both central and south America, is not of a nature to encourage our country to place its future national aspirations under the protection of the Monroe doctrine. We are suffering enough just now, from the use by our neighbours of a name, though chosen by them at a Paris banquet, given in the honour of Franklin, which goes to show that our friends of the United States of America are arrogating to themselves the sole right to the name of Americans which should really designate all the groups of inhabitants of the whole continent. American invasion under a peaceful name has already set in, I regret to say. Very fortunately the other states have not yet recognized that abusive use of a name by the United States of America, which after all is but one of the forty-eight states of the world. Surely it is a most absurd dream to believe in the protection of the Monroe doctrine rather than in British protection.

Anything which will tend to loosen or to destroy our ties with the parent state is, in my opinion, an act of high treason towards our country, because it would mean for her a Diminutio Capitis, that is to say, a reduction of rank in the eyes of the world. Canada left to herself, without any more British protection, would be open to be annexed to our neighbours, or to be sold to them, by her sovereign. We have to speak plainly; do you imagine, for a moment, that England, not receiving even

the moral support or any co-operation in its defence from Canada, would do anything to protect the latter from an American or other foreign invasion? I have taken for granted, at this moment, that England would not try to coerce its colony of Canada. But it is within, as we have said, the power of England to resort to such coercion by way of taxation, threats of sale or exchange of territory, as in the case of Heligoland for Samoa, and the purchase of our territory would have an easy job to get possession of it. For, if those who do not wish our parliament to put up any defence should succeed in convincing our people of the correctness of their foolish opinions, Canada would be utterly unprotected both on sea and on land, and liable to be conquered by a border invasion. What are words of mouth worth against the bullet of the fusileer or the baton of the constable? I beg some of my Quebec friends to remember the days of 1837, when words, newspaper articles, and epistles from those having brought about the resort to arms, and who were keeping themselves in hiding in foreign lands, proved unequal to prevent my fellow-men from dying either on the battlefield or on the scaffold. Sir, I do not like to speak of those dire possibilities, should the opinion of those in my province who want an undefended Canada, prevail. Suppose that England inflicting chastisement, should disinterest herself of Canada; then in the case of annexation, for example, what would be the result for our church, our laws, and our language. Has any one thought of such a possibility? The treaty guarantees of 1763 would exist no more with regard to the use of our language, or the enjoyment of our civil laws, or with regard to the Catholic church, which would surely lose the privileges so long enjoyed by her. Surely, those institutions of ours, which are so dear to us all, would be in imminent danger, since say two senators, and four congressmen would represent the province of Quebec, provided—which is not certain—that the American states would accord the dignity of statehood to each of the provinces of Canada. However, it is quite possible that no such recognition of existing political divisions would take place, and that Canada would be governed by laws passed in Washington, without our having adequate representation there. I do not see why, if Canada, being either abandoned, or even sold or exchanged by England to the United States, the latter should not consider our country in the very same light as Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. Would the United States of America give any consideration to a defenceless, and a friendless Canada? Sir, no power would give consideration to a country defended by hustling trumpeters, pamphleteers, and self-styled newspaper-office peers. Surely no Canadian patriot will admit for a moment that such a change in the political life of Canada, that is to say annexation, would not be tantamount to political slavery.

I pray my fellow-citizens, not to trust our great hustings trumpeters, our pamphleteers, or our self-constituted editorial peers, for either defence or diplomacy. I refrain from dwelling upon the possible realization of such a nightmare, for I am too thoroughly convinced that our citizens would prefer death to the consequence of refusing to part with 25 cents a year each for the construction and maintenance of our navy as is proposed by the government. Sir, I prefer to be the son of a conquered freeman than the son of a self-constituted slave; for, as I look at it, I consider that for Canada to seek protection in the Monroe doctrine, is to constitute herself the slave of a power whose rule is getting more and more unbearable to all. The idea of moving towards providing for the defence of Canada, combined with effort towards the extension of her commerce, is surely an inspiration. Let the building of a navy proceed if only to prevent annexation.

Let us now examine the question of Britain's neglect of our interests, which was raised the other night, by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He charges England with having given away to the United States a strip of land which is equal to the territory of many states; he also charges England with having sacrificed our interests in the Alaska boundary arbitration case. I will not discuss, at any great length, the correctness of the statement of the hon. member. There is, no doubt, a great deal of truth in it, but I must remind the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that Canada has in this, a great deal of blame to take upon her own shoulders. Even in the case of the Ashburton treaty negotiations, Canada did not say much, when she should at least have raised her voice to keep her own territory. In the Alaska arbitration dispute, perhaps Canada could have better looked to the settlement of that case through the channel of diplomacy. We must also admit that in 1834, and later on, in 1852, Canada did not do much to prevent Newfoundland from taking possession, in spite of statutes and treaties; and the possessory rights of the province of Quebec, of that long seashore, which is known to-day as the Newfoundland Labrador.

On the other hand, we are bound to admit, to the credit of England, that the undisputed possession by Canada of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and other gulfs and bays, with their fisheries, as well as the

exclusive possession of the St. Lawrence river, as well as the right of navigation in common of the Mississippi river, are some of the great victories secured by England for Canada through the treaties or correspondence of 1784, 1818, 1826, 1854, and subsequent treaties or agreements. Is it not England who brought the United States to consider all the bays, straits and gulfs of Canada's King's Chambers, bounded in accordance with the head line doctrine; thus securing for Canada millions of miles of rich maritime territory. Sir, if England has neglected the interests of Canada, I do believe that Canada has not done all she should have done to protect her own interests.

A very good way for Canada to protect herself now, as she has not done much in that direction, in the past, is to build up what may be styled the beginning of a navy; to make the appointment of commercial agents; to look herself after her own commercial affairs; to do all that is necessary to satisfy England; and to try to get in return a freer hand in the management of her own business. The argument is advanced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk)) that because England has given away some portion of our territory, we should do nothing for England, and, remaining passive allow the balance of the assets of Canada to be taken by anybody wishing the possession of them. This is, after all, the conclusion we have to come to if we follow the advice of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I do not see any patriotism in holding such a view. Smaller states, with less population, have performed marvels in defending themselves and have spent a great deal more to defend their country than Canada would do by voting a yearly expenditure of four and a half million dollars.

Without looking at the eight first-rank maritime powers, we find that some small states, like Uruguay, with a population not exceeding 2,000,000, has five warships. Chili, with a population of about 4,000,000 has nevertheless 15 warships. The Argentine Republic, with a population of about 6,000,000, has about 40 warships, some of them of the latest type.

Take the case of Sweden and Norway; take the case of Italy which is doing a smaller amount of trade than Canada—all these states, because they know that there is wealth in the maritime trade, and that there cannot be any maritime trade without vessels of war to defend it, are ready to spend generous portions of their income to build the means of protection of their money-making instrument, their merchant shipping.

According to certain newspaper men, and a few platform speakers in our country, because Canada has boasted herself the fifth commercial country and the sixth maritime trader of the world, and all this through the protection and prestige of England without paying anything for that protection, she finds herself, to-day, in a terriffic condition of mind, because England proposes to her to spend a little portion of her wealth for the maintenance of that profitable condition of affairs. That reminds me of the case of a son who had been doing business for his own benefit with the money and through the prestige of his father, and who, upon the death of the latter, wanted to sue his estate for damages caused by the loss of said prestige. Sir, no group of men can call themselves a nation without assuming responsibilities and risking sacrifices. This is the gist of the reason why the idea of a state implies such a degree of prestige and admiration everywhere and in all times. It is because it means that a number of men, more or less great, have worked, suffered and died for the creation, the final establishment, of a common national ideal. A group of men, who are fond of calling themselves a nation, must be also ready to build a navy for defence. Now, coming to the question of the pecuniary advantages to Canada of standing by Great Britain, we must admit that such advantages are rather important. Let us consider the interest our country is paying on its public loans—just 3½ per cent. But if we examine the public loans made to foreign countries, we discover at once that the German empire was paying last week four and a fraction per cent on a very important loan. Brazil has just made an issue of debentures, redeemable in gold, sold at 94, with interest at 5 per cent. The Argentine republic borrowed very lately $50,619,000 at 5 per cent, its bonds being sold at 97. The divers loans of Brazil aggregating $867,432,500 bear interest at 4 per cent, 4½ per cent and 5 per cent. Uruguay for its loans of 1891, 1895 and 1901, has paid as high as 5 per cent and 8 per cent. If we look up the rate of interest payable by Sweden, Norway, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Italy, we are bound to admit that most, if not all, those foreign states are paying about 1½ per cent more upon their loans than is Canada upon its $400,000,000 of funded debt.

This means that our country, through the permanency, the stability, the security of its institutions, its political and social conditions, together with its natural resources, and above all, the prestige of our British connection, is gaining 1½ per cent upon its loans, which means a saving of about $6,000,000. Is it not proper to take half of that saving to build up a fleet which will at the same time help England to some extent, at any rate, and to organize for our own country a system of defence which may be of very great use in time to come?

Then, if we come to examine the conditions of trade and finance generally in Canada, we discover that our country and its business men, its shippers, its merchants and even its farmers, are deriving great benefit from the good relations existing between England and Canada. Take, for example, the rate of interest on loans to individuals, the rate of insurance, the rate of transportation, the steamer fares, railway fares, and what do you find? The fact is that all those rates are cheaper than in most foreign countries. What is the cause of all this? No one can deny that it is due to the permanency of our commercial and social conditions; but that permanency is in turn due to the permanency and stability of the parent state, and, lastly, the stability and permanency of the parent state are no doubt the consequences of the undisputed and indisputable supremacy of the British fleet.

And what are we paying for the maintenance of that navy which means so great a benefit to Canada? In the past, and until to-day, we have paid nothing. England is asking my fellow countrymen to contribute in the future to the extent of one quarter of a dollar per head. No one, I venture to say, in the province of Quebec, will object to such a little contribution which will prove so beneficial to our country. The credit of Canada is nailed to the topmast of the British navy, I may say. Let this belief be dissipated and within one year the public loan rate of interest will rise from 3½ per cent to 8 per cent; and private loan rates of interest will double. When speaking of that feature of our political condition let me dwell upon two topics very pertinent to it.

One may think, and very naturally, that by complying with the requests of the British admiralty, which have been thoroughly explained in previous speeches, Canada will derive some other advantages, especially political advantages. As I said before, our country is enjoying none of the rights which make a country independent or sovereign. One of those rights is that of making treaties. Even during the negotiations of the last Franco-Canadian treaty the conferences practically were held in the name and under the authority of England, this being required because of our condition, from the point of view of international law.

But if Canada wishes to be something in the world she must have conceded to her by England that very important power of negotiating treaties with foreign countries. Is there any better way of getting that favour than to convince England that Canada is ready to do all she can for the maintenance of British prestige throughout the world? The treaty-making power is worth the cost of even a navy. Another very important concession which our country should perhaps seek to obtain would be the concession by England of the right to appoint Anglo-Canadian consuls, that is, men born in Canada or the appointment of such men by England herself upon the special request of Canada. As I said in 1904 in this House, the British consular service is inefficient, according to the statements of the newspapers, and of the greatest parliamentarians of England, such as Sir Edward Grey, Mr. James Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Sinclair, and according also to the general consensus of opinion. Canada is in great need of new openings of trade throughout the world. Those trade openings are still to be found and established; but who are the agents to secure for us these immense benefits? Some one naturally will say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is always there, that is, in Ottawa. But business men will answer that good commercial agents in the field are, to-day, the only men to bring to our shores the many millions of dollars' worth of trade we need. As a matter of fact, we have no trade relations to speak of with South America, we have no line of steamers between Canada and the divers states of South America, we have no commercial agents either in Brazil or the Argentine Republic, nor in most of the twelve or fifteen states of South America, though with each of those states Canada could build up a prosperous trade by direct representation. Our apples, potatoes, butter, cheese, and even our ice, could sell at a very high price in Brazil, where you find a population of over 20,000,000. Our cod, which is caught just off our shores, is not shipped direct to South America, but is sent to Lisbon, where it is cured, and thence reshipped to Brazil under the slang name of bacalia. We could sell South America any amount of vehicles, agricultural implements, wooden structures, and building materials, because the timber of those countries, though precious and for some purposes more valuable than ours, is unfit for constructing wagons, and for most building purposes. There would be no end to the list of profits which could be made through a proper system of commercial agencies of consular status established by Canada in South America and in many other foreign states. As I pointed out in 1904, smaller countries than ours are spending, on an everage, half a million of dollars for maintaining consular service, while Canada is doing practically nothing for that purpose. A sum of at least $1,000,000 should be spent yearly to pay the salaries and expenses of a hundred commercial agents and Anglo-Canadian consuls either appointed from amongst Canadian born, by England herself, or by Canada, upon some special concession granted to the latter. I am ready to say that should

our help towards England to-day go to secure for us the appointment of Anglo-Canadian consuls, I would be ready to ask this House to vote per year, not ten, or twenty cents, but $10 per head, for the establishment of such a system as would undoubtedly improve the commercial relations of Canada, and I would venture to state that as a result the trade of Canada would be three times larger than it is to-day. I speak of this important question of Anglo-Canadian consuls because it is very closely linked to that other question of extension of our external or maritime trade, which will be a new impetus under the escort of our fleet.

But there are many other advantages to Canada in the building of a fleet. It is undeniable that at one time Canada was the greatest ship-building country of America. The maritime trade spirit was alive and progressive. It was natural, because most of its inhabitants are descendants of mariners, they are the offspring of those marvellous sailors, the Norsemen, who discovered America, and started establishments on this continent about sixty years before Christopher Columbus secured for Spain the official paraphernalia necessary to grant her so-called discovery rights. We all come, the most of us at least, from those Norsemen, from the stock of Normandy or the British Isles, who have braved the perils of the sea for at least ten centuries. Most of our immediate forefathers have been farming and trading in small towns for a couple of centuries, but, without claiming to be a prophet, I may assure the House that it will not take many years before the sons of farmers and traders and professional men can qualify for the re-conquest of the great seas, the legacy one may say, by the law of nature, of the brave Norsemen of yore. Let us revive the industries of our ancestors.

Let me remind hon. gentlemen of somo of the many other advantages to be derived from the building of a fleet. Marine engineering, and the art of navigation, will receive a very great impetus from the adoption of the proposed plan.

Let me say, Sir, a few words to our students about the advantages they will reap from the building of our navy. The art and science of ship-building will go to a great extent to open new callings in life for the students in our special schools. With regard to those schools, allow me to give a few words of explanation. Let me open a very short chapter about the school system of Quebec that will have some direct connection with the execution of the plan of the government. The students of our schools will have much to do with the construction, the manning, and the maintenance of our merchant and war fleet, for both will have to develop simultaneously.

And what about our academy of marine, or naval college, to complete the system of our special schools? Montreal, with its two universities, would be the ideal place to locate a naval college. In no place else in Canada can there be found a better place for a naval college, better professors, more modern laboratories, more valuable libraries and general educational equipment. I must tell the Quebec students, even those who have signed petitions against the passing of this Bill, just four things: That marine engineers occupy the first rank in the engineering world; that marine officers are the most learned and cultured men; that amongst their many intellectual gifts, they must speak many languages, and in every case the French language, which is the language of diplomacy, is that which is spoken by the marine officers of every state of the five continents, so that the building of our navy is a good means of making our French language honoured. While speaking of our Quebec students protesting against the passing of Bill 95, let me ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to present to them a few copies of that new book of Mr. Emile Foguet, ' Le Culte de l'Incompétence,' or lecture them about experimental superiority of older men over young men. It is one of the many good maxims of Mietzche which he expresses in saying very properly:

> A sign of nobility, a sign of aristocracy, such is the respect of youths for older men.

The other day I listened to a lengthy debate in this House about technical schools in Canada. Many things were said about foreign technical schools, but not one word to explain the tremendous progress which has been made in the province of Quebec for the establishment, side by side with its classical schools with their three degrees of efficiency, of a whole set of special schools, which I style a higher commercial school, where the science and art of foreign languages, of precis writing, commercial geography, state finance and industrial chemistry, and physics, are taught for the purpose of making men able to manage commercial houses, and to promote commerical relations abroad. We have, in the province of Quebec, also established colleges of technology, or technical schools, where the theory of every art, from that of the plumber to that of the jeweller, will be taught by book and laboratory, and where also the practice of each such art will be impressed on the minds of the students by designs, tools, and hand work. Alongside of these, schools of agriculture are already established. At St. Ann's, and at Oka, agricultural experts will be very shortly graduated for the purpose of establishing in nearly every county of the province of Quebec, agricultural labora-

tories where inspection, examination and analysis of grain can be taught to the farmers; all of which must eventually conduce to the benefit of our export trade. A school of forestry has also been established. The graduates of the school of forestry of Nancy, France, and Harvard, will teach the people of the province of Quebec how to preserve their natural resources and reafforest their woodland, thus securing the proper amount of moisture necessary to successful agriculture. In addition to these, McGill College and the Polytechnic school, in the teaching of civil engineering and the art of architecture, are ready to provide for our country, skilful engineers of all kinds, to wrest honourable profit from Canada's natural resources. I say this, in passing, for the purpose of showing our students that something is in store for them out of the building of our navy; and also for the purpose of telling the Minister of Labour and the members of the Technical School Commission when they come to inquire into the conditions of technical schools, that if they wish to be properly informed, they would do well to go to Quebec and stop there for a little while, before going elsewhere. It is to the everlasting glory of Sir Lomer Gouin, the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, that he has built up a complete system of special schools alongside of the classical schools of that province, which will make of it before twenty years, one of the most learned centres in America.

I have been calling the attention of the House to our educational system, just to show that our would-be gunless and shipless defenders in Quebec are, after all, very neglectful of the interests of our students when they fail to see for all of them numerous advantages in the realization of the shipbuilding programme. Our graduates are perhaps the best equipped to benefit from the new policy. The construction of a fleet should also be approved of for the sake of our many special school students, who will therein find many and varied employments and callings. Quite a number of good positions surely will be secured for those students by the establishment of the new marine equipment. Our special school graduates will contribute in some way or other to the construction of the new fleet, and thereby contribute to the enhanced prosperity and greatness of Canada.

There are many other reasons for which I am ready to vote for the passing of this Bill. I will vote for the Bill, because:

1. It will cost but a trifle per head of our population to build a few ships which will help England, satisfy our obligations towards her, and gratify our national pride;

2. The expenditure of a few cents per year may go to secure for Canada the concession from England of the power of making treaties, of the power to appoint Anglo-Canadian consuls, thereby securing for us benefits which will be a hundredfold greater to Canada than the total of our expenditure today;

3. I would rather stand by our parent state than depend upon American protection, I prefer British protection.

4. The building of a fleet will to a great extent help our classical and special school graduates;

5. It is in acordance with the dictum of the public law of England towards Canada, for it is not within the province of the latter to refuse any contribution to help England;

6. The creation of a Canadian navy will to a large extent tend to create for Canada new openings of trade, the establishment of new commercial agencies and negotiations of commercial treaties—three keys to the treasuries of the world;

7. This possession of a fleet is the best and only way to secure progress in peace for our country and to assure its everlasting prosperity.

For all these reasons, and many others, I appeal to this House, and to my constituents of St. James, not to begrudge a shilling a year for the maintenance of the prestige of England, and the enlargement of our national life.

And now, to those unthoughtful enough to close their eyes and stop their ears to the great lessons of history; to those who shout aloud that nothing should be done to defend Canada, to those who are continuously, dangerously, creating agitation, to all those who do not wish to give any kind of aid to England, whether they be representatives of the western grain growers, or agriculturists of Quebec, I would say this: You do not want any naval defence for Canada, you prefer to remain in statu quo, you are afraid of military and naval expenditure, let me remind you of a past which is still the present for us. If Canada, when she was a weak colony under the French monarchy, had followed the advice, the admonitions and prayers of that incomparable and immortal American statesman of the seventeenth century (though not born in America) Governor Frontenac, who implored France not to reconstruct the marvellous palace of Versailles, but to build a navy, to send soldiers to Nouvelle France, and to equip an army to protect its territory and the entrance of its Gulf of St. Lawrence, never would Wolfe have defeated Montcalm on the Plains of Abraham, and never would it have been possible for England to conquer Canada.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, should we have no navy, what Wolfe was able to do, one Von der Goltz or one Henri de Hohenzollhern, may try to repeat. Canada, being without naval defence, without coast protection, should ever a European conflict hold back

the English fleet in the North sea, the entrance of the St. Lawrence would be left undefended against a hostile fleet which would be able to anchor before Montreal with much less risk than in the Baltic sea. Sir, such a possibility should awake in the people of Canada, and more especially in my fellow citizens of Quebec, a strong desire to grant what is asked from them to secure both a defence of our coasts, and a compliance with the wishes of England. My fellow citizens of Quebec, I am sure—and here, I believe, I am expressing their inner sentiments—are ready to stand by England to-day, for we are indebted to England for the fairness with which England has treated us. Should I speak tonight in my own mother language, it would be due to the liberality of England. The French and English languages were for hundreds of years spoken in the mother parliament on the banks of the Thames, in the same way that Greek and Latin had been the official languages of the parliament of Rome. I beg leave to convey to the English speaking citizens of Canada tonight, the assurance that their French speaking friends will stand shoulder to shoulder with them for the maintenance of British institutions in Canada, as did, twenty centuries ago, our ancestors, the Gaelic senators when they joined the Roman senators in the defence of the state of Rome.

While I am saying all this, I cannot forbear from denouncing as infamous, the veiled charges of disloyalty which have been and are still being hurled against my compatriots. Sir, Quebec will always remember that beautiful sentiment enunciated by the distinguished Prime Minister of Canada at a Paris banquet in 1905: 'To France, we owe our origin; to England, our liberty.'

Mr. WILLIAM R. SMYTH (East Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I am sure you must be wearied of this debate, and I am sure that this afternoon must have made you more wearied still. The hon. member for St. James, Montreal, (Mr. Gervais), has taken up nearly three hours of the time of this House, and I am sure that very few members of the House are much enlightened by what he has said. He started in with an argument against the Bill from a legal standpoint. But, like an old steeple-chase horse, when he comes to the bank he is afraid to go over, and so he turns and supports the Bill after all, though it is not just to his mind from a legal point of view. Some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman call to my memory something that happened in connection with our first attempt —I think it was our first—at what might be called Canadian diplomacy. The hon. member (Mr. Gervais) scored British diplomats in their efforts to settle the great questions between Canada, and the United States, and other countries. We all remember the commission that was appointed by this government, composed of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Aylesworth), Sir Louis Jetté, and another whose name I have at the moment forgotten. These gentlemen did not bring such great results to Canada in connection with the Alaska boundary question with which they had to deal. Did not they allow a great deal of our territory to be taken away and given to the United States? So, I do not think we have much to complain of in British diplomacy in view of what our own representatives have done.

I do not purpose taking up much time, in fact, I should like to confine myself to within ten minutes. But, before entering into the question as to what my views are on the navy question, I must first express my regret that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), took occasion to prove his loyalty to the British Crown —in fact, about three-quarters of the time of his speech was devoted to that purpose. If I ever felt proud of my leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) it was when he spoke in answer to the Prime Minister. It was not necessary for him to waste one minute in proving that he was loyal to the British Crown; every one knew where he stood.

I must also say something on behalf of my French Canadian friends, of whom I have a great many in my riding. In fact, I think that perhaps one-third of the electors in my riding are of French Canadian origin. I have no hesitation in saying that every one of them, so far as I know, is true and loyal to the core. But I think if the right hon. Prime Minister should go up into that country, and say some of the things he has said in this House, and on many an occasion outside, he would not be very welcome for those utterances. But the French Canadians of my constituency are true Canadians, and true British subjects. I almost wonder that they are in view of the statements made by the leaders of the French Canadian people in this Canada of ours. We have heard the Prime Minister himself declare his independence, and we have heard other hon. members giving us lectures on independence. I wish to call attention to some of the utterances of certain leaders of the French Canadian people in this respect. I am proud to say that notwithstanding all that the leaders in this House can say, the French Canadian settler in the northern part of New Ontario—and, I think, all over the Dominion of Canada—are true and loyal. But one would wonder why gentlemen who occupy seats in this House, from the First Minister to the lowest back bencher among his followers, should endeavour to mislead the ideas and views of the French Canad-

ian people. We find, Sir, the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte), saying something in connection with independence. This is part of what he said, and I take it that this is a proper translation of the hon. gentleman's statement:

Independence appears in certain quarters to be a monster and a nightmare to those whose interest in Canada is small and secondary, and who have only the love and loyalty of the empire in their hearts. But I ask of these men, shall not Canada sooner or later have to choose between annexation and independence? Are we destined to remain a colony, and are not true Canadians who love their country before all others to have in their hearts a very legitimate ambition to see it free and independent? It suits badly those politicians who have a great many years' experience, who have seen unrolled great events and political changes which are to-day included in the history of our country, who have seen the nation grow, and who realize its possibilities and its resources. It is neither patriotic nor loyal on the part of these men to put obstacles in the way of the complete development of our political organization and to pretend that we ought always to dwell under the protection of the British flag. But, thank God, I am convinced that this will not be the case, and the creation of this naval fleet in my humble opinion is the last step towards independence.

Is that not preaching independence? Is that not a true expression of the opinions of many hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House? I take it that this voices the opinion of a great many hon. gentlemen opposite. He was greatly applauded when he made this statement. Further he says:

It is from this point of view particularly, and I might say exclusively, that I at the present time give my adhesion to the Liberal policy. I speak from a Canadian point of view, and I believe this view of the question is that of the majority of the electors of my county; indeed, I do not believe that it would be too much to affirm that it is that of the majority of the people of the province of Quebec.

There is something which is addressed to the French Canadian electors, and I——

Mr. G. A. TURCOTTE. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Did he remark in my speech a sentence in which I said that I would never consent to independence unless England would consent to it and that it would come through good will and not otherwise?

Mr. SMYTH. I will answer by asking my hon. friend another question—if he denies that he made the statement that I have just read.

Mr. G. A. TURCOTTE. I do not deny it at all.

Mr. SMYTH. Well, that is the answer. We have another hon. gentleman who has, during his life time, spoken of independence. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) once gave utterance to something of this nature. I must confess that he is very eloquent and ready to do as he is bidden. I do not know whether he has been whipped into line or not. I am going to read an extract from a paper called 'L'Evenement,' published at Quebec. It states that:

Postmaster General Lemieux moved at the Club Nationale, some years ago, the following resolution:—

That while admiring the English constitutional system the members of this club are in favour of obtaining by constitutional means the independence of our country and its complete emancipation from all European alliances.

I would like to ask the Postmaster General if that is correct?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad that my hon. friend has put that question straight to me. I read that statement this morning in 'L'Evenement' of Quebec. I never moved that resolution, and 'L'Evenement' does not say that I moved it. Once in my life I did speak on that question. That was, I think, in 1893. I am surprised that that fact was not mentioned during this debate. In 1893, there was in Montreal a gentleman who was connected with the construction of the Monument National, where the meetings of the St. Jean Baptiste Society, the national society of French Canadians, take place every week. In order to obtain the necessary funds to build that monument he organized a large meeting at Sohmer park, Montreal. There was to be an academic debate on the four following questions: Annexation to the United States, the statu quo, imperial federation and the independence of Canada. I was then a young, budding lawyer, and I was asked by the organizers of the meeting to take part in the debate. I was assigned the role of advocate of the independence of Canada, which I accepted.

Mr. BARKER. And you accepted it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. A gentleman from the province of Ontario—I forget his name, but I think it was Mr. Elgin Myers—spoke in favour of annexation to the United States. A friend of mine, Mr. McGoun, a very distinguished lawyer of Montreal and a Liberal, spoke in favour of imperial federation, and a young friend of mine who was a very active member of the Conservative party, Mr. Cardinal, now dead, I am sorry to say, spoke in favour of the statu quo. There was a vote taken and there was an entrance fee of, I think, 25 cents paid by all those who were present. It was an academic debate. I do not deny that I took part in that debate, stood to my guns and advocated the independence of

Canada, but it was a purely academic subject. I am surprised that the fact was not mentioned in this debate. But as to the resolution, I never moved it, and this is the first time I heard of it. That is my explanation.

Mr. SMYTH. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is that chickens come home to roost sometimes. Always be sure that your sins will be found out.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Club Nationale ex-chicken now.

Mr. SMYTH. I am sure you are not. Do you still belong to that club?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Independence club?

Mr. SMYTH. The Club Nationale?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Club Nationale exists, but I never moved that resolution.

Mr. SMYTH. I accept the hon. gentleman's denial. I was just going to remark that I have the utmost confidence that the great mass of the French Canadian people take no stock in any such utterances as that anyway. They are too intelligent, notwithstanding that sometimes around election time especially some of their leaders would like to agitate them and ask them to do things that are not perhaps quite along the lines that they otherwise would follow on those occasions. I know that I have suffered a great deal from that myself; I know that while my French Canadian friends in my riding stood loyally and true by me when I was their candidate for the local legislature, they deserted me and deserted me very greatly indeed during the campaign of 1908. And, Sir, that was because of the pamphlets and the literature that were sent out——

An hon. MEMBER. 'The duty of the hour.'

Mr. SMYTH. Yes, 'The duty of the hour,' that was published and paid for by the Liberal party and circulated by the Liberal party in wagon loads all over the northern part of Ontario. We on this side of the House have been twitted by gentlemen opposite who claim that we are very much divided on this question; but when it comes to the vote perhaps they will better understand just how much divided we are. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a sign of life in any political party when its members do take issue one with the other on such a great question as this, and when they think for themselves and are not led by the nose by any leader or any number of leaders. Sir, we stand each thinking for himself and each acting for himself, and I am doubtful whether hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House can say the same thing. Indeed I have been astonished at the utterances of some of the Liberal members who have spoken in this House, because I have heard these very same gentlemen speaking outside on this same Bill and they played a very different tune. I am inclined to think that the 'composing room' and the gag and the thumb-screw and the offers of graft——

An hon. MEMBER. And straight jackets.

Mr. SMYTH. Yes, and straight jackets and everything else have been applied to some members on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Wilson) also said something about independence, and he told us that the navy is a preparation for the change in our national condition for which we ought to be ready. Well, were the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) in his seat I would like him to explain what he meant when he said we had to be prepared for a change, because I hope, Mr. Speaker, the day will never come when there will be any change or any attempt at a change which will sever Canada from the British empire. But all the sentiments in connection with independence and ingratitude to England do not come from the French Canadian members on the other side of the House. I was sorry indeed to hear the other day a member of the great family of Scotchmen to which I belong giving utterances to certain statements, and I recommend that hon. gentleman to read the statements made by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Gervais) to-night, who told us that we did owe a debt of gratitude to the motherland. But my Scotch friend from South Huron (Mr. McLean) thinks we do not owe the motherland anything. Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a different song sung by his forefathers when the British empire required assistance and help. In those days the McLeans went not only with a wave of enthusiasm, but they took off their coats and buckled on their swords and fought for the empire. And, Sir, it amazed me to hear the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) declare that instead of taking off his coat and putting on his kilts and buckling on his sword for the empire he would send over his love, for that was all he could afford to give them. Well, I don't think that this is very Scotchlike. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, some members on this side of the House have been twitted with having accused the French Canadian people of disloyalty, and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) this afternoon made certain statements which I was very pleased to see that you, Mr. Speaker, made him withdraw. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) told us over and over again that he had read the speech of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) from end to end and backwards and forwards and crosswise, and he could

not find any other meaning in it than that which he gave to the House. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read what the member for Frontenac did say, because I must confess that when I heard the construction that was put on his utterances I was very much grieved to think he would so far forget himself as to cast any reflection on our French Canadian people, which, of course, as a matter of fact he did not do. I did not have to read the speech of the hon. member for Frontenac very far to find him using this language:

I am not charging, and I have not said one word to charge the mass of the people of the province of Quebec with disloyalty; I have not said anything that could be construed into such a charge. On the contrary, I have said that the people of the province of Quebec have shown a more than ordinary intelligence in resisting the political leaders who for political purposes essayed to lead them from their allegiance.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) dwelt a long time on this incident, but I would ask any fair minded man: Where can you find anything said by the member for Frontenac that any French Canadian or any one else could take offence at?

Mr. MOLLOY. Read further.

Mr. SMYTH. You can read it yourself; you have more time than I have. Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the question of the navy, and I must say that I was very much disappointed at the lack of information which the right hon. Prime Minister had when he presented this Bill. I have been a business man the greater part of my life, and as a business man I have never entered into anything that I did not first study out what it was going to cost as nearly as I possibly could. If I were building a house I would first get an estimate from a man properly qualified to give it, and although it might cost a little more than the estimate, I would know approximately what my responsibility was. But, when the right hon. the Prime Minister was asked several questions in regard to the cost of this navy he could not answer them when he introduced the Bill, and he said he would give the details when the Bill got into committee. Well, Sir, I do not believe in going into it blind, and I would like to know here and now before committing my constituents, and the people of the Dominion to the principle of this Bill, what will this Canadian navy approximately cost? That information we are entitled to have from the Ministers of the Crown, who are supposed to know it. The ministers who have charge of this Bill should have been able to announce to the House as nearly as possible what will be the cost of this tin-pot navy of theirs which they are going to construct. I may say in the first place that I do not think that the navy which the right hon. gentleman is going to build is any good as a fighting force, or of any value whatever in the defence of the empire. I am certain that no sane being at this present date would build such a class of ships for defensive or offensive purposes in any part of the British empire or any other empire except the party that is in power to-day in Canada. I am not willing to entrust the building of even this tin-pot navy to the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches. In the face of the charges against them more than ten—yes, more than twenty—that I have heard since I have come to this House, and that we have been trying to investigate—charges of the misappropriation of moneys, the spending of moneys foolishly, the wasting of the people's resources in various ways—they should not be allowed to enter into this great work which is going to entail such enormous expense on the country. For that reason alone, if for no other, I would be inclined to vote against the building of this navy. I am not opposed to our Canadian people getting all the benefits that might accrue from the building of a navy in Canada; but such a navy is not going to be built in three years or five years, or even in ten years, if it is to be efficient; and before the last ship is completed, the first will probably be out of commission, and in the bottom of the sea or on the scrap-heap. The right hon. the First Minister should have laid before this House an approximate estimate at least of what this navy was going to cost Canada. Now, I want to say that during all the campaigns in which I have taken part in the last ten or twelve years, I have never heard the question of a Canadian navy, or a navy of any sort, brought before the electors, and I am not going to commit the people that I have the honour to represent to any such scheme without first having their authority to do so. I am not going to commit them to anything that I have not myself some idea of the cost of; and I am not going to commit them to any such expenditure especially when it is to be handled by the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches at the present time. I feel that there is a responsibility on me to ask the people of the district I have the honour to represent whether they are in favour of a Canadian navy or not. That is one of the reasons why I will vote against the proposal of a Canadian navy at the present stage. By giving a direct contribution, even if it is $20,000,000, or $25,000,000, I know that it is no more, and no less, and I know that it is not going to be called for year after year, but that is the end of it. We are told by the First Minister that the government purpose building the Georgian Bay canal, which is a much more important project than a Canadian navy. They

are going to build the Hudson Bay railway. They have now under construction the Grand Trunk Pacific. All these are about as much as Canada can bear at the present time. I have taken up more time than I should, Mr. Speaker, but I felt that it was my duty to my constituents to place myself on record as against the construction of a Canadian navy at the present time. I also wish to place myself right as not being in sympathy with any sentiment that might lead our French Canadian people to believe that we accuse them of disloyalty; but we do accuse some of the leaders of the French Canadian people in this House of making statements that I would very much rather they had not made, in the interests of this great Canada of ours. I hope the gentlemen on the other side of the House will all balk when they come to the fence, and will not go over.

Mr. J. E. O. GLADU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the Tories, I say it with all due respect——

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Text.) Speak English.

Mr. GLADU. (Text.) I shall speak in French, as it is my own language and, as you are aware, I have a right to do so.

(Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the Tories, I say it will all due respect, are the same the whole world over, and are not capable of improvement, not any more in Canada than elsewhere. When a few years ago the hon. Finance Minister was about negotiating an important loan in England, these same Tories of Canada thought the best they could do was to depreciate Canada's financial standing, and thereby endeavour to prevent the floatation of the loan.

While the British Tories were engaged in the last general election, they thought similarly that the best they could do would be to discredit the King's navy, with the object of forwarding their political aims, caring very little what would be the results, or whether their country would suffer from it or not, exactly in the same way that the Canadian Tories had shown that they did not care a snap for the good name of Canada.

I do not propose speaking at great length, but before taking up the main question, there are several statements made in the course of this debate by hon. gentlemen on the other side who have preceded me, to which I would like to refer. I will not take up any of the time of the House answering the taunts which have been directed at the right hon. Prime Minister. Thank heaven, that mud, as we all know, has been slung from depths too great to ever reach the man at whom it was aimed. Thank heaven, I repeat it, the right hon. gentleman's loftiness of mind, loyalty, and force of character are too well known, and such insults cannot possibly sully his good name even in the slightest degree.

Let me call the attention of the House to some of the charges made by hon. gentlemen on the other side in the course of their remarks of recent date. The hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) found fault with us for being too docile, for blindly following, and with servility—to use an expression of the Nationalist leader of the province of Quebec—the leader of the government, in a word for not having sufficient individuality. The member for North Toronto, of course, is an authority on questions of breach of discipline. He will need to go back only a few years, in company with some of his friends who still occupy seats not far distant from his own, to live again those glorious days when he was charged with being a traitor, with being one of the nest of traitors, by the then leader of the government. Thereby will he realize what is meant by a lack of discipline.

In that same speech he characterized us as silent dogs. I regret that, for his own sake, he did not hold his tongue when that Naval Bill was up for discussion, and that he allowed to go forth—the expression I am about to use may not be parliamentary—the infamous words which he thrust at the heads of the Prime Minister, the Catholics and the French Canadians of this country.

The hon. member stated also that there were in our midst a few dogs which were beginning to bark. If I may be allowed to refresh his memory, he also has on previous occasions given proof of his ability to bark, and if he will only come with me to the Senate with six of his friends—he knows who I mean—to offer a fair shake hand to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the latter will let him know what is meant by 'a dog who can bark.'

The hon. member stated also that the Prime Minister had a policy for the province of Quebec and another for the province of Ontario. I take such charges to be not only an insult, but an imputation of dishonesty against the Prime Minister. And remember that the hon. member for North Toronto bears on his forehead a stigma impressed on it two or three years ago by the hand of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylsworth), who, in the course of a terrific denunciation, dealing with that question of the Union Trust, compared him to the unfortunate McGill, defaulting manager of the Bank of Ontario, and declared, after looking into the matter of the Independent Order of Foresters, that he might not have fared any better.

Mr. G. M. CAMPBELL (Dauphin). (Text.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to discus that question until after the findings of the judges in Toronto.

Mr. GLADU. (Text.) I have the right to recall a speech that was made two years ago in this House by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. H. LENNOX (Simcoe South). (Text.) It is true, as the hon. gentleman says, that the hon. Minister of Justice, upon the floor of this House, did most ungenerously and improperly impute criminal conduct to the hon. member for North Toronto, but does not the hon. gentleman know that Mr. Justice Magee, in dismissing the action for slander, utterly refute and overturn the statements of the Minister of Justice to that regard.

Mr. GLADU. (Translation.) I say that there is a man occupying a seat here who has not been acquitted of a charge laid against him in this House, and of which he has not cleared himself. I say I have the right to refer to these facts, though the case may still be before the courts. Besides, we are acquainted with the recent findings of the courts.

The hon. member has also taunted the right hon. leader of the government for having two policies, and for being disloyal to the empire. Let me, Mr. Speaker, recall a fact which seems to have slipped from the minds of a great many people here. Who is prouder of the friendship of France than the British people and their Sovereign? The latter has shown himself greater even than the British empire, by securing to that same empire the noble and beneficient friendship of France through the 'entente cordiale.' Well, at that time the President of the French Republic, Mr. Loubet, stated that it was in the course of a conversation he had had with the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada that the idea had been suggested to him of negotiating an 'entente cordiale' between the two countries, in the same way that it existed betwen the two races in Canada.

Now, let us concern ourselves with another very interesting bird, which I am sorry not to see in his seat just now. I refer to the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes). That hon. gentleman has thought fit in a speech which he delivered on the question of the Naval Bill to state that the leaders of the rebellion of 1837 were nothing but cowards. I shall quote the very words which he used on that occasion:

> In the speeches of the First Minister, and of the Postmaster General, and of the member for Pictou—I do not see how the member for the Yukon happend to miss it— they all eulogized the heroes of 1837, and by heroes they mean the cowardly men who went in for misleading the poor innocent habitant in the province of Quebec, and the innocent men in Ontario, and inciting them to commit crimes which led to loss of life and destruction of property.

I have only one word to say in answer to that: These men died in defending a cause which was dear and sacred to them, and I say that a soldier, or one parading as such, like the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, who insults the memory of those who died in defending a cause which was dear to them, is only a plumed bully, and cannot be anything else but the hero of a striking hovel——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that expression is not parliamentary.

Mr. GLADU. (Translation). I withdraw anything that is not parliamentary, but if you allow what is parliamentary to remain there will still be enough of it left.

I shall now deal with a man who cannot be said to be in sympathy with the French Canadians and the Catholics, but who, nevertheless, solemnly quotes the writings of Father Hamon, a Jesuit, who is not known to him, but with whom I have the honour of being acquainted. I give you my word of honour that this gentleman has always had enough dignity and discrimination to avoid the expressions which are attributed to him in a translation, the exactness of which is doubtful.

The House I hope will pardon me this rather long preamble, but I was anxious to point out these insults which may not have the importance I attach to them. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has thought proper to speak with contempt of the memory of a man whom the province of Quebec honours and respects; whom she has represented in his lifetime, and whom she has honoured for years and years by an annual pilgrimage to his tomb. I refer to Honoré Mercier.

I shall not say anything of the aspersions he has deemed proper to cast on the Prime Minister of this country. But I shall tell him as well as to the hon. members for Victoria and North Toronto that to my regret, I will have to recall what I said last year: that in every grave there is room only for the corpse; there is no place for anything else, not even for the poisonous breath of the serpent. In the province of Quebec, we are disgusted with those desecrators of tombs, these gnawers of the dead; we are disgusted with those who thus take pleasure in wrenching open the lid of our great men's coffins and turn over their ashes in the hope of securing thereby some political capital. I read in the memoirs of Mr. Claude, chief of police of Paris, that human vampires repaired at night to the Père Lachaise cementry and desecrated the graves of virgins who had been inhumed in the course of the day. I say that such men play the part of vampires as regards political celebrities in the same way as these others are the ravishers of dead virgins.

I now come to the question of the Naval Bill. I shall not dilate very long on the proposal emanating from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I regret to say that in all earnestness it looks to be as a deliberate attempt at stirring up sectional feeling. I cannot admit that there should be a distinct policy for the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, and still another for the Conservative party in the province of Ontario and the English-speaking provinces, and the province of Quebec will not be misled by such a ludicrous farce.

Now let us take up the proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition. I am forced to the conclusion that it is unfair as regards a large section of our people. What right have you, ask, in a country such as ours, made up of heterogenous groups of population, of various nationalities, of Italians, Germans, Frenchmen, Russians, &c., what right have you, I say, of taking the money contributed by these taxpayers and producers and make a free gift of it to Great Britain, who will apply it to building Dreadnoughts, with which she may start out to cripple the navies of the mother countries of these people, sweep over their sea coasts and send broadsides furrowing those lands still moist with the sweat and blood of their forefathers?

I now take up the plan submitted by the right hon. Prime Minister, and I find it acceptable to those who make up the people of Canada, to those who supply the funds, who pay the taxes, towards our progress and our development. They cannot take exception to the building of a fleet which will remain our property. I find it acceptable, because under it our money will not be handed over to a nation who, though at peace to-day, may at any time be at war with the mother country of any of the peoples I have just mentioned. The moneys appropriated by us towards that object, will be spent right here, and since we are entitled to make whatever use we think proper of the public revenue, nobody will have reason to complain. These moneys will be spent in Canada and for the benefit of Canadians.

There is a matter, Mr. Speaker, which seems to have made a vivid impression on the minds of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, it is the question of loyalty. There is no need for me of referring to it once more; the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) dealt with it the other day in a masterly way, pointing out the various circumstances in our history when that loyalty asserted itself. I shall be content with recalling what Fréchette said one day; appealing to the English speaking population of this country and pointing to the British flag which floated over the citadel of Quebec, in a stanza which will live forever, he exclaimed:

'Had it not been for us, it would be there no more.' Should I recall also the memorable dates of 1775 and 1812. If Salaberry and his three hundred Canadian voltigeurs had not fought at Chateauguay, what would have become of the British flag? In 1870, have we not also generously contributed our share to the defence of the country? And what shall I say of 1885? The hon. member for Victoria stated the other day that we had approved of the rebellion of 1885. Does he not know that in 1885 the 65th battation, under the command of the French Canadians, ex-Justice Ouimet, vigorously took a hand in the defence of that same flag and in quelling the Northwest uprising. The same may be said of the 9th battalion of Quebec. Has the hon. member for Victoria forgotten that in 1899 my countrymen have generously given of their blood for the defence of that same British flag on the African veldt? I challenge him to mention a single instance in which our people refused to generously fight and work for the upholding of the British flag. We are taunted with being disloyal because the Prime Minister of Canada, on a certain occasion, stated, it appears, that possibly some day independence might be our lot. Well, in this connection, I shall quote the opinion of a man whom nobody, I am satisfied, will think of charging with disloyalty. Lord Milner, in the course of a speech at a banquet in Montreal, stated that fifty years hence, Canada would have to choose between imperial federation and independence.

We are taunted with being disloyal; but should not such a charge be brought forward rather against those who, in England, from day to day, add to our political freedom, who of their own accord, sever the ties binding us to Great Britain. Disloyal you say? Who can be more disloyal than the men who, occupying seats on the other side of the House, make it their special duty to sow discord and strife between the various races, by charging us with fanaticism and disloyalty, and most unfairly, as we have shown in the past.

There is all the difference in the world between the line of conduct of these men and that followed by the builder of this country, the peace-maker between its various races, of that man who appealing to the good will of Canadians of all origins, urges them to work in harmony, at any rate whenever the interests of Canada are at stake? What marked contrast there is between the policy of the man who made this country what it is to-day, great and prosperous, and those who in order to subserve their political aims, have been content purely and simply with running down the country, injuring its good name and doing their best to nullify it in the eyes

of the world. I shall not delay the House any longer, since I promised to be short. For the reasons I have mentioned I shall vote with pleasure in favour of the government's proposal; I shall do so without fear, without weakness, and I even say, without hesitation.

Mr. THOMAS BEATTIE (London). I shall not, Mr. Speaker, offer any apology for taking up the time of the House for a short while because I believe that every member of this House should pronounce himself on this most important question; and in giving expression to my views, I trust that I shall not utter one word which may offend any hon. gentleman. The question of loyalty, I am sorry to say, has been brought up several times in this debate. To my mind it would have been better for this Dominion had that question not been raised, but, of course, I am simply giving my opinion and others may differ. But, it seems to me that after the generous manner in which Canada has been treated by Great Britain during the past half century there ought not to be one man in this House or out of it—be he Scotch, French, Irish, English, or born Canadian—who would stand up and say that he would be anything else than a good, loyal, British Canadian.

Were it not for the remarks that fell from the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean), I would not have taken part in this debate. In his speech that hon. gentleman said that we owe nothing to Great Britain but good-will and respect. I can only compare my hon. friend with that celebrated old character, Rip Van Winkle—I hope, Mr. Speaker, this remark is not unparliamentary. I am very much afraid that he has been asleep during the past half century, unconscious who was protecting him, or he would not have made the statement he did. Or he must have forgotten that there is such a place as Great Britain. But, of course, we all know that the clan McLean, during the flood, was said to have been quite independent of Noah and the ark, because they had a boat of their own; and by a similar flight of the imagination my hon. friend probably convinced himself that he was perfectly safe under the protection of the old family shot gun. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that our forefathers were not driven from Great Britain. They had not to leave Great Britain, because the people who had to leave were generally sent to Botany bay. They did not come to Canada for Canada's good, but because they were under the impression that by so doing they could improve their position, both socially and financially, and in my opinion ninety-five per cent of them did so benefit. But had Great Britain not sent her army and navy to Canada and planted the Union Jack on our shores, our people would not have had this Dominion to come to; and for that alone we owe more than good-will and respect to the mother country.

If Canada expects to continue within the British empire—and I believe that we all do wish and intend to remain under her benign sway—we should not expect to live like drones in the bee hive, receiving all the protection, honour and benefit the empire can give us while refusing to assist in adding any honey to the hive. The question before this country and parliament is: Shall we give Great Britain for the British navy a present of two of the best battleships that can be built, or shall Canada build a so-called navy, which has been very aptly described by my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Doherty) as a stay at home navy? Two battleships would cost about $18,000,000, and not $25,000,000, as stated by hon. members opposite. But what would the contemplated government navy cost? I am informed that the annual expenditure on the maintenance of that navy would be about $7,000,000 and that amount would be expended on a navy which would have nothing to do, and would be compelled to remain idle in our harbours of Esquimalt and Halifax and others. The crews would have no other occupation but to paint the ships, scrub the decks and eat three good meals a day, to which they would, of course, be entitled. And the officers, no doubt, would fill in their time giving pink teas occasionally to their friends on shore at the expense of the people of this country.

Let me now recall some of the many favours which Great Britain has bestowed on Canada in the past few years, and I shall only mention those which are fresh in our memory and for which we have never paid or were asked to pay one dollar. Take the first trouble that occurred in our great northwest—that great heritage of which we are all so proud and boast so much. Did Great Britain not send us out General Wolesley, one of her best generals, who took charge of the Red River expedition, restored that country to peace and quietness, and handed it over to this Dominion. Then look back to the civil war in the United States, what did Great Britain do when there was danger of trouble along our borders? What did she then do for Canada? Did she not send us 10,000 of her best troops, composed of her best regiments, and several of her most efficient batteries of artillery, landing them at Halifax and marching them a thousand miles overland through ice and snow to the western part of Ontario? Well do I remember, as a small lad, the arrival of the 63rd regiment in London one midwinter midnight in the sixties. After that came the 53rd regiment and the 47th and the 60th rifles,

one of the best rifle regiments in England. There also came Major Balfour's Grey battery of artillery—one of the best in the service. These troops were kept in Canada many years, at the imperial expense. until all danger of trouble was over. That expedition alone must have cost Great Britain much more than the price of the two Dreadnoughts we propose to give. And yet, although those troops were all stationed within gunshot of the door of my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McLean) that hon. gentleman says we owe Britain nothing but respect and good will. Did we ever pay one cent for that expedition? No, we did not. Were we ever asked to pay a cent for it? No.

Hon. gentlemen opposite keep telling us, over and over again, that two Dreadnoughts would cost $25,000,000, but I have it on the best authority that two of the best battleships can be built at a cost of $18,000,000 at the outside. Would it not be better to pay that amount and be done with the matter than to go on with the proposed navy, the cost of which, when completed, no one can foresee, and which, when completed, will be of no earthly use to Canada, but be simply a stay-in-the-harbour navy. And I am informed on undoubted authority that the upkeep of that navy will amount to $7,000,000 per year. Our militia, which in 1896 cost us but $1,000,000 per year, is now, thanks to the right hon. the Prime Minister and his sunny ways, costing us over $7,000,000 annually. Add these two annual expenditures, and you have $14,000,000 for the yearly upkeep of the navy and militia, or $2 per head for every man, woman and child in this country, babies included.

During this debate I have heard some hon. gentlemen describe Canada as a nation within the empire. Would not the terms 'Dominion within the empire' sound just as well? For my part, I do not care for that word nation. To me, it has a tingle of separation, and I trust that we shall continue, as I believe we shall, to remain under the good old Union Jack, because I believe that five years of separation would inevitably land us under the wing of the American eagle. Let me say in conclusion, that I trust no member sitting in this House to-day will live to see this Dominion separated from the British empire.

Mr. P. A. SEGUIN (L'Assomption.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in order not to take too much of the precious time of this hon. House, I intend to offer but a few remarks. Still, I deem it my duty to express my views on the important question which has been under discussion for several weeks, namely, the creation of a navy for our national defence.

I have carefully listened to the speeches delivered from the very inception of this debate, and with a few exceptions I have found that most of the violent objections raised against the proposed navy are based on the fact that the measure introduced by the government does not go far enough..

Even the disloyalty of the French Canadians has been referred to, and the Prime Minister himself has not been spared the most outrageous attacks, on account of his attitude on this question. I am surprised that neither the leader of the opposition nor the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who know how to wave, each to his own way, the opposition flag, have deemed it their duty to protest against those violent expressions directed against the government by hon. members opposite.

But violent as the debate has been, it has served a useful purpose in enlightening the minds, and I am free to say, Sir, that I am satisfied from what I heard of this debate that the government, in seizing the House with this Bill for the creation of a navy, has thoroughly mastered the question, having considered it from every standpoint, and that they have viewed it from the standpoint of the general interest of the country, irrespective of any party or racial consideration, or any local or private interest.

I may say that at first glance, prior to the debate and before I had examined the matter, the statu quo seemed to me an ideal state of things, and along with others, I was inclined to think that, the country having so far done without a navy. might very well do without it for a good many years, but I have since found out that it was a falacy.

The nations are groups of individuals, therefore, like the individuals, they grow in order to reach adolescence and then mature age.

Canada is still in its period of adolescense but without being disloyal to the mother country, we are quite free to think, in looking into a more or less remote future, that the time will come when our country will have to shape its own course; in short, Canada will do like the grown up boy who leaves the paternal roof in order to create a home for himself..

If we may have an insight into the future of our country, is it not desirable that we should, from this moment, begin to prepare ourselves for the struggle for life in the future?

There is not a single country, however small it may be, in Europe and in the rest of the civilized world, anxious for its future destiny, which has not its nucleus of a navy for national defence.

Although a mere colony, Canada, owing to the vast extent of her territory, her immense natural resources, her population growing yearly by leaps and bounds, is much ahead of those countries I have just referred to, and yet, she would remain indifferent to the fate which the future keeps

in store for her. That would be, to say the least, imprudent.

Looking at the question from the standpoint of our relations with the mother country, I find also that it is but fair that we should contribute in some way and help to preserve the supremacy of the empire. The other colonies have responded to that very natural feeling; will Canada alone lag and stay behind? No, Sir, the political genius of the Prime Minister has devised the means of saving our autonomy and has succeeded in making the best of that scheme of national defence.

While allowing us to freely discharge our duties as colonists towards England, the government Bill provides first for our national defence, and it may well be said once more, on the present occasion, that the Liberal party has adopted the policy of 'Canada for the Canadians.'

The creation of a navy is calculated not only to give satisfaction to the just pride of a whole people, but moreover, to give the country the benefit of a new industry; the establishment of several navy yards for the construction of those warships will materially contribute to the prosperity of a portion of the population, and then, the building of those warships will be followed by the construction of merchant ships; now, everybody knows that for a country like Canada a merchant marine is the thermometer of its prosperity. Moreover, as we have in Canada the advantage over other countries of possessing enormous deposits of iron and nickel and everything that enters into the construction of ships, we may hope that this new industry will take an enormous development and even allow us to build ships for other countries, to the great benefit of our country. This new ship-building industry in Canada is going to procure work to thousands of heads of families and secure an inexhaustible source of revenue for them. Besides, this national navy will open to our young men an honourable career well worthy of their best aspirations. In short, Mr. Speaker, I consider that we have in that policy a new and considerable element of national prosperity.

As against the policy enunciated by the government, the hon. gentlemen opposite present two policies, quite indefinite and diametrically opposed; first, the hon. leader of the opposition wishes to place at the disposal of the Imperial authorities two Dreadnoughts, that is to say, all at once a sum of from twenty to twenty-five million dollars, even if we have later on to decide whether it is desirable or not to build a navy. I should not like to use here any offensive language, for I am loath to follow the hon. gentlemen opposite on that ground, but I wonder if the leader of the opposition, in formulating his proposal, has duly taken into consideration the interests of our country and its future destiny? Should it become urgent, in a more or less remote future, to build a navy for the defence of our country and the experience of other countries shows that such urgency will soon be felt—of what use will those twenty-five million dollars have been which Canada, at one blow, would have given to the mother country? Would not that void produced all at once in the public exchequer be calculated to retard the creation of our navy, and who knows what would result from such delay? It seems to me that the policy of the leader of the opposition on that point is disastrous, and it does not require much musings on the matter to come to such a conclusion.

Then comes the proposal of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who says that the question ought to be submitted to the people to obtain at once the nation's opinion; but I ask, what is the use of an expenditure of two or three hundred thousand dollars when the nature of the result of that plebiscite is known beforehand?

I consider that the newspapers of Canada reflect public opinion; then, all you have to is to consult them, if you want to be well posted in that regard. I did very carefully consult those papers and I find that for the most part they are in favour of a contribution of Canada for the defence of the empire, and I infer therefrom, Sir, that the project of contribution devised by the Canadian government is the one which tallies best with the aspirations of our people. A few newspapers are more noisy than serious in their opposition to the government measure; but in their case it is easily seen that they aim more at stirring up popular prejudices against the government, the creator of this marine scheme, than against the scheme itself: in short, it is but a pretext and nothing else. I should not like to insinuate that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, in advocating a plebiscite, is only aiming at setting up for a champion of the rights of the people. I am quite ready to believe in his sincerity, but undoubtedly one of the reproaches he will incur later on will be that of having used a subterfuge in order to avoid pronouncing himself, by his vote, on the merit of the policy of both parties on the issue now under discussion.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the attitude assumed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and some of his friends seems to show that the policy of the government, in this matter is absolutely fair and in full accord with the best interests of the country. Having realized the extravagant character of the policy advocated by the leader of the opposition and by his sup-

porters, they cannot give it their support; but as they should think they were failing in their duty of blindly approving, in any and every case, the measures brought down by the government, they fall back upon a policy of plebiscite which, after all, means nothing and would have no results.

Personally, Sir, exclusive of the powerful voice of the press, I find that the opinion of nearly all the representatives of the Canadian people assembled in this legislative hall, with a view to working in the best interests of this country, is unquestionably the sound opinion of the whole people of Canada. Now, the nature of this opinion is well known, and with the exception of a small group of seven or eight members, the whole deputation—even should there eixst some difference of opinion as to the mode of contributing to the defence of the empire—none the less admits that it is desirable to do something in that direction.

Therefore, Sir, I infer therefrom that the well-understood interest of the country, our trade relations with the mother country and our future destiny are so many reasons which militate in favour of the creation of a navy for the national defence.

Therefore, I will vote in favour of the Bill, because I am satisfied that the revenues of the country are amply sufficient to meet the expenditure involved in the creation of such navy, without it being necessary to increase taxation; and, moreover, because it cannot affect the national works under construction, as well as the works that are now contemplated. It would be idle, and I should take without any necessity the time of the House were I to give a statement of the revenues of the country and of our national wealth; just as it would be an unnecessary repetition of former statements to give the figures showing the increase in population; and to compare the present position of Canada with what it will be in a few years.

It is quite easy to agitate public opinion, to go through the country as some one is now doing in the county of L'Assomption, which I have the honour of repre-presenting, trying to rouse prejudices by means of sonorious words, more or less devoid of sense. They talk about militarism, they refer to imperialism, they talk of millions of dollars; but, Sir, I should like to know if such verbiage is suggested by a sound and enlightened patriotism. Does that verbiage, on the contrary, not betray an ill-disguised ambition, a certain personal interest which seems, so to say, to silence the voice of reason and of public interest? But the electors of my county, as well as the electorate of the whole country, far from listening to those interested clamours, will realize that their mandatories had something else to do besides playing the part of a demagogue. That mandate, Sir, I did accept with all the responsibilities involved, and the oath I have taken as a representative of the people makes it incumbent upon me, under the circumstances, to give my most loyal support to the Bill providing for the creation of a navy for the national defence, and so doing, I think I have well deserved of my country.

On motion of Mr. Loggie, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 9, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMEMDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 159) to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am not able to state with exactness the provisions of this Bill as I have not seen a copy of it, but I understand that the shape in which it finally passed the Senate was an extension of the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court to include the case of accidents which may happen not merely upon the line of government railways, but, speaking generally, in consequence of the operation of such railways. That is the scope of the enactment as it is now presented to this House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VOLUNTEER BOUNTY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 163) to amend the Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of the Bill is to extend the time during which the scrip issued under the Volunteer Bounty Act may be located from the end of the year 1910 to the end of the year 1911. There are two minor amendments which do not affect the principle of the Bill, and which can be explained fully in committee.

Mr. HUGHES. Does this extension apply to scrip that is already sold and in the

hands of speculators, or does it apply only to scrip in the hands of volunteers?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no distinction in the original Act between scrip that is in the hands of volunteers and scrip that is in the hands of speculators, and neither is there any distinction in the amendment to the Act.

Mr. HUGHES. I might point out to the minister what he very well knows that owing to the very short time that was given a great many of these volunteers to locate their land they found it absolutely impossible to do so. This war was brought to a close in 1902. Year after year this matter was brought to the attention of the government, and year after year we were met with the statement that the government had not decided whether they would retain control of the northwest lands or hand them over to the provinces. Finally, in 1905, the government decided to retain control of these lands, the matter was pressed on their attention again, and it took us three years to get this scrip issued. Meantime, the volunteers had lost heart, they had no notion that they were likely to get this scrip, and when at last the minister did justice in the case, or a certain degree of justice, and decided to issue this scrip, the announcement came upon the volunteers so suddenly that, not having saved up their money, they were not in a position to go out and take up their homesteads. I know many volunteers who, if they had had any notion that they were going to get even one year's extension, would not have sold their scrip. The matter was taken up by a number of speculators, gentlemen who are well known to us, and some of whom are not more than a thousand miles away from this House, they have secured this scrip practically for a song, for a dollar or a dollar and a half per acre, and they retailed it, in many instances, at two and three times what it cost them. I maintain that it is unfair to the volunteer who sold his scrip under the conditions laid down by the old Act that the speculator, who secured that scrip, should have the right to this extension. He will only stand in the way of the honest volunteer who wants to secure a homestead. I maintain that this extension should only be given with respect to scrip already issued to bona fide volunteers who wish to settle on the land themselves. Had they been given the right to take this scrip in 1902, and had they been allowed until 1911 to settle on the land, 95 per cent of the volunteers would have gone upon the land. Had they known that they would have six or eight years to get ready for settlement upon the land they would have gone upon the land, and would to-day as farmers be assisting in the up-building of the Northwest. As it is the scrip has largely fallen into the hands of speculators, and I very much fear that the result of one year's extension—I certainly would have preferred two years—will be to cause this scrip still further to fall into the hands of speculators.

Mr. MACDONELL. I would like to ask the minister whether the class of persons to be benefited by volunteer scrip is to be extended to others. The Imperial South African Volunteer Association, I understand, have applied for a grant. Is it the intention of the government to extend this grant to those persons or to any others who served during the war?

Mr. OLIVER. As I have already explained, the Bill simply provides for an extension of time during which the scrip which was provided for under the Act of 1908 may be located. That is the only important provision of the Bill. It does not provide for any extension of the principles of the Act of 1908, or give the benefit of the Act to any other persons than those provided for in the Act of 1908.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand that one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House introduced a motion or a Bill into the House permitting volunteers who had taken up their land and found the land worthless to exchange it for better land elsewhere. I would like to ask the minister if this Bill covers the point, and if it is the intention to grant such a privilege. I understand that quite a number of the volunteers went to the Northwest in good faith to locate their land. They had very little money, and less time. Immediately they landed there they were in the hands of men who were interested in townsites, and land corporations, and they were led off into desert country, in some cases thirty and forty miles away from the railway, and were induced to locate on this land in order to increase the value of other land held by these corporations. After locating, they discovered that their land was of very little use, and in addition that it would be perhaps years before they would be in a position to take advantage of the market being so far away from the railway. One of the hon. members from the west introduced a measure to correct that, and to permit them to exchange their homesteads for other lands more suitable to their purpose. I would like to know if the minister has included a provision in the Bill to meet cases of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER. Again I have to say that on the introduction of the Bill I stated its provisions. The Bill does not make any provision for the case which my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Will there be another Bill introduced that will?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that, but I presume there will not.

Mr. HERRON. I am sorry to hear the minister state that there are not going to be any extensions or privileges granted to others than those already mentioned in the old Act. In my opinion, Sir, there should be included in the bounty Act the men who enlisted and started on the journey to South Africa, but who met with misfortune of some kind on the way and had to be invalided. I think these invalided men have just as good a right to the privileges as those who went forward and served in the war.

Mr. HUGHES. Once they were enlisted.

Mr. HERRON. Yes, I refer to the enlisted men. If there are any changes made in the Act these men should be included in it.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am very anxious to see this Bill get before the House for the simple reason that I have already introduced a Bill providing that a volunteer or his substitute who had located a warrant on poor land should be able to exchange it. Owing to the position of my Bill on the order paper I have no hope of its being reached this session, but I expect to be able to submit my proposal to the House in the form of an amendment to the Bill which the minister has now introduced. There are only a limited number of men interested in this, but it is a matter of very great importance to each of them, and I hope nothing will happen to interfere with this Bill being submitted to the House so that I may endeavour to incorporate the provisions of my Bill in it.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The civil surgeons who went to South Africa and participated in the war and went through all the hardships of the campaign, are deserving of recognition from Canada, and yet they have been deprived of the privileges given to the South African veterans. This matter has been drawn to the attention of the Minister of the Interior on a number of occasions, but so far he has refused to include civil surgeons in this legislation. No more deserving class participated in that campaign, and I would urge that the minister should recognize their services under this Bill.

Mr. COWAN. I endorse what the last speaker has said with regard to the civil surgeons who served in South Africa. What I rise specially for is to ask the Minister of the Interior whether those men who are entitled to land under the Act will be allowed to enter for lands in the Dominion railway belt in British Columbia. I understood the minister to say last year that this would be done, and I wish to know if he has provided for it in this Bill. I would also ask the minister whether he considers that men who enlisted and who after the war domiciled in Canada are not almost equally entitled with those who were domiciled in Canada at the time of enlistment. I understood the minister to say last session that one object of the Bill was to reward service in the field, and the other object was to secure desirable settlers, and if the Bill has that double purpose I would ask the minister to say whether or not he has considered the claim upon the Dominion of those who were not domiciled in Canada at the time of enlistment, but who became domiciled in Canada after the war. They, like the others, served their country, and they, like the others, would make desirable settlers.

Mr. OLIVER. Again I have to say that the Bill contains only one provision of importance, and that provision extends the time during which the holders of scrip may locate upon lands in the prairie provinces.

Mr. HUGHES. But the minister is open to conversion with regard to these other matters.

Mr. OLIVER. When the Bill gets into committee that will be the proper time to discuss all these and other suggestions. As to the point raised by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Cowan) that I promised that provision would be made for the location of these grants within the railway belt, I may say that I have no authority to make such a promise. The limitations of the Act as it passed parliament did not permit of that privilege, and the Bill now before parliament does not in its present form provide for it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

COAL LANDS ALIENATED.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. During the time the Hon. Clifford Sifton was Minister of Interior, what was the total acreage of coal lands alienated from the Crown?

2. What was the total acreage of timber lands for which licenses and permits were issued, and what is the total acreage of land sold?

3. During the time Hon. Frank Oliver has been Minister of Interior, what was the total acreage of coal lands alienated from the Crown?

4. What was the total acreage of timber lands for which licenses and permits were issued?

5. What has been the total acreage of lands sold, exclusive of pre-emption?

Mr. OLIVER. Stand.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like some explanation of this 'standing business. Is it

to stand for ever or only for a day. I have allowed it to stand for ten or twelve days, and I would like to know when I will get an answer.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a very great deal of labour involved in preparing an answer to this question. As soon as the question was asked, measures were taken to have the answer prepared, and I hope to be able to answer my hon. friend at an early date.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is all I want to know.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose it is obvious, even to my hon. friend, that it is one thing to ask a question and quite another thing to answer it.

Mr. LENNOX. No doubt about that.

SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BEST:

1. What are the names of the sessional and temporary employees of the House of Commons who were under pay on the 27th January last?
2. What is the number of the said employees stated in the estimates of 1909-10?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stands as notice of motion for a return.

BANK DEPOSITS.

Mr. BURRELL:

What was the amount of money on deposit in 1909 in the Post Office Savings Bank, and in the other banking institutions of Canada?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING:

On December 31, 1909, the amount of such deposits were as follows:

Post Office Savings Bank		$43,081,033 76
Dominion Government Savings Bank		14,288,396 35
Quebec Savings Banks (two)—		
Government		104,541 86
Special		263,000 00
Public		30,925,654 56
Chartered Banks—		
Government	$ 32,796,940	
Demand	261,268,387	
Time	499,082,024	
Elsewhere than in Canada	75,088,499	
		868,235,850 00
		$956,898,476 53

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT BURLINGTON.

Mr. LAKE:

1. Is the government aware that the collector of customs at the outpost of Burlington, Ont., is said to be also engaged in keeping a licensed hotel in the village of Burlington?
2. Does the government approve of its customs officers being employed in a commercial business while holding his office as collector?
3. Is it the intention of the government to ask for the resignation of this officer if he is found to be running a hotel?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The officer employed as acting subcollector of customs at Burlington is not engaged in keeping a licensed hotel in the village of Burlington.
2. The government, as a general rule, does not approve of a customs officer being employed in commercial business while holding the office of collector.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. What is the number of horses on the experimental farm at Ottawa?
2. How many of them are geldings?
3. What is the number of acres under cultivation on the farm?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

1. 18.
2. 13.
3. 400.

W. R. BARGE, ROSEDALE, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. With respect to the application of W. R. Barge, of Rosedale, B.C., dealt with in the Interior Department, correspondence file No. 264,921, May 29, 1909, on what date were the licensees therein referred to notified to the effect that they must remove the merchantable timber on this land within two years from date?
2. Has any extension of time been applied for? If so, what answer has been made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. May 19, 1909.
2. The licensees of berths A and 61, in which the lands referred to are situated, have made application to be granted four years within which to remove the timber on the berths, but no special reference is made to the lands in which Mr. Barge is interested. No answer has, as yet, been sent.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WILLIAM W. RUTAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I notice that I am reported in the newspaper 'Le Canada' of March 9 as having made a speech in this House yesterday on the navy question, and as having announced myself opposed to the government policy. This must be a typographical error, and I am sorry that it occurred, and I am sure that the gentleman whose name should appear instead of mine will feel equally sorry. As this article is in French, I am unable to read it, but I wish to say that I have not yet made a speech on the navy question, nor had I intended to do so; for I had thought that the matter was tho-

roughly threshed out by men as competent as I am, and perhaps more so. At this point I will only say that I am thoroughly in accord with the government policy. I believe it to be the only policy to be pursued in this young country of ours, to maintain unity amongst all the nationalities that we have in the country, and those that are coming to the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. The navy question is not before the Chair.

Mr. RUTAN. I am perfectly willing to leave it at that.

PORT ARTHUR DRY-DOCK.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works whether it is true, as announced in the press, that subsidies have been granted for the construction of a dry-dock at Port Arthur, and if so, when it was granted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite true that the government has decided to grant aid under the Subsidy Act for a dry-dock at Port Arthur. That decision was arrived at a few days ago.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the hon. minister state when the papers relating to that matter will be brought down, for which an order of the House was issued in November last?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was under the impression that they had been brought down, but I will make inquiry, and if they have not, I will endeavour to have them brought down in a day or two.

ADJUDICATION OF CLAIMS TREATY.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he has had any word yet as to the ratification by the United States Senate of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States in regard to the adjudication of claims.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will make a note of it.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland). Mr. Speaker, I think any hon. member who has had the privilege of being present here during the past two weeks must have realized that if the country is not tired with the discussion of this navy question, the House is absolutely and wholly tired out with it. Last night I made a good resolution, which I hope I may be able to carry out to the full, that was, that if my remarks had any virtue at all, it would be particularly in the line of brevity. In aproaching the consideration of so great a question as that involved in the motion, and the amendments thereto now under discussion, fraught as it is with such vast possibilities to the future history and destiny of Canada, I do so with a good deal of timidity, and trepidity as well. Having listened carefully to the debate, and having read the speeches when I have not been permitted to hear them, I am conscious that in many respects I do not concur either in the amendment to the amendment, or in the amendment, and that I am not wholly in accord with the original motion itself. Although I think I can fairly say that I am not wholly discordant with the principles and spirit which that notion breathes, but am wholly out of tune with the propositions involved in the amendment to the amendment, and the amendment to the motion. So emphatic is this realization that I begin to be impressed with the conviction that I shall be obliged, like Lord Dundreary's peacock, to flock all by myself alone. For thirty-five years and upwards I have been an active adherent of the Liberal party, I am so today, and I believe that I shall be to the moment of drawing my latest breath. For thirty-five years I have served that party, and I hope that a few years more at least will be permitted me to continue that service. One of the reasons why I have been associated with the Liberal party, and why I hope to be continued with it, is the liberty of conscience that is given to every individual member of the party. That has been the history of the party in the past, and the moment that it deviates from that course, it will have ceased to be a Liberal party.

Now, Sir, I am making these remarks for a very good reason. I have said that I am not in perfect accord with the Bill which is involved in the original motion, and I hope before I take my seat to explain wherein that is the case. It is not pleasant for one who has been a great many years a follower of that party to find himself unable to see eye to eye with it, yet there are occasions in the life of every public man when his convictions must not be suppressed, when they should not be submerged, and I simply propose to state before this House and the country the views which I hold on this great question. I have said that it involves the future destiny and history of this Dominion. I go further and say that it involves the present conditions under which we are living. I go still further and say that it is a momentous question, involving almost every condition of public service, and every idea with respect to the course and

administration of government. Holding that view it is but fair that, since I cannot accept all that those with whom I have been associated desire to have adopted, I should explain my position, not only to my friends, but to the House and to the country at large. I have the greatest confidence in the leaders of the Liberal party, and I regret that I have not, perhaps, the same confidence in my own judgment. I may be absolutely and entirely wrong, but I am bound to be true to my own convictions, regardless whether my judgment be good or the reverse. The convictions I hold are honest and sincere, and as such I must stand by them.

No one listening to this debate could fail to be impressed with two prominent features which have characterized it. First, the desire of those who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate the glorious inconsistency and variableness of those who sit on your left; and I am bound to say that the attempt has been crowned with a measure of success, somewhat startling, if not wholly edifying and comforting to the people of Canada. The second feature is the determined effort of those who sit on your left, Sir, to prove to the world at large that those who sit on your right are absolutely enemies of the empire, traitors to His Majesty the King, his crown and realm and person, and to the flag which heretofore, in our enthusiasm, we have been proud to say has braved the battle and the breeze throughout the lifetime of the British nation. All this is an edifying spectacle indeed. As regards the effort to prove inconsistency, even if inconsistency be proved up to the hilt, and out of the very mouths of the offenders, is it really germane to the problem we are attempting to solve by the agency of this Bill? True it may not be flattering to this country to have it shown that the leaders of a great party, bent on securing the reins of government, are simply playing the role of opportunists, and are as variable and mercurial as an April day, regardless of the country's peril or the people's interest. But that question is one which the party leaders will have to settle with their followers and the country at a later day. Such a spectacle presented in this day and generation may tend to shake public confidence in the men who essay to govern and thereby become the guardians of the political and national conscience of Canada, but it does not greatly illumine the subject to be dealt with. Of one thing it does convince us, and that is that there is room in Canada for a Canadian James Russell Lowell, and a Canadian Hosea Bigelow to illustrate the characteristics of our political conditions at this time.

The other attempt which has been made has been to show that those who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, are disloyal. That is a very old cry. It is one with which we are all familiar, and is certainly not one upon which I should claim the attention of this House at any length. I have heard that cry from the very beginning of my knowledge of political affairs. I have heard it raised against the Liberal party. In my boyhood days, particularly after the struggle for responsible government in Nova Scotia, I heard that great statesman, Joseph Howe, denounced as disloyal, and as an innovator, not true to his King and country, because he contended for a larger measure of freedom and political control in the affairs of the country in which he lived. This cry has always been the answer to those who were pleading for an enlargement of the people's rights. When there is nothing else to be said against any one or against any political party, the attempt is made to prove disloyalty. Now, while I hold the views I do with respect to this subject, I do not think it is fair to say of the right hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he is in any sense disloyal, or that he is not as sincere is his desire for the advancement of the country as any other hon. member in this House. It is not fair to say that one party has a monopoly of loyalty, and of a desire to advance the interests of the country; and I think that we can sweep away as unworthy of our consideration all arguments advanced with a view to show either inconsistency on the part of the Conservative party or disloyalty on the part of the Liberal party, in the consideration of this question.

Now, Sir, I will reverse the order of the motions in my consideration of them. First, I will consider the amendment to the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk); then the amendment to the original motion which was moved by the hon. leader of the opposition; and lastly, the original motion involving the adoption of the Bill introduced by the right hon. the Prime Minister. Now, as to the policy involved in the amendment to the amendment, I can best characterize it as a 'do-nothing policy.' We remember that in the United States, many years ago, they had what was called a 'know-nothing policy'—and I suppose my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is the leader of a third party in this country which advocates a 'do-nothing policy.' I have no sympathy with the ideas involved in that amendment to the amendment; while I have every respect, indeed a profound respect, for the hon. gentleman himself, who stands well in this House and in this country, a man of culture, a man of broad ideas, a man of ability. I respect him as such, but I certainly think that he has not done justice either to himself, or to Canada, which he, in common with the rest of us, I hope, loves, or to

Great Britain, to which he gives a great deal of credit.

The next in order for consideration is the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition. That seems to me to be based on two principles, one, that of a contribution called for by an emergency crisis, and the other, the policy of a plebiscite. Now, I shall endeavour to deal with this amendment from the standpoint of a contribution, I do not propose to discuss at any length the question of a crisis, or an emergency. That has been treated so fully that I think we may consider it as having been disposed of, so far as it enters into a discussion of this question. As to that amendment advocating a contribution. it cannot be said that it is anything more than an act of expediency, not one of policy. No hon. gentleman can say that, so far as that amendment relates to the contribution of Dreadnoughts, it lays down a platform or a policy for the people of Canada to follow. It might, under certain circumstances, be considered as a generous act; it might, if you will, be considered as a quid pro quo offered in a moment of magnaminity. But it can never be said that it contains a policy for the people of Canada to build upon, a platform upon which they can start out to erect their superstructure. We must remember that we have to deal with this question, not merely for the present but for the future, and that as we start to build, so will the completion of our structure be. If there is anything in the idea of the amendment, it is in my judgment foreign to the spirit of the government under which we live. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in his boyhood days, I know, was wont to pay great attention to the public speeches, lectures and utterances of the late Hon. Joseph Howe; and I fancy there is no gentleman sitting in this Chamber who is more familiar with the utterances of that great statesman. I know that he must have a clear memory of the speeches that gentleman delivered at Southampton, of the letters to Earl Grey, to Sir Francis Hincks, the twelve resolutions which he moved early in the history of colonial government in Nova Scotia, and his great speeches on the organization of the empire. My hon. friend, brought up, as I know he was, and as I was, in a Liberal family, must have been familiar with the principles which the Hon. Joseph Howe enunciated; and I am sure that when my hon. friend came to pen that amendment he must have felt that he was contradicting every principle and all the early teachings concerning responsible government which he had imbibed from that great statesman. For that reason I would dispose, so far as I am individually concerned, of that amendment as unsatisfactory; I could not find it in my heart to vote in favour of it. I repudiate the idea that we are mere colonists, I repudiate the terms 'colony' and 'colonists'. They may have been proper terms to use in the early days when we were a Crown colony, when we were looking to Downing street, when we were mere subjects, subservient to a government beyond the sea; but to-day we stand in an entirely different position.

An hon. MEMBER. How?

Mr. EMMERSON. To-day we have local responsible self-government within Canada and within the provinces of Canada and so we should have a reasonable respect for our surroundings, for our conditions, for our rights, for our dignity as a young nation within the great empire of Great Britain.

As to the second feature, that of the plebiscite, it does not occur to me as necessary that this matter should be submitted to the people of Canada. We must all recognize that this question has not been entirely overlooked. The attitude taken by the government of Canada in 1902 and in 1907, has my fullest and heartiest support. I also support in its entirety the principle contained in the resolution of March 29, 1909, the point where I diverge from it being as to its inclusion of the word speedy, and the meaning of this I shall explain later. I have said that the principles enunciated by the government in 1902, 1907 and 1909 have my approval and concurrence and I shall endeavour to show how these principles can best be turned into effect, having regard to the conditions prevailing in Canada and to the future of this country. I have endeavoured to express the idea that the amendment of the leader of the opposition does not contain a policy but simply a suggestion as to an expedient and it is not I think, worthy of any great party that seeks to administer the affairs of Canada. Its whole foundation, if it has any reason for existence at all, lies in the attempted creation of a German scare, of a menace to the empire of Britain, from the German or some other empire. Such a menace, it seems to me, does not exist. We have had many scares in this country originating under conditions not unlike these. The entrance of New Brunswick to confederation resulted because of a Fenian scare. Later we have had the Russian scare, we have had the French scare. All these were great crises. Later on we have had many election scares, we have had the scare of French domination in our province and all over the Dominion. These scares and these fancied crises originate, I was almost going to say from brains that are sprained in some way, they are not merely the result of brain storms but they are spasms and paroxysms that

seem to come to political parties at intervals and at times when there is some great end to serve and some great purpose to achieve. Therefore I say that in so far as the basis for any contribution is concerned, it is gone and absolutely gone, as has been demonstrated to this House time and again in the last few days by the extracts quoted from the speeches of prominent men in Great Britain, of the chancellor of the German empire, and the utterances of a few days ago of the great thunderer of Great Britain, the London 'Times.' It is conceded on all sides that there is no emergency, that there is no crisis, that it simply exists as a conjuring of the brain. Assuming that it does not exist, then where falls this policy of a contribution. England does not want it, she does not ask it. What England wants is some assertion of principle and policy on the part of the Canadian people that will be a moral force in support of the empire and that will be a notification to the nations of the world that if Great Britain is in trouble, if the empire of Britain is menaced or imperilled, the dominions beyond the seas will be at her back and will spend their money, their men and their strength without stint. I believe that if a national crisis existed, Canada would give money and men without stint. But does the emergency exist? There is no one who can say it does exist or that there is a likelihood of its existence and therefore it is simply now a question for this House and this country to consider as to the course that Canada should take in connection with her attitude as a young nation within the great mother nation of the empire.

This leads me to the consideration of the original motion, the one to the effect that we shall have the second reading of this Bill and go into Committee of the Whole to take into consideration what we should do towards helping the empire, not merely in a crisis or in the event of a crisis but as a settled policy, a policy whereby we shall be recognized measureably as a part of the British empire, at least sustaining the burdens and assisting in the protection of ourselves as a portion of the empire and aiding and contributing to the support and the defence of the empire at large. It is simply a question, after all, as to the means to an end. I would like to deal with the practical and economic features of this measure. I would stop to analyse for a moment Canada's position in respect to the empire and with respect to the conditions prevailing within her own bounds. What is expedient for her, using the word expedient with its wide and proper meaning. It is a question of expediency, having regard to our conditions, having regard to our situation, having regard to the problems which we have in hand at this time, and which we anticipate having in hand in the near future. In determining that question of expediency we must not forget that everybody's problem in life is not to fancy what he would like to do but to find out what he has to do and make the very best that he can of it. What is thus true of the individual is true in the larger sense of nationhood. Now, the Bill involved in the motion of the right hon. leader of the government is one that is worthy of consideration. Let me say at the very outset that I have always agreed and do now agree with the principle of that Bill. I question its necessity at this moment. I question the judgment that would conclude that it was necessary to introduce it before the people of Canada at this moment, but that is merely my opinion and I hope always to have the courage of those opinions born of conviction and sincerity.

Now, I want to make a little personal explanation. I have been credited with the coinage of a term that has been freely circulated from one end of this country to the other. I refer to the phrase 'a tin-pot navy.' Let me say that if there is any credit for the coinage of a phrase, I am not entitled to any credit for the coining of that phrase. More than that, I am not aware that I ever made use of such a term I know that I never voiced the words, and yet I am told that this was given free circulation in some of the public newspapers in Canada. If I had used the term, I would stand by it, but as I did not, I must relinquish claim to the credit and repudiate this as an utterance by me. But, Mr. Speaker, we must realize in dealing with this measure the conditions under which we are living to-day. Canada has many great transportation problems. The extension of our canal system and the creation and construction of magnificent railways are necessary to the development of our rapidly expanding country. The deepening and widening of our waterways, the extension of our trade abroad, the establishment, in the interests of the people of this Dominion, of commercial agencies wherever there is trade to be had, the initiation of a policy which would have, as representatives of this Dominion in every country where Canada has trade, agents of our Customs Department in order that they might spy out the opportunities and report the conditions affecting the internal affairs of Canada, our tariff conditions and our trade, to our government, which reports could be disseminated through the country to the advantage of the commercial world and the business element which are becoming so prominent within our borders—these are all great problems that must be solved. We must also recognize that we have assumed immense burdens, that we have taken hold of difficulties that to greater countries, and countries of greater wealth, would be recog-

nized as almost insurmountable. We have one great transcontinental railway, and we have two others in course of construction, and both nearing completion. The people of the country to the south of us, although they have a population of upwards of eighty millions, although they have been in advance of us in the business and industrial world, have not one single transcontinental line of railway spanning their country from the shores of the Atlantic to the shores of the Pacific. That is a startling fact, but it is one that is true, nevertheless. They possess railways connecting one with the other whereby you can start from the Pacific ocean and reach the Atlantic, but they have never assumed the burdens in connection with transcontinental railways which the people of Canada have had the courage to undertake. We want, in addition to that, to bring about the development of our transportation facilities. We want population. Canada wants more steamship services from the St. Lawrence and the maritime ports, to every port in the world. She wants to enlarge and deepen her canals and improve her river channels so as to accommodate the largest ships. She requires the construction of new canals, new railways and branch lines for those railways. Then, these branch lines must connect sections wherever population is to be found with the centres of population. She wants these lines projected into every section where a mining or agricultural population can be maintained. She demands large expenditures, not only in furthering a great national policy of transportation, but also in promoting the increase of her population. The people want a live, up-to-date and intelligent grasp of the necessities of the hour, with hustling action on the part of governments and those charged with the responsibility of the development of the country. They do not want timid hesitancy in respect to these matters. The prophecy of the right hon. leader of the government that the twentieth century would be Canada's will be realized if we are but measureably active and alert with regard to the illimitable and rich natural resources of our country.

These are some of the wants of Canada. We are face to face with meeting those wants, and in that connection comes up the question of the advisability of the construction of a navy at the present time. Well, Sir, I do not take very great exception to the initial cost, either of the commencement or the completion of a navy in itself. But, one must bear in mind that we are embarking on a wider sea than these limitations would indicate. There is the question of the maintenance of that navy, and as to that I shall not refer particularly. What I want this parliament to remember is that in the adoption of this Bill we must be careful not to overlook the fact that if you have a navy to defend your coasts you must have in conjunction with it modern fortifications in every sea-port, and harbour on the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans, and so, when we embark on the construction of a navy we are of necessity launched into immense expenditure for these fortifications. The question then comes for our consideration, are we in a position to assume the burden in the manner proposed? As an incident of a navy we must have dockyards, we must have dry-docks, and I suppose we must have admiralty boards and councils. I am no pessimist with respect to the strength, and the willingness, and the power of the Canadian people to accomplish great undertakings. I believe that our people are able to overcome any difficulty that is likely in the ordinary course of events to confront them, but, we are charged with the responsibility of legislating, and we must hesitate before we place burdens upon the people. I am not now speaking of the proposal in this Bill as a contrast to what has been proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition. His proposal means a grant of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 offhand, and the proposal of the right hon. the Prime Minister means not so many millions at the outset, but it involves great incidental expenditures which may be, and will be in my judgment an obligation upon the Canadian people for all time to come. Then, let us ask ourselves if this navy in one form or other is a necessity at this moment. And, Sir, in considering that question, while I defer to the judgment of the right hon. gentleman, and of those by whom he is surrounded in council, I do say that the spasm and the paroxysm that has seized upon hon. gentlemen opposite in their clamouring for a contribution, and for Dreadnoughts ad libitum to be sent across the water has impregnated the atmosphere to some extent although it seems to have lost some of its power in its passage across the floor. However, there is not a difference as to principle, it is simply a difference as to detail, Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that the expenditure for maintaining the proposed navy, and for the continuance of admiralty boards and councils is, perhaps, not an obstacle that should frighten the people. But, when we realize that Canada has expended in the last twenty years for the maintenance of our militia upwards of $60,000,000 we can form some estimate of what the establishment of a navy, and naval boards, and naval councils will mean. I may be somewhat radical on these points; it may be that I have not a due appreciation of the requirements of this country, but I have felt that already we have had too much of these military councils; that we have had entirely

too much of men going from one end of the country to the other, who toil not and neither do they spin, and yet none are arrayed like one of these, and who have placed in their hands, by the influence of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House as well as on this, thousands and hundreds of thousands, and millions of dollars year after year to sustain this great establishment. And, Sir, when I realize what that expenditure would have done in other directions, I confess that I am sorry it has not been spent in what to me would appear a manner more conducive to the welfare of our country. I am no lover of post mortem examinations into the past, but I feel it my duty to invite the attention of the House to that expenditure in order that we may realize in some degree what may be expected from us in the future if we duplicate these organizations in the form of a navy, and navy boards, and naval councils—Lord high admirals and admirals, and so on. Now, Sir, I can read the condition of Canada to-day in the light of history. When the thirteen colonies declared for independence they had terrible difficulties to surmount in the matter of their maritime power, and the success which attended an earnest sincere, and valiant people was little dreamed of by Lord North, and those who inspired him at the beginning of that struggle. I can come down further in the light of the history of the war of 1812, and realize what an efficient navy meant to the American union at the time of the declaration of that war. Although the union had been preparing for that conflict she had not more than seventeen war vessels, but she had a splendid merchant marine which was found to be an efficient auxiliary to the naval force, and which in a very short time was supplied with 50,000 men. The union did not have more than six warships proper, and these were frigates of no large size, manned by 5,000 sailors. I may be told that conditions have changed, and so they have. But, Sir, although I have spoken longer than I intended, I must continue in order to say that I would have been glad if the government could have presented a Bill containing the very principles which this Bill contains, but also containing suggestions which I shall with all due deference place before the House, and especially submit for the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite as a restraining influence upon their frenzied brain style of reaching forward towards Dreadnoughts ad libitum.

I would have been glad if the government had introduced a measure providing for training ships in sufficient number to meet the requirements of the Atlantic sea-board, the Pacific sea-board and the inland waters of Canada, the great lakes. Training ships to do what? To furnish the personnel for a navy that must come. If we are to reach out into greater nationhood, if we are to expand and develop, if our population is to increase, it is not so very far in the future where, without regard to any condition that may exist elsewhere, but as a necessity of our internal conditions, our growth and expansion, there will be a necessity for the establishment of a navy suitable to our means and our conditions. That training could provide, first, somewhat on the lines of the Newfoundland naval reserve, a scheme to educate the seamen of the east and of the west and along the lakes, so that they would graduate into a navy almost automatically. We must remember that in the manning of a navy conditions have changed from what they were in 1812 and in 1775. To-day it is not merely able-bodied seamen and men of valour that are required; but you want technically trained men; you want the machinist, the mechanic, the electrical engineer. You want men with trained eyes and trained hands and trained brains, and they cannot be created in a day. They are the condition precedent of a navy; and I would add, and I think the people of Canada would add and demand, that when we have a navy it should be Canadian-built and Canadian-manned. And what is more, I never want to see a ship of the naval force of Canada launched into the waters of our coasts commanded by any other than a Canadian or controlled by any but men of our own Canadian brain and brawn. That would be my idea. Correlative with that I would provide for an emergency. I would have that training fleet in operation, and I would begin to provide for what might be termed a peace fund in Canada—a fund that could be changed into a fund, if necessity arose, for the protection of the empire. Now, why have such a fund? Canada can, it is true, stand, and would be willing to stand, large contributions for her own development and for the defence of the empire. We all recognize and gratefully acknowledge the fact that our trade routes and our commerce are protected by the navy of England. In proportion to our trade and in proportion to the protection given to it, our customs revenues expand and increase; they are expanding and increasing year by year; and the people of Canada would do right, and they would be willing to do it, to set aside year by year a percentage of those customs revenues—it might amount to $3,000,000 or $5,000,000 or more each year; and the fund so formed could be placed, if you will, to the credit of Canada in the bank of England, and named, if it needed a name, 'Canada's peace fund.' It would be a notification to the nations of Europe and to the world that Canada was determined to

support the empire in her hour of need, if that hour ever came. That fund would grow. In the meantime, it would cost nothing to maintain. There would be no outgoes in the maintenance of it, and it would be ready at any moment, if the emergency arose, and could be contributed at once to the empire for the benefit of the empire. Is there anything more needed by a nation in stress of conflict than money? Recent history has demonstrated that. The war between Russia and Japan and the war between Spain and the United States are illustrations. Even in the Boer war Great Britain did not find it very easy to provide the funds to enable her to put down the Boers. Votes of money were given, and given generously and freely; but the burden on the people of Great Britain was very great. The additions to the budget were enormous, but they were cheerfully assumed by the people of Great Britain. But if in case of an emergency we were in a position to place at the disposal of the empire $50,000,000, or $40,000,000, or $30,000,000, this would certainly be a contribution that would be of advantage, and would demonstrate to the world that we were doing something in support of the empire, even if we did not send Dreadnoughts. What, Sir, would such legislation mean? After all, what was wanted by Great Britain was a declaration on the part of the overseas dominions that would have a moral effect with the nations of the world; and if it were known by Germany or any other European nation that Canada was preparing a fund primarily for the preservation of peace—because, after all, as I understand it, these armaments are justified because they tend to preserve the peace of the world—consider the moral effect the knowledge of such a fact would have. At least that is how the nations justify the creation of great naval fleets and the establishment of great armaments. They plead that they are incurring these heavy expenditures in order that the peace of the world may be preserved. If an enactment by Canada would not be a notification to all these nations that Great Britain would have our support, I do not know of any other course that could more effectively convey that idea. I shall not touch upon the fact that the United States and Japan have lessened their war appropriations at the very moment when we are proposing to launch out into this heavy expenditure. Japan, in its last estimates, decreased its vote for the navy and army, and so did the United States, whereas we in Canada are going to branch out into an increased expenditure this year and a still greater expenditure next year.

I could not divest myself of my personal responsibility even if I would. I owe a duty to my constituents, and I recognize

the fact that I am absolutely and unreservedly opposed to the policy of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) and also to the do-nothing policy of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). Then what shall I support? I shall take a course without fear, favour or affection, and I assume that every hon. gentleman will do the same. But I find myself, as I have said, very much in the position of Lord Dundreary's peacock. I am obliged to flock all by myself alone, but there is a bird near me which is more to my own liking. I cannot have what I would. All government is based on compromise. We cannot all have our own way, and I have given this matter great consideration. I am bound to say that there has not been any man on either side who has asked me what my attitude was on this question. My declaration by my vote will be in favour of the principle which I have enunciated—that is a principle which involves a policy which is Canadian, which is for the future, and which means something for the empire. To give a contribution this year or next year to Great Britain would mean perhaps that we would be expected to do that the following year, but there would be no fixed understanding. One government and one parliament might do it, and another might not. But to put it in a form of an enactment, showing what Canada is prepared to do, is a tangible something which governments and parliaments cannot violate, which would go on for the benefit of the empire and the advantage of Canada, particularly as I see it. I did not intend to take up so much of the time of the House. I have given criticisms on the details of the Bill which perhaps would have been more opportune in Committee of the Whole; but its principles are quite in accord with my own and the scheme proposed is in a sense identical with my views except in this respect, that I say the time has not come for us to launch it. My hon. friends say: yes, it has. My hon. friends opposite say send millions and send Dreadnoughts; do that without plebiscites, but do not do the other without going back home and consulting the people.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I do not intend to weary the House by following the argument, if it may be so called, of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Emmerson), further than to congratulate him upon being, as he assures us he is, the only member of this House, amongst two hundred odd, who has not gone into paroxisms and spasms on this question. While he was making his plea, one would have thought that his argument would have lead to the very reverse of the conclusion

he arrived at. The hon. gentleman compared himself to the historical peacock. I should have thought that he would have added another bird to his aviary and would more fittingly have likened himself to a peacock of canabalistic propensities with a dish of crow before it which it was eating with undoubted enjoyment. The hon. gentleman has given us reason after reason why the Bill of the government should not pass, and he consequently felt impelled to state that no doubt we would be surprised to find that after all he was supporting the government. Well, speaking for myself, I was not at all surprised. I had no idea that he would do anything else except eat crow. I was therefore not at all surprised that, after making a speech bristling with declarations of independence, he should wind up by supporting the government. He still, however, tries to leave the House in some doubt as to what he may do in the end, because he still reserves the right to bring forward in committee a do-nothing policy of his own. He is not going to do this, that, or the other thing. He does not approve of the government policy, he cannot vote for that of the leader of the opposition, and he is very much incensed at the policy introduced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, which he styles a do-nothing policy, and he winds up by declaring, what no one doubted, that he would support the government, taking care, however, to throw out some obscure intimations as to some other course which he may take during the debate in committee.

The main reason why he opposes the policy of the leader of the opposition is that, first of all, there is no emergency, and secondly, that he wants the people of this country to understand that the proposal of the opposition is not one of policy, but of expediency. Let me ask the hon. gentleman: Can he name to me a wiser, a higher quality of policy for this great country than the declaration to the world at large that any nation which interferes with the mother country will at the same time interfere with Canada? I see that the hon. gentleman has gone out. Will some one kindly ask him to come back before the debate closes, because I would like to put to him this question; and I would use my influence with my party and try to prevail on the leader of the government to allow the rules to be broken and give the hon. gentleman another opportunity to speak on this question, and tell us, if he can, what policy would be grander, nobler or better for the country than one by which Canada would declare, not only to Germany, but the world at large, that, in case of emergency, no matter how many millions were required, Canada would stand by the mother country first, last and all the time. The hon. gentleman, throughout his remarks, indicated that he was in favour of British connection, but if there is anything in his so-called flocking alone policy, it means that Canada should go meandering along, taking the benefit all through the ages of everything that Great Britain has done for this country in the way of constructing a navy for the advantage of the trade of Canada to enable us to produce, as we all want to do, flourishing manufactories, with the means of shipping our wheat to foreign countries, and doing all this while sponging on Great Britain to protect our products while we send them forth into the universe. My hon. friend talked about dignity; my hon. friend talked, I took down his words, about a 'dignified policy for Canada.' Well, now, I would not like to give my boys a lesson upon dignity in the sense that the hon gentleman understands dignity. I would not like a boy of mine, after I had educated him and fitted him for a successful career in life, after I had taught him lessons of manliness, and endeavoured to instil in his heart a love of uprightness and nobility, nationally as well as individually, after I had done all this for him, and after he had grown up to manhood, I would not think it would be dignified for him to say to his father: I am 21 years of age, and the old man is 65, and it is dignified in me to repudiate him if I can save a little money by so doing. The hon. member may consider that dignity in the county of Westmorland, but my constituents would call it gross meanness.

He talks about the meaning of the word 'speedy.' He voted for that resolution, which the leader of the opposition put forward as an amendment in order to save the honour of this country by giving speedy relief; and the hon. gentleman, forsooth, wants to beat around the upper lakes with a few fishing boats, and still he does not make up his mind what kind of a flag they are to sail under. And he does not want to do even this for five, ten or fifteen years. Sir, I must say that his opinion of what is speedy relief is entirely at variance with the idea of an ordinary school boy, let alone a grown up person in the county of Lincoln. But just as the hon. gentleman wants to do his duty to his constituents, so I am bound to say, in doing my duty to my constituents, that that is not my view of what constitutes speedy relief to the motherland.

Now, the hon. gentleman pooh poohed the idea that there was any emergency. The hon. gentleman has a colleague here from his province in the person of the hon. member for Sunbury and Queens (Mr. H. H. McLean) who declared, as he was bound to declare, the other day, in my hearing, and in this same debate, that he did not

agree with the contention of the other government supporters that there was no emergency; he made a very powerful argument to show that there is an emergency, and that this country requires something to be done in order that Great Britain may understand our position in that emergency. So, while the hon. member for Westmorland is trying to walk alone, he is up against the arguments of a gentleman on his own side of the House, as well as against the arguments of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Having said this much in criticism of the hon. gentleman's speech, I need not bother this House any more with him.

Now, as to the Bill itself, what position are we in? The government admits, by the introduction of this Bill, that something has got to be done.

Now, the whole issue between us is: Are we to deal with Canada alone, or with Canada as a part of the British empire? That is the crux of the question, and we must face it. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you realize that as well as any other hon. member in this House—must we consider Canada as an independent nation, or as a part of the British empire? The hon. gentleman no doubt is sincere in the stand he takes. I do not say that in any sneering manner, because I believe that hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere, although they may forget themselves on occasions. But I apprehend that hon. gentlemen supporting the government are sincere when they say that there is no emergency, and that consequently we should shape our course as though Great Britain did not need our assistance. For my part I believe that there is an emergency, and even the government supporters admit that if there were an emergency it would be the duty of Canada to render effectual assistance to the empire. However, they deny the existence of the emergency and hope that no emeregency will ever occur, although we fear it will. Now, if they are sincere when they argue in this manner, it does seem strange to me that they have not seen a way out of the difficulty. If they are sincere, why do they not adopt the amendment of the leader of the opposition and so relieve themselves from the difficulty? Let them adopt the amendment of the leader of the opposition if they are desirous of maintaining the integrity of the British empire, and every one of their views will be complied with. If there is not an emergency, they will still be showing their adhesion to the view that Canada is an integral part of the British empire, and is bound to do something for imperial defence; while if there is an emergency, they are rendering that speedy assistance to the mother country which the resolution of last March calls for. Sir, it is not the paltry value of the money gift that counts in this matter, but it is the great moral influence which Canada will exert upon the whole world by taking her stand by the side of the mother country. Every hon. gentleman on that side of the House assumes in his argument that if Great Britain were attacked it would be wise and right for Canada to stand at her back.

Now, I appeal, if it is not too late, to the Prime Minister himself. Could he not call his supporters together again in caucus and say to them: Gentlemen, I gather from the arguments of those of you who have spoken on this question that it is very desirable that the parliament of Canada should be united, and as the amendment of the leader of the opposition meets the objections of the member for Westmorland, as it does not propose any permanent tax upon the people of this country, as it does not propose the adoption of a naval policy until the question has been discussed upon the hustings, let us all vote for the amendment of the leader of the opposition. Sir, there can be only one reason why the Prime Minister wont do that, and that reason must be because he is not prepared at all hazards to say that the Canadian fleet, in time of war, must be controlled by the British admiralty. That must be his only reason, because there can be no other. I would not suggest that the right hon. gentleman is not loyal. It is not fair to suggest that hon. gentlemen, his supporters on the other side of the House are not loyal; but it does become fair and right to discuss the question of loyalty when a proposition is made that modifies in any way our constitutional relations to the mother country. It is right to ask whither such a course is tending. Now, I am going at first to discuss this question upon the basis of what is best for us standing alone; and then I will discuss it from the point of view of what we should do as an integral part of the empire.

First of all what have we to gain by having a navy in this country that is not to be controlled by Great Britain, and, again what harm can it do us if our navy is controlled by Great Britain unless, I say again, you are determined to leave the door open for separation instead of locking that door and make sure that you and your descendants for all time will remain British subjects. There is nothing in the amendment of the leader of the opposition that can do the Canadians any harm whatever unless the Canadians are anxious to have the door left open, to have a chance to escape British connection and to become independent. If some hon. gentlemen, as two or three have admitted, are voting for this Bill because it may lead to independence, that of itself seems to me is a reason why the rest of us ought to rise and say: Under the British North America Act we

cannot do that, it is not only illegal but absolutely disloyal in the sense of a breaking of the allegiance which, while the British North America Act continues and this country remains under the constitution, cannot be broken except by rebellion. These hon. gentlemen, it seems to me, are not so much to blame as the Prime Minister who has led the way in regard to this Bill. The Prime Minister undertook to say he was neither an imperialist nor an anti-imperialist. With all deference I am bound to say there are some things in this world that must be either yes or no. I cannot believe that I am married to my wife and I am not married to her. I cannot believe that Edward Hamilton Lancaster is my son to-day and reserve the right to say, ten years hence, that he is not my son. I cannot believe that I am free to reserve the right to say I am an imperialist and I am an anti-imperialist. I do not believe that I can owe allegiance to Great Britain unless I am an imperialist, I cannot see any difference between an oath of allegiance and imperialism. What is allegiance? I am speaking only for myself in what I am going to say. I believe that every gentleman has a right to be guided by his own conscience. I have to be guided by mine and many a time my conscience has caused me to refrain from doing things because I thought them wrong while other men felt free to do those things. It is a matter between the man and his Maker. I have three times taken the oath of allegiance to King Edward. There is nothing in that oath permitting you to change your mind ten or fifteen years hence. Before I was allowed to take my seat in this House I had to take that oath. It is absolute and unalterable, a man taking it swears allegiance to King Edward. I do not see how I am to keep that oath and vote for a Bill which would construct a navy not under King Edward's control if we are to remain a part of the empire. The arguments of hon. gentlemen would tend to the belief that we have reached something which we have not reached. They argue that it is just as well to have an independent Canadian navy. And why? So that they may or may not interfere in wars in which Great Britain may become engaged. The very minute that you establish the principle that a navy built by Canada may or may not, as it sees fit at the time, join the motherland in its wars, that very moment you are proposing a rebelion if that policy is insisted on. Why do I say that? There is the navy constructed, there is the navy ready to fight. An order comes from Ottawa saying whether or not our navy is to join in that war. Suppose it does not join in the war. What is that navy? It is not an imperialist, it is an anti-imperialist. The imperial navy is at war with Germany or Austria, or Russia or some other country and where is the Canadian navy under those circumstances, what condition is it in? How can any one say that Canada can remain part of the empire and take such a stand as that, it is an absolute contradiction in terms? It is claimed sometimes that a man has a right to fence. I have never thought it wise to fence. Although I have a close constituency which at the time I first ran was supposed to be strongly hostile to my party I have never thought it would pay, I have never dared to insult my constituents, my wife or my children, by undertaking to say both yes and no on any question. A man is no good in my opinion if he cannot find what his duty is under such circumstances. The Prime Minister is in an impossible position when he says he is neither an imperialist nor an anti-imperialist, just as Edward Hamilton Lancaster, must be my son or must not be; it is impossible to say that he may be one day and may not be another day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCASTER. The right hon. gentleman thinks this is very funny, that it is quite a joke. I am trying to illustrate in a practical way what I understand by my oath of allegiance and by allegiance to any country. It may appear to be very clever to take this double position. Just as it may appear to be clever to denounce the Manitoba school question in Ontario and uphold it in Quebec, so it may appear to be clever to say in some parts of the country: Sir Wilfrid said in the House that he was not an imperialist, and to have 'Hansard' scored out with pencil or with scissors, and to say in another province: The Prime Minister said in the House that he was an imperialist. Thus I say the Prime Minister has set a bad example to his followers and we see the fruits of that example, when he says that he is not an imperialist and not an anti-imperialist.

The right hon. gentleman made a quotation which I think was an unfortunate one for him. He quoted Kipling:

> Daughter am I in my mother's house,
> But mistress in my own.

Daughter in his mother's house? What kind of a daughter? What kind of a good-looking little Canadian girl, I do not care about the English or the Scotch or the Irish girl, but what kind of a little Canadian girl? What about my daughter? —for I have got one—I wish I had a dozen. After her father educates her and teaches her all he can and after her mother teaches her and brings her up to honourable womanhood, suppose that she is given a magnificent fruit farm and is allowed to use it without rent or taxes; suppose some

one comes to her and says: Do you know that your mother and father are being beset by barn burners and others? What kind of a daughter in her mother's house, would she be if she would not give up everything she had to protect the old gentleman and the old lady? Daughter am I in my mother's house—yes, a most unworthy daughter who would have the contempt of the whole world, if under the circumstances of this Bill he did not do what we are advocating. Kipling said both things, daughter in my mother's house and mistress in my own. Mistress in my own? Yes, mistress in Canada, in the autonomy of Canada, in dealing with great transportation questions, in making protective or free trade policies for her farmers, her manufacturers and all her people. Absolute autonomy is what I fight for, absolute autonomy in Canada. Let Canada attend to its own affairs absolutely. Let Great Britain keep its hands off the British North America Act. But the same British North America Act which gives us autonomy in Canada to deal with our domestic affairs has given us no right when we get outside of Canada to interfere with imperial affairs. Daughter in my mother's house, is not Canada's autonomy. 'Daughter in our mother's house' is outside of Canada, it has relation to imperial affairs. Mistress in our own house is dealing with Canada's affairs and this Naval Bill is going beyond Canada's affairs and interfering with imperial affairs. Under those circumstances I cannot but regret that a gentleman like the hon. gentleman from South Huron is induced to ask in this House: What did Great Britain ever do for us? The poison, so to speak, which was sown upon the second reading of the Bill has reached him. He is a Scotchman, or a gentleman of Scotch descent, and he is a man above all others, perhaps, except an Englishman which I am myself, who would be expected to suggest that these imperial rights should exist in this country. As I am referring to what he said, it is fair to quote his exact language and therefore I would refer the House to page 4520 of 'Hansard'. After saying that Great Britain had done nothing for us, that she never gave us any more for our lard, our oats, our wheat, our cabbage, or something of that kind, than any other country, that she did not give us more than our goods were worth—and I do not know of any Canadian who would be undignified enough to want to get more than his goods were worth—he proceeds to say:

> It is quite proper that I should say that our love for and devotion to the mother country is only commencing. Filial affection, I am sure, is one of the noblest traits of human nature; but filial affection divorced from self-preservation does not amount to a very great deal. It is the boy, the young man, which makes the best use of his opportunity and the gifts with which he has been endowed, and who shows a disposition to carve out his own future and to paddle his own canoe who is always dearest to the mother's heart.

Yes, because she expects that if some burglar or horse thief waylays her, this young man, because he is her son, will come to her relief. This love is just commencing according to the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean). What kind of love is the boy to have for his mother? When it has arrived at its completion? Because he is twenty-one years of age does that mean that in spite of her love, and her up-bringing he is going to murder or assassinate her when his affection is complete? Is that the kind of love he is commencing to have for his mother?

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. The words used were not 'only commencing,' but were 'highly commendable.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I am sorry if 'Hansard' has done the hon. gentleman an injustice.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. These words do not appear in the original, but in the corrected 'Hansard' it is all right.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but it is fair to 'Hansard,' that I should say that the words appearing there are:

> It is quite proper that I should say that our love is only commencing.

I am not sure that the context would bear out the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. However, the hon. gentleman thought that there was some necessity of the boy, at some time, loving his mother, but that when he had become a big fellow, twenty-one years of age, thick in the chest, and doing well, and all this because of his mother's kindness, the mother's love and affection for her boy should only commence to bear fruition. To go a step further, we want to see our boys and girls manifesting always an affection for their mothers and fathers, and the more there are of these the more strength we will have as a nation. You cannot disassociate the character of the nation from that of the individual. What the individuals are, so is the nation. It is absolutely impossible to be otherwise.

I wish to commend what the hon. member for Queens and Sunbury (Mr. H. H. McLean) said, although he has not said that he is going to flock alone. Although he has not taken a position very much different from that of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), although he has not said that we should give aid in paroxysms and spasms, and although he has not said that this is necessary, he has

said that there is an emergency existing and that something should be done. I appeal to that hon. gentleman under these circumstances, before this vote is taken, and I ask him if he does not think that he could carry out his views better by voting for the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. How can he, consistently with what he said, vote for this Bill? He has also said that he believes that this navy should be controlled by the mother country, and in that respect he is at daggers drawn with the government. Under those circumstances, I say that there can be no question in the mind of any intelligent, and fair minded member of this House, that the policy of the government is utterly impossible from a practical point of view. It is not practicable. If you are going to be in unison with the mother country, you cannot for five or ten years at least expect to give relief to any body. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in their emergency, as I say, and I think that they are in more of an emergency than Great Britain is, in one way, are considering how they can square their views with the necessity of voting for the government. We cannot help but laugh at the remarks of the right hon. leader of the government in introducing, and in moving the second reading of this Bill, in which he undertook to rail at the opposition, because they did not all express the same views upon this question. He forgot that the opposition, no matter what views they expressed, had not the ear of the Governor General, and could not bring in a Bill of this kind. He forgot that no matter what policy we proposed we could not, under the rules of the House, because we are not the advisers of His Excellency, introduce a Bill. But the right hon. gentleman has his own language coming back upon him because his supporters behind him are more at sea upon this question than we are, and there is more disunion among them than there is upon this side of the House. One hon. gentleman says that he would have to vote that the navy shall be controlled by Great Britain. That is my hon. friend from Queens and Sunbury (Mr. H. H. McLean). Another, the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), does not want a navy Bill at all, because he wants to give more grants to subsidize railways or dig a few canals. The hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte), says he ought to vote for this Bill, because it is going to bring independence. So we find that all these gentlemen are going to support the measure of the Prime Minister although they are not at one upon it. If the right hon. gentleman were well advised, if he were not determined to try and get in the thin edge of the wedge of independence for Canada by placing this Bill before the people, he would withdraw it. As an imperialist, because I refuse to call him an anti-imperialist at the present time, although he says he is neither one nor the other, as a loyal citizen, and as the Prime Minister of Canada for the time being, I think he would be well advised if he withdrew this Bill, and go on with the domestic affairs of the country in parliament instead of interfering with the rights of Great Britain, as this measure must do. This measure must lead to independence, and for that reason, if for no other reason, my constituency would require me to vote against it. I am not talking about the Conservatives only of Lincoln and Niagara. Every intelligent Liberal as well as every intelligent Conservative in the constituency of Lincoln and Niagara would insist upon this being done if he really believed that it was going to lead to independence. When we find an hon. gentleman who is in the caucus of the right hon. Prime Minister, who knows what is going on, standing up here, and saying that that is the reason for his voting for this Bill, I think we are right in concluding that this measure is not one which this parliament should accept. An independent navy means an independent Canada. What else could it mean? The existence of Canada as a part of the British nation cannot be consistent with an independent navy. If you do not want an independent Canada, you do not want an independent navy because if you are to give Great Britain protection as it may be required you must put this navy under the control of the British authorities. We have heard a great deal about the pride and duty of Canada, and all that sort of thing, and there has been a great deal said about what we owe to Great Britain. In addition to what I have touched upon let us see what we owe to Great Britain. We owe everything we have here to Great Britain. Great Britain made us what we are. True we developed ourselves when we had the chance, true having got a start, we have gone ahead and expanded. Neither would the Prime Minister be sitting here nor would I be standing where I am if it were not for Great Britain. Great Britain made this country, Great Britain gave us our rights, her parliament passed the British North America Act, and said that we should do as we liked in respect to matters purely Canadian.

Great Britain's army and navy have protected us as they have protected our forefathers, and they have taught the world to know that if any hostile nation should interfere with Canada in her pursuit of the arts of peace, that nation would have to reckon with Great Britain. And what more has Great Britain done for us? For more than a century her navy has protected our commerce and enabled us to pursue in peace a policy which has tended so greatly to our

development. We have not paid a dollar for that army or for that navy of Great Britain, but that great strength has been behind us to warn pirates, confiscators and grabbers of territory to keep their hands off. What has Great Britain done for us? What would we amount to as a people to-day were it not that Great Britain has done for Canada that which she has done for every nation in which she has planted her flag? Great Britain has carried civilization and religion into every country, and proclaimed the doctrine that the weak are entitled to their rights as well as the strong. What would be our state of civilization in Canada to-day were it not that in past years we have lived under the British flag? I shall not now speak of sentiment; I shall put it on a lower plane. I shall speak from the material standpoint, and I will ask: How many of our wheat fields, how many of our factories would exist, how many of our people in all walks of life would have achieved their high stage of civilization under any other flag than the grand old Union Jack? Who protects the commerce of Canada, who guarantees that Canada shall pursue in peace her path of progress? Sir, our protection is to be found in the army and navy of Great Britain, to which we have never contributed one cent as yet, but which, mark you, we might legally under our constitution be to-morrow compelled to contribute to. When a child is not manly enough to contribute to the support of his parent in need, that parent may, under process of law, compel him, and if Canada should persist in the mean policy of not contributing to the defence of the motherland (and her own defence as well), the day may come when we could be told by Great Britain: As you are not manly enough to do this of your own free will, we will impose a tax upon you and make you do it. And, Sir, if Great Britain did that, Great Britain would be acting strictly within her legal rights. But Great Britain has not done it in the past; she has trusted us to do our duty, and shall we fail? What has Great Britain done for Canada? Look around and you will find the answer. Get on board any railway train, go on board any boat, walk through our wheat fields, drive along any country lane, and you will see what Great Britain has done for Canada. Look at the manhood and the womanhood which exists in Canada to-day, and ask yourselves if we would have that civilization, that intelligence and that education in which we pride, under any other flag than the flag of England. The answers of every Canadian, irrespective of party, must be, no. Now, let me point out to hon. gentlemen that this is not the first time that a Prime Minister of Canada has undertaken to say that the British navy is entitled to some support from us. And, to show this, I shall quote an editorial in the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' of December 4, 1909. I shall submit this article to hon. gentlemen opposite to show that when they talk about building a little navy that has got to run away as soon as the enemy approaches, and when they talk about doing something for Great Britain, Great Britain can very well say: Why, you owe us a back debt which you have never paid, and the payment of which we have never pressed you for. Now, this article which I shall quote, because it expresses in better language than I could use, the point I wish to make, says:

AN EARLIER CONTRIBUTION.

That the idea of provision for naval defence is new some people believe. But the statutes of Canada tell a different story. By chapter 37 of the Consolidated Statutes of 1859 several thousand acres of land were vested in the 'commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland,' for ever in trust for the service of the said department. The lands so vested were described in the schedule to the Act as follows:—

1.—288 acres in the county of Sherbrooke, county of Haldimand.

2.—389 acres in the townships of Tiny and Tay, in the county of Simcoe.

3.—8 acres and 2 roods at Point Frederick, in the township of Pittsburgh, in the county of Frontenac.

4.—4 acres on the west side of Meadow street, in the town plot of Gwillimbury, in the county of Simcoe.

5.—3,000 acres at Point Pelee, in the township of Mersea, in the county of Essex.

6.—200 acres in the township of Vespra, in the county of Simcoe.

7.—500 acres on the Island of St. Joseph, Lake Huron.

8.—106 acres on the said island in Lake Huron.

9.—4 acres and 2 roods in the township of Pittsburgh.

In the Act provision was made authorizing the Governor in Council to grant other lands to the commissioners under a similar trust, and they were also authorized to purchase other lands out of any funds provided for the purpose by the imperial parliament. Sales of lands were to be made by the commissioners, the moneys received therefor to be paid as they should direct. This Act and two other Acts respecting ordnance lands (chaps. 24 and 36) were repealed by the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886, chap. 55, in which some of the lands were re-described, while parcels 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were omitted, and the following new parcels were given in the schedule, intitled 'Naval Reserve transferred to the Dominion of Canada':—

1.—556 acres at Fort Henry, known as the Barriefield Common.

2.—23 acres, Cedar island, tower and glacis.

3.—125 acres, 2 roods and 1 perch in the township of Pittsburgh, purchased 6th July, 1844.

4.—102 acres in the same township acquired 20th March, 1840.

Chapter 58 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, repealed the above Act and gave a schedule, in which some of the old parcels of 1859 appear, namely, 4, 5, 7 and 8, together with the following:—

1.—219 acres, Grand river.

2.—48 acres, 2 roods and 3 perches, Barbet Point.

These are in the schedule, intitled 'Admiralty Lands, or Naval Reserves transferred to the Dominion of Canada.' The total of the three schedules gives 5,674 acres; but, as none of the schedules agree, there is doubt as to the present position of the trust. A statement ought to be laid before parliament showing what lands are still available for naval defence.

That article commended itself to me, and I place it upon 'Hansard' for the benefit of the government and for the benefit of the country. It is important that the people should know that in the early part of the last century there were lands in Canada devoted to the admiralty of Great Britain—not to the Governor General of Canada and his advisers—and that that trust remains in Canada, ignored now as it always has been, and to-day Great Britain could properly ask for an accounting in respect to these lands. And yet, we talk about our magnaminity, and we talk about our charity in contributing a little navy fifteen years from now, when either Great Britain is licked or has licked the whole of the world that attacks her. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a word about the legality of this Bill, for I have so far endeavoured to discuss it only from the material and sentimental standpoint, and from the standpoint of Canada irrespective of what the rights of Great Britain may be. As to the legality of the Bill, I am bound to say that if we were to pass it as it has been introduced by the Prime Minister, we would be ultra vires of our rights, and Great Britain would be intra vires of her legal powers in disallowing such a Bill.

For that I have to look at the British North America Act, on which the whole constitution of this country depends. To hear some hon. gentlemen talk, one might suppose that already Canada was an independent country, and that Great Britain was allowed to float the Union Jack over these buildings, and to have a picture of His Majesty the King in this chamber merely as a matter of courtesy, and not as a matter of right. But we must remember that Great Britain still can tax every foot of land, every gold mine, and every thing else in Canada. Great Britain says that we may handle the land of Canada for ourselves, but she might say: 'You are not able to handle it properly,' and take from us the control of it. Great Britain has passed the British North America Act, by which she says that certain things may be done in Canada. She says by one section of that Act:

> The command-in-chief of the land and naval militia, and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King.

It says not only the navy 'in' Canada, but the navy 'of' Canada is to continue and be vested in the King. This Bill undertakes, by three or four sections, to say that the navy of Canada is not to be vested in the King, but that it is to be vested in the Governor General, which means practically in the Prime Minister of this country; and no matter how much we may venerate or respect the personnel of any Prime Minister of Canada, we cannot by any vote of this House oust the King from the control of the navy, and put the Prime Minister of Canada in his place. We would have to get another British North America Act passed before we could do so. There is another section of the British North America Act which provides that the King in imperial council in Great Britain can disallow within two years any legislation passed by this parliament. It has often been said, and the matter has come up in debate as to abolishing the Senate this year, that Great Britain would never think of interferring with any legislation of ours in regard to any domestic affair. I agree with that. Great Britain says in the British North America Act that in our domestic affairs we can do as we like; but she reserves the right, if she sees fit to disallow our legislation within two years; and I cannot conceive of a case in which that right ought to be exercised if it is not such a case as this, where we go outside of our domestic matters and undertake to say what will be done with a navy manned by British subjects and part of the imperial navy, and, according to the British North America Act, under the command of His Majesty the King. This being the condition of affairs, I say advisedly, that even if we thought it wise, which God forbid, to cut loose from the British empire, we could not legally do it; and we cannot by this Bill do what it purports to do, give control of any navy to the Governor General. The words in the Bill to that effect are useless; and in order to prevent a conflict of authority, I would think it wise on the part of Great Britain that the King in Council should disallow this Bill as soon as a certified copy is sent to the Secretary of State (as has to be done with every Bill we pass), and should say to Canada: You have exceeded your jurisdiction; we cannot have one navy to fight against us, and another to fight for us; we never gave you permission to do what you have done; these matters you must leave entirely to the control of the imperial parliament; therefore, under this other section of the British North America Act, we must disallow your Act as improper and illegal.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I must vote against the second reading of this Bill. If hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious to do only what is right, I cannot see why they cannot accept the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition, which puts no permanent tax, and no permanent policy upon Canada until every body in Canada has a chance to discuss it with their would-be representatives, who will come here in another parliament to vote on the question. They have no mandate from the people for this measure. They had no mandate in 1908 to do this thing, and they have none now. It is practically a breach of faith towards the people of Canada to pass an Act of this kind. When they will not accept the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition for the sake of unanimity which they pray and beseech us to give them; when they will not see that the way to prevent Germany, or any other nation from attacking Great Britain is for Canada, and all the other colonies to show a united front in supporting Great Britain; and when they reflect that if Germany or any other country thinks that at least half the people of Canada are against always supporting Great Britain, and that it does not necessarily follow that Great Britain will be supported by Canada in a war, then the government supporters are creating the very emergency which they pretend does not exist. When I see them put their political party before the empire, I need make no apology for voting against this Bill. Before sitting down, I will read one stanza of a poem which seems to me to voice the feelings of the intelligent Liberals as well as Conservatives of my county:

There is no flag in all the world save Britain's
blood-red cross
That guards pure justice, honour, truth; and
keeps the weak from loss.
That gives the poor the righteous law, that
lifts the bitter wrong,
And champions in the war of life, the weak
against the strong!
What other nation keeps its pact though all
its world shall fall?
What other leaves the ease of life to follow
duty's call?
Honour and duty! noble stars! by which our
race is led!
God grant their double light may shine for-
ever overhead.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would not be doing my duty to the constituency which I have the honour of representing were I to permit the vote to be taken on the question before the House without giving my reasons for voting against the Bill proposed by the government. We have had a long debate on this question, a debate lasting for several weeks, and I think the House and the country are getting weary of it. I believe in a full and complete discussion of such a very important measure. I think it wise for the leading men on both sides of the House to express their views on a measure of such great importance; but the speeches have been characterized by too great length, there has been a great deal of repetition in them, and many of them have been read from manuscripts. I think the country would have been better satisfied if the speeches had been shorter. I believe that the people send us here to do business and do not care to have us fill pages of 'Hansard' with speech after speech, long and wearisome as many of them are. What they want is that we should do business in a business like way and show more brevity in our discussions. One result of our long sessions is to keep out of parliament men of great prominence in business, and in the professions because they cannot afford the time which our interminable sessions would compel them to devote to parliamentary life. As a business man, I should like very much to have our sessions shortened even though that would necessitate the curtailing of speeches to a very great extent; and I trust that I shall not sin against my own views by making remarks which may be found too long or wearisome.

We had yesterday the pleasure of hearing from the splendid representative of the county of South Waterloo (Mr. Clare). If there is any man in this House who can claim to represent here a special nationality, my hon. friend (Mr. Clare) can claim to represent the German people of the Dominion as well as the splendid county of Waterloo; and I am sure that we were all delighted with the speech he made and the sentiments to which he gave expression. For my part, I reiterate the sentiments so well expressed by my hon. friend because I too have the honour to represent a county in which there are a great many Germans, and I can only say that a more industrious, thrifty and law-abiding people you could not desire. I have lived among them in the county of Haldimand all my life, I have grown up among them, and I know that there are no better citizens to be found in that county or anywhere else. We may bring in immigrants from England, Ireland, Scotland or from anywhere else, but we shall get no better class than the good German element residing in the counties of Haldimand and Waterloo.

We have been told by many of the speakers who have addressed the House on this question that Germany is preparing for war, that she is a great and warlike nation, and is extending her army and increasing her navy. Well, I presume that Germany has a perfect right to indulge in this extension and in carrying out what she deems to be the best policy

in her own interest. But if the Germans are a war-like or quarrelsome people, that description certainly does not apply to those who have settled in the counties of Haldimand and Waterloo because they are just the reverse. They are very quiet, inoffensive and industrious, desirous of living at peace with their neighbours, and they are among the best farmers and the best people in the county I have the honour to represent. Should there be trouble between Great Britain and Germany, we would all greatly deplore it because Germany and England are bound together by ties of relationship as well as commerce and business, and we hope that no trouble of that kind may ever come between these two nations but that they will continue to live at peace in the future as they have done in the past.

It is my intention, in the course of a few weeks, to visit that great country of Germany. I am not going there for the purpose of studying their war-like preparations, but to see, if I can learn something from those German people in regard to their industries and ability to manufacture merchandise in a way to surpass any other country. And I am sure that as a Canadian and a representative from this House, I can say to the people of the German empire whom I may meet that the people of Canada have the most kindly feeling for them and hope that the time will never come when there will be any trouble between Great Britain and her colonies and the German empire. But in the speeches delivered in this House I have heard sentiments which I was very sorry indeed to hear. I have never, in any election campaign, made any utterances upon the public platform or elsewhere which would excite racial or creed difficulties. I have been always opposed to that sort of thing. I do not believe that it is for the good of either party that such sentiments should be brought up either in the House or out of it, and I am not in accord with any expressions which call into account the loyalty of any section of our people. We are all good Canadians although we may belong to different nationalities. But I have heard from the lips of gentlemen opposite sentiments which rather surprised me, and I must say that that distinguished gentleman, the right hon. the leader of the government himself, has given utterances to some which are not in accord with the views of the Canadian people. In introducing this measure, the right hon. gentleman told us that the navy he proposed constructing was to be a Canadian navy, that it was not to be in any sense an imperial navy. For my part I think that a Canadian navy, if we are to have one, should be certainly an imperial navy. It should be a navy at the disposal of Great Britain, not by the vote of the Canadian parliament, but automatically. It should be an imperial navy, in every sense of the word, under the command of the King. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Gervais) yesterday told us, in speaking about a Canadian navy, built in Canada of Canadian material, by Canadian workmen and manned by Canadian crews, that it would be under the command of the King but at the direction of the Canadian parliament. The latter condition, I think, was a rider to the imperial character of the navy, which changes entirely its condition. The navy we want is a navy to be under the command of the King and not under the direction of the Canadian government.

The right honourable the Prime Minister told us, when introducing this Bill, that in case of trouble, such as the Crimean war, he would hesitate about the Canadian navy taking any part in it. I think that such an opinion came as a surprise to the members of this House and the people of this country. I do not believe that it was in accord with the sentiments of Canadians, regardless of politics. I can only compare that declaration that he would not allow the Canadian navy, under similar cirumstances, to take part in a British war, with the sentiment expressed by that great Canadian, whose name is revered and loved by the people of Canada, the late Sir John Macdonald. Speaking of the Crimean war, the late Sir John said:

> Who can look back to the time when the Crimean war broke out and not remember with pride how Canada rose as one man to stand by the mother country and by France when the French Tricolor and the Union Jack were joined together fighting the battles of liberty against absolutism on the shores of the Crimea? There was a rush of Canadians to the battlefields, and I had great pleasure—

I notice the contrast.

> —I had great pleasure as a member of the government of Sir Allan McNab, to be instrumental in carrying a vote of twenty thousand pounds sterling given unanimously out of the public treasury in order to show that Canada made common cause with England and with France in the Cremean war.

What a contrast between the sentiments of the present Prime Minister of Canada and the sentiments of Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the Conservative party and the head of the government of Canada for so many years. Is it any wonder that the memory of that great statesman is loved so well, and that he is held in such reverence by every loyal and patriotic Canadian? Is it any wonder that we on this side of the House, and I believe the people of Canada generally, feel that there is some

little doubt as to the object of the right hon. leader of this government in establishing a Canadian navy? Is it any wonder that the people of Canada, or the great majority of them, are opposed to this proposition for a Canadian navy? I know that in my section of the country the sentiment is growing every day in opposition to this scheme, because the people feel that the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister himself, in introducing this Bill, did not have the right ring about them. They were not good Canadian sentiments; and consequently, although they are opposed to the idea of the Canadian navy on general principles, they are still more opposed to it when they reflect upon the expressions of the Prime Minister in introducing his Bill. We find that the same sentiment prevails to a considerable extent among the more humble followers of the right hon. gentleman sitting to the right of the Speaker. Only a few days ago we heard an hon. gentleman opposite expressing the idea that the ultimate destiny of this country, if not independence, was annexation to the United States. Sir, this kind of sentiment does not meet with much response in the hearts of the people of this country. Let me quote the words of the hon. gentleman to whom I allude, a member coming from the province of Quebec:

> But I ask of these men, shall not Canada sooner or later have to choose between annexation and independence?

And a little later in his address he says:

> It is neither patriotic nor loyal on the part of these men to put obstacles in the way of the complete development of our political organization and to pretend that we ought always to dwell under the protection of the British flag. But, thank God, I am convinced that this will not be the case, and the creation of this naval fleet in my humble opinion is the last step towards independence.

That was the sentiment expressed by an hon. member of this House from the province of Quebec, sitting on the government side, only a few days ago. And the member for St. James Division, Montreal (Mr. Gervais), in his speech yesterday, made reference to the same subject, but although his language was veiled, there can be no difficulty in understanding his meaning. He referred to the American revolution, and he said that had it not been for the possession of a navy by the thirteen colonies, they would not have been able to resist the imposition of taxes upon them by England; and he stated in his address that England has the power, if she likes, to impose taxes upon Canada. I wonder if he means that a Canadian navy will be the means of protecting Canada against an effort on the part of Great Britain to tax this country against her will. I do not see what other meaning he can have for making such a reference. I do not think, Sir, that the people of this country have much fear that Great Britain will ever impose any taxes upon Canada that are not in the interest of the great empire to which we belong.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LALOR. At six o'clock I was alluding to some of the remarks made by members from the province of Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me rather unique and strange to open the House without any member of the government being present. A cabinet that has no representative in this House—I am glad the right hon. the Prime Minister has put in an appearance, since the debate was going on without any representative of the cabinet in the House.

Mr. LALOR. I am entirely opposed to any sentiments that may be expressed in this House in favour of independence. The expressions we have heard here not only advocate independence but some of them separation, and, failing that, annexation to the United States. I hope the time will never come, no matter how large a country we may grow to be, when there will be any sentiment in this country in favour of separation from Great Britain, for independence, of course means separation from the British empire. I believe that in expressing those sentiments I express the sentiments of the county I represent as well as of the people of Canada generally. I do not believe that the people of Canada endorse the principle announced by the Prime Minister that parliament would be called together to consider whether the Canadian navy should be used in case England was at war with another country, for I believe that the people of Canada will be at war when the empire is at war, and that no Prime Minister of this country, whether he be a Liberal or a Conservative, no matter from what province he may come, no matter what government might be in power, could hold back the sons of Canada if the British flag were attacked, and to provide in a Bill presented to this House that a Canadian navy built by the Canadian people with Canadian money can only be used with the sanction of the Governor in Council, which means the parliament of Canada, is a course that will not be approved by the people of this country, for I believe our people, regardless of political allegiance, are loyal and prepared to stand by the British flag whenever that flag is attacked, or whoever may attack it. If

Great Britain were at war we would have a repetition of what we saw in connection with the South African war where the Canadian boys would rush to the front, and no government or Navy Bill could hold them back. I believe the people of Canada love the British flag and are ready and willing at all times to show their allegiance to that flag and to our King. But, Sir, while I was surprised at the expression I have already mentioned, I was still more surprised that a member representing a great constituency in Ontario, South Huron, a constituency with which I am acquainted and in which I know the people are loyal and patriotic, should tell us that we owe Great Britain nothing save good will. I believe that when he goes back to his constituency and asks his electors to re-elect him for this parliament he will be buried under the ballots of the people of that county, because I do not believe they would support a member who made such a statement in this House.

We are told that there is no unity in the Conservative party. A few days ago I met a leading physician from an Ontario city, a very strong Liberal in politics. He was very much opposed, as I believe the Liberals throughout Ontario generally are, to the present Naval Bill. The only argument he could present in favour of his own party was that the Conservative party were divided on this question. The Conservative party are not divided on this question when it comes to being opposed to the building of a Canadian navy: the Conservative party are as one man all opposed to the building of a Canadian navy. There may be differences of opinion as to what is best for Canada and for the empire, as to the best method to adopt, but there is no question as to the unity of the party so far as their opposition to this Bill is concerned. But, when we are told about differences of opinion on this side of the House, we hear occasionally a discordant note from the opposite side of the House. We heard one to-day from an ex-minister of the Crown, the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) who, in a lengthy and eloquent speech has given us a new policy as emanating from the front benches on the government side. He reminded me of the chipmonk that came out of his hole to find the hole closed up after him when he tried to get in again. But the hon. member for Westmorland was not to be caught in this way and he left a little loophole open that he might crawl back. After denouncing the government Bill and saying that the project was too expensive, that our people could not afford it and that we should expend our money in building railways and canals and other great undertakings—and I felt quite proud of him when he was making these remarks, because I felt he was taking an independent stand.

But I was surprised to find that in the last two sentences he announced that he was going to support a measure that he was so strongly opposed to. I noticed the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) sitting beside him. You know what a kindly feeling exists between the hon. Minister of Public Works and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, both coming from the province of New Brunswick and sitting beside each other. The Minister of Public Works applauded his remarks and pounded his desk very gently, of course, when he heard the sentiments uttered by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. I wondered if the Minister of Public Works himself had some little independent thought in connection with this navy. It is reported that he has. Rumour says that the Minister of Public Works did not like such an enormous expenditure to take place unless within his own department. It is said that the Minister of Public Works actually advocated that all this expenditure that it is now proposed to be made upon the navy should be made upon dry-docks and in the department over which he has charge. He probably had in his mind at the time the Richibucto wharf, known as the sawdust wharf, that he no doubt thought of making use of in connection with these docks for naval defence. But if we were to know the exact sentiments and feelings that exist among the government supporters in connection with this measure, if we could see the letters that they are receiving from day to day by hundreds from their constituents and the petitions that they are receiving from farmers all over the country in opposition to this measure we would know how much unanimity of feeling there is amongst them. The Prime Minister has a great influence upon his followers. We are free to admit that. They have a very great love and admiration for their leader, and no doubt they are prepared to stand by him and support him in this measure, even though it may be objectionable to them and not to the satisfaction of the constituencies which they represent. But there are other reasons why they support this measure. Some of them have judgeships in view, others have senatorships in view, others have public offices in view which they know they cannot get unless they stand man to man in support of the Prime Minister and in support of any measure that he may bring before this House. I think that some of them perhaps have in view the fate that befell those who expressed independent views in opposition to the government. I refer to the late Hon. Mr. Tarte, the late Hon. Mr. Blair and many others in the same list,

who, having some independent sentiments, found themselves landed outside of the party and the party councils as a result. The unanimity that may exist upon this measure and the solid vote that may be given by supporters of the government in connection with it, I do not believe is the result of their own consciences or feelings in the matter, but is the result of party caucuses and party whips, because I believe that throughout the whole country, whether it is in the provinces by the sea, in the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, or in the great provinces of the west, there is one very general sentiment, and that is in opposition to the building of a Canadian navy, which has been styled a tin pot navy. I think that is a very good name for it. You might add a little more to it and call it the Quebec navy, because I think it is designed to try and give the people of the province of Quebec some halfway measure, some resting place, so that hon. gentlemen opposite may feel that they are satisfying Quebec and at the same time meeting the views of the other provinces of the Dominion. But in this they mistake the sentiment of the country, for if they appeal to the country they will find that the people are opposed to them. The measure should not be submitted as it is to the members of this House merely for them to sanction and carry into effect without it first having been discussed before the people of Canada. I think it should be submitted to the people to have their opinion upon it, and if not, for the people to actually vote upon the measure it should be submitted to them at least in a general election, when every man could stand upon a public platform and advocate either the programme of a Canadian navy or manifest his opposition to it according to the views that the candidate might hold, and upon this measure and upon these views the candidates might receive and expect the votes of the electors in the constituencies that they were contesting.

I am opposed to a Canadian navy first, because I believe it will be absolutely useless. I do not believe that the government or anybody in this country take it seriously. I do not believe that the people think that the navy, when built, will be of any use to Canada or the empire. It is practically a do-nothing policy. It means nothing at all. It means, in the first place, according to the statements made on behalf of the government, that for one year at least they will do nothing and that four or five years must elapse before they can turn out any ships. Probably, if we interpret that statement correctly, it will be ten years before this small, worthless, tin pot navy can be launched or be of any service to the country. Then, the enormous cost of it is too great for the people of this country to stand at the present time. I do not say that the time will not come when we should have a Canadian navy under the direction of the British admiralty, because the time may come, when the population of Canada may grow to be much larger than it is to-day. Perhaps then we should have a navy. But, I do not believe that a people numbering six or seven millions can afford to build a navy of their own. The government tell us that this navy will cost $16,000,000 or $17,000,000, but I do not believe they know what it will cost, I believe it is only guess work when they talk about the cost of the navy. The right hon. leader of the government told us when the Bill in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific was introduced that the road would cost $13,000,000 and not one cent more. If we are to judge of the cost of the Canadian navy according to his estimate of the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific I think that the people of Canada will have a very heavy burden to stand before they get through with the building of the Canadian navy. In place of it costing $16,000,000 or $17,000,000, in a short time, it will be $25,000,000 and it will soon run up to $50,000,000. For the upkeep it is estimated that it will cost $7,000,000 annually which will almost certainly soon run up to $10,000,000 or even $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 a year and even at ten million dollars of an annual expenditure in twenty years we would spend the enormous sum of $200,000,000. When we consider this question from the point of view of what is most economical for the people of Canada we must come to the conclusion that it would be better to present Great Britain with two Dreadnoughts, even if they cost $20,000,000, because the interest upon $20,000,000 would be about $700,000 per year and the people of the country would know just what they are getting and exactly what it was costing them. But, we enter in the thin end of the wedge of an expense in connection with a Canadian navy as to the cost of which we have no definite idea. When the Prime Minister presented this Bill the other day he told us that it was going to cost $16,000,000 or $17,000,000 and he was asked by the hon. member for South Simcoe if there was included in the expenditure the cost of arms and guns. To my surprise, and I think the surprise of all the hon. members of this House, he hesitated and did not know whether it included the cost of these things or not. We know that the greater part of the cost is for armament, so that we can easily judge how enormous the cost of this Canadian navy is going to be. A few days ago I received a letter from a farmer who has been a very strong Liberal in the county that I have the honor to represent. He and his family lived in my county all their lives and he

was always a very active Liberal politician. He has recently moved over to the county of Wentworth and I am sorry the hon. member for that county (Mr. Sealey) is not here in order that he might hear what a gentleman who supported him at the last election and who is a strong Liberal in politics has to say in reference to the Canadian navy.

This gentleman addresses to me an open letter, the last few sentences of which I shall read. He speaks of the representative of the county (Mr. Sealey) as his hired man, and he wants to know what he is doing here, and then he goes on to say:

Who are you going to have for admiral on this fleet. Peary, I presume, or Cook the pole climber. Whoever he is, see that he is a good swimmer and also able to fly for it is my opinion that when this fleet gets into deep water it will either go up or down. No Mr. Member, no Canadian fleet for me but give Great Britain two Dreadnoughts that will be a credit to Canada, something that Britain can depend on in time of war. Tell my hired man to see that this is done and you help him all you can.

These are the sentiments of a good Liberal farmer in the county of Wentworth whom I have known for a good many years.

An hon. MEMBER. What is his name?

Mr. LALOR. I would be very glad to show the hon. member the letter and give him the name, but I do not think I should give it in public.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. LALOR. I will be glad to show this letter to hon. gentlemen opposite and give them the name if they come over to this side of the House. I believe, Sir, that this farmer and strong Liberal represents the feelings of the farmers of this country about the navy. We find the 'Farmers' Sun,' the leading farmers organ of this country, opposed to the Canadian navy; we find the farmers throughout the country regardless of politics petitioning parliament in opposition to the Canadian navy, and I want to tell the Prime Minister and his followers that there never was a more unpopular measure presented to the parliament of Canada than the proposal to build this navy. I believe, Sir, that when this government appeals to the people—and I only wish it were at once—they will go down and out on this policy. I believe that it is much better for us to give Great Britain a sum sufficient to buy two first-class battleships or two Dreadnoughts than to adopt the Bill submitted by the government. I believe the proposal of the leader of the opposition would be less expensive by far to us, and at the same time it would be more satisfactory to the British admiralty and more satisfactory to the Canadian people. I am opposed to the measure submitted by the government, and I shall have great pleasure in supporting the resolution moved by my leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) which reads as follows:

That the proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty and in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war are ill-advised and dangerous.

That no such proposals can safely be accepted unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

That the said proposals while necessitating heavy outlay for construction and maintenance will give no immediate or effective aid to the empire, and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditure of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purpose of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I begin with the prayer that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, were he able to be here, would have presented this Bill to the House, may speedily be restored in health and to his accustomed seat. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the speech of the right hon. the leader of the government; I have listened to the Japanned oratory of my hon. friend the Postmaster General; I have also studied the cryptic formulas on this great mystery of a Canadian navy which were submitted to us by the hon. the Minister for War, and I have listened to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite in which they have lauded the leader of the government and his ministers. I have also listened to the speech which my hon. leader (Mr. Borden) delivered in this House when the measure was presented; a speech which in strength of reasoning and sustained eloquence will bear close comparison with any speech ever delivered within these walls. After listening to all these speeches, after reading the newspapers every morning and considering the various policies that have been dished up to us daily for our consumption; after having taken counsel with my friends as well, I have come to the conclusion that the question now before us is one of the greatest moment and one which should not be trifled

with. It is a question that should not be discussed from the point of view of the Conservative, or the Liberal, or the nationalist, or the imperialist; it is a question which, to my mind, should be discussed entirely from the standpoint of the Canadian. It is a question which requires sound statesmanship, for, by this Bill, we propose to change the policy followed by this country for a great many years, and to embark upon a new career. And, Sir, it is my view that a question of that great importance should be approached in a non-partisan spirit and that we should deal with it on the principles of broadest statesmanship. Statesmanship is not a matter of instinct; it means a close study of present events in the light of past experience and future contingencies. That light of experience is not given to us, so far as I can see, by a study of the life of Peter the Hermit, or of the career of Isabelle of Croye, and neither do I think that we can find much help in the solution of this problem in the life of Lord Durham or the story of his famous report, to all of which the Prime Minister directed our attention.

A good deal of water has gone over the Chaudiere falls since March last when this question was first raised in parliament. The resolution then unanimously passed in this House has been quoted often, and it is not necessary for me to cite it again. Let me recall, however, some of the contemporaneous conditions existing a year ago. There was a so called scare passing over the British speaking world. For some years a state of hostility, without actual declaration of war, had been existing between Great Britain and Germany. The German emperor's message to Kruger, which was delivered after some German vessels had been seized in Delagoa bay, had caused the first break in the long friendship which had existed between Germany and England from the time of Frederic the Great and the Seven Years War. There was friction in Morocco, and other trouble between Germany and Great Britain over some railways located in the territory contiguous to the Persian gulf. These diplomatic clashes are the foster children of war, and as a result, for the first time in a great many years, the British fleet was concentrated for decisive action.

That will explain to some extent the real reason for the absence of a large portion of the British fleet from various seaports in Canada. An army scatters to distant continents, and to barracks during peace; but when there is war an army mobilizes or concentrates to fight. It is so with a fleet. This trouble, as I have stated, did not arise yesterday.

In the battle of the Sea of Japan between the fleets of Russia and Japan, naval instructors and strategists learned several important lessons. The first of these was the deadly accuracy of the large guns at long range, the tremendous advantage the larger guns gave; the second was the great advantage the armoured battleship had over the unarmoured cruiser, and the third was the importance of the torpedo boat in night attacks and blockades. The great battle fought in the Sea of Japan was decided in a few moments. The Russian admiral in that battle perpetrated the great mistake of placing his cruiser squadron, consisting largely of unarmoured cruisers, in the first line, and his battleships in the second. The Japanese reversed that order and opened upon the cruiser squadron of the Russian fleet at heretofore unheard of range, and in a few minutes destroyed the cruiser squadron. When panic reigned supreme in the Russian fleet, the Japanese massed their battleships and destroyed the Russians in less than an hour. The lesson learned from that battle I have already described. The first nation to realize that lesson was Great Britain, with the result that the British navy decided to adopt the big type of battleship known as the Dreadnought. For some fifteen years the Germans had been building a commercial fleet. It had grown from nothing to be the second greatest commercial fleet in the world. As long as this fleet was not protected by a navy, it remained merely a hostage in the hands of the British navy in case of war. The British navy had always been, and is to-day the trump card of Great Britain in a diplomatic fight in Europe. The German commercial fleet is the hostage for Germany's good behaviour, while the British fleet has enabled Great Britain, in all these diplomatic struggles, to prevent the balance of power in Europe from being disturbed, and also to a large extent to nullify what is known in Europe as the pan-German movement. Germany could not hope, in a great many years, to equal the pre-Dreadnought navy of Great Britain, in the number of ships or guns; but the moment this lesson had been learned in the Sea of Japan, and the British authorities had decided to build a type of capital ship which meets the conditions, in regard to speed, heavy armour, enormous guns and gun power, that very moment the Germans realized that since they were commencing to build a fleet of their own, they should take advantage of this opportunity, and virtually commence building a new navy on even terms with Great Britain. The advent of the Dreadnought, according to naval writers, and those in authority, marked as great an era in navy building as the ironclad did over the wooden walls. The Germans, therefore, started building their navy virtually on even terms with Great

Britain. They provided enormous subsidies, which had been voted unanimously by their parliament. Now, Sir, two courses remained open to Great Britain in that event. One course was to keep pace with the Germans, following them in building capital ships or Dreadnoughts, and instituting a system of conscription in Great Britain similar to that which existed in Germany. That course was virtually endorsed by leading military authorities, such as Lord Roberts, who were agitating at the time for conscription. The other plan was to duplicate the German ship-building programme, and let conscription go for the time being. This has been the plan adopted. Now, Sir, in order to arouse public opinion to the danger that hung over the horizon, it was necessary that a great many public men in England should speak out, and speak out in alarmist tones. A panic ensued, and was not confined alone to Great Britain. It spread to the colonies, as we all remember, and I might say that it spread to Germany also. When this panic was at its height, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) moved the famous resolution of March last. I would not trouble the House with a recital of these events, known to us all, were it not that we are often prone to forget the events which impel us to act in a certain manner. At that time, if we had offered to the British authorities two Dreadnoughts, following virtually the same lines as the other colonies, we would have saved this House, and this country perhaps a great deal of trouble. But that plan was not adopted. The plan that was adopted by this House was adopted in good faith, for the purpose of preventing any partisan spirit or discussion arising over this question in any manner, shape or form, and I regret very much that the right hon. leader of the House has brought in a Naval Bill which must of necessity cause partisan discussion.

Now, let us follow the events in their chronological order. In that way we may be able, as Mr. Gladstone would say, to sift this matter down to the bran. A few months after the resolution was passed, delegates from this government were sent to London to find out what Canada should do under the terms of that resolution. These delegates went to attend what was known as an Imperial Defence Conference. They were to find out all about the German peril, so that Canada could act in a manner suitable to her position as the premier colony of the empire. I take it that that was the principal business of the commissioners—to ascertain if there was a real ground for a war scare, or whether it was a business transaction of the music halls, and the great warship and gun-building concerns, which are represented in England by Vickers Sons and Maxim, and in Germany by the Krupps.

The resolution of March last declared that 'the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire, and the peace of the world.'

This commission went to London to ascertain if that supremacy were really threatened, and if so, in the language of the said resolution, to give:

> To the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour to the empire.

Was there any peril? Did the commission find there was any cause for alarm, any need for mad haste in armament? Let the Prime Minister answer in his own words, he is supposed to be the chief fountain of knowledge on this point, and the commissioners were his associates in council, and surely would report the facts to him. He gave this House the result of his inquiry, the benefit of his knowledge in his speech on the second reading of this Bill. He said:

> For my part I do not see any cause of danger to Great Britain at the present time.

Again:

> It is true that Germany is creating a navy, but I see no reason whatever for supposing that Germany is creating a navy for the purpose of attack.

Now Sir, if the naval supremacy of the empire is not threatened, if what the Prime Minister says is true, I contend that the proper thing for him to do is to come to this House and courageously separate the question of emergency from the naval policy proposed for the future. In other words, revert to the statu quo, or the policy of 1907, which received the approval of the people at the polls.

I can quite understand why there is such a large element of our people, especially such a large number of Liberals, not only in Quebec, but even more so among the English speaking provinces, who cry out against the proposed navy. The Prime Minister whom they have followed, in whom they believe, has said: 'There is no danger to British naval supremacy.' Then they say: Why indulge in the luxury of an independent navy? Why tear up the tree of peaceful colonial development and expansion by the roots? Why launch this country alone, and not under the aegis of the British navy, on the mad torrent of European militarism, of bankrupting European competition in warship building? The millions that will be spent in useless warships might better be expended in improving transportation facilities, in enlarging our canals, in helping the farmer

to build good roads, in aiding him to contend with noxious weeds, in opening up new country to settlement, in developing industrial enterprises, in establishing technical schools, and doing the many things necessary to enable us to take advantage of the great undeveloped natural resources that lay dormant at our very doors.'

These are the men who are going to pay this money for this navy. They are the true empire builders, and they say: 'If there is no danger to the naval supremacy of the empire, then allow us to turn the furrow and throw the shuttle in peace.' If there is no danger, if there is not going to be a war, why not stand pat, follow the old blazed trail, keep in the middle of the road. For many years this country has struggled against adverse circumstances. For years we have had to contend against the ignorance of the world as to our natural resources, our climate, and our opportunities. The republic to the south of us for years offered an asylum to the down-trodden masses of Europe, who sought to escape from grinding, hopeless systems, of terrorism, despotism and militarism. There they could start life anew. There they had equal opportunity irrespective of birth or fortune. There the conscription did not tear them away from their homes and workshops. There they had no grinding tribute to pay to the god of war, who constantly hovers on the European frontiers. The arts of peace, there predominated over the arts of war. Historians and observers of social customs tell us that it is the brightest minds, the most intelligent, courageous and energetic are those who immigrate. These people did not know that within the boundaries of Canada there were equal opportunities, equal freedom. But now we are coming to our own, and what happens? We are about to establish a navy and institute an old-world system which is one of the chief objections of these people against the countries from which they came. They say it is not disloyalty surely to wish to develop the resources of this country in peace. It is not disloyalty to desire to keep as long as possible free from the terrible financial drains, the grinding taxation, the economic waste, that follows in the train of a standing army or its collateral, a navy. Ten millions per year this toy navy will cost, and we will forfeit forever the right to say to the prospective immigrant, Canada offers you an asylum free from the terrors of old-world militarism, free from the domination of the sword.'

If the Prime Minister is right, and we will rest the responsibility upon him, that there is no danger to the naval supremacy of the empire, then those who believe in standing pat, are quite justified in opposing this Bill and denouncing the government which has forsworn Liberal principles and traditions.

I wish to say a word on behalf of the old Reformers. The right hon. leader of the government and the Postmaster General called upon the spirits of Papineau, Lafontaine, Baldwin, Mackenzie and all the old Reformers to witness that they were the true descendants of those old Reformers, and that in foisting an independent navy upon the people of this country, they were doing just what these heroes would have done under similar circumstances. I never realized more fully that famous chapter of Macaulay, where he recalls the scene in Danté, in which is described the transformation of the woman and the serpent, and he says that parties change, that the Tory of yesterday is the Radical of to-day, and the Radical of to-day the Tory of to-morrow. The Prime Minister and the Postmaster General are not the only students of history in this House. I confess that I have read a little of the history of those stirring times, the days of the men of 1837. If I have judged the characters of these men right, they would have been found fighting on this side of the House, before they would have permitted any government of this country to tie this country up to any standing army or navy.

These men fought their fights for principles, for new world freedom, against old world ideas. They would not have swallowed in 1910 what they deemed as right in 1907. In this debate some aspirations have been cast upon the actions of these men of '37. It is too late in the day to revive old partisan feeling. I am a Tory, and whilst I cherish the traditions of my party, if I found that those traditions clashed with what I considered the true interests of my countrymen of to-day my voice and my arms would be with my country, Had I lived in '37, who knows I too might have come linking down the forest trail with Lount, and the men from Simcoe who followed him, with their old iron pikes and rusty scythes, seeking what? Not victory, for I have spoken to many of these old heroes, and they never expected victory, not wealth and power for there was neither to be had in the country at that time. Not even immortality, but they took arms in their hands and marched away bravely. They said 'Morituri morituros salutant,' in order that if some of them should die, the attention of the whole world would be called to their grievances and these righted. It requires courage to die for one's country in this way. To die, on the gallows with the stigma of traitor sounding in one's ears, in order that one's country may be delivered from tyranny. But it is from such sacrifices that we have obtained what liberties we possess, even our civilization.

Our brothers in Quebec have never been behind, in opposing wrong in seeking to destroy the tyranny of the placemen, who were then as now ruling this country after old world methods. That was then the real issue. Carpet baggers was the name given to this class of men in the United States, after the civil war. This government has a similar system in vogue in Canada to-day. A government despotic, irresponsible, retained in office by placemen. Knowing the lives of these men as I think I do, I can imagine how the hero of Montebello, would have rallied his followers against this Naval Bill, how Lafontaine would have thundered his burning periods against the administration. How the calm analytical Baldwin would have criticised the fallacy of the measure. How the fiery Highlander Mackenzie would have indulged in fierce invective against such a Bill. They would have insisted strenuously upon the statu quo. They would not seek to lay violent hands upon the policy of free democracy which by their sacrifices they had succeeded in establishing in this country. It is well in studying the lives and actions of these men to glance at contemporary history. If we do, we will find that similar struggles were taking place in the mother country. These were the days of the Chartists, of riots and blood shed when men there also fought for representative government. The right hon. gentleman cannot read Papineau, or Baldwin, Lafontaine, or Mackenzie, neither can they read Lord Durham into supporting this measure. If they read and studied the lives of these men more closely; if we all who seek to legislate for this country did so, we would take a more statesmanlike view of things. The lives of these old Reformers will shine brightly from the pages of our history, let us give them credit. They and the men who consistently opposed them in maintaining British connection would on a question such as this be found fighting on the same side. For this independent Canadian navy is a new departure, a complete reversal of our old colonial policy.

Now at the time of the Imperial Defence Conference where did our ambassadors stand? The old question of participation in naval defence had been discussed in 1902, and in 1907 it came up again. Australia and New Zealand agreed to accept the proposals of the admirality, in other words, they agreed to join in a great naval league of defence of the empire. The Canadian ambassadors refused. They pleaded the peculiar situation of this country. That was an obscure term. They agreed, however, that they would carry out a modified programme. They would not accept the fleet unit idea, because they had ideas of naval strategy of their own. Australia accepted the programme, and let us see what the Australian government did. Instead of bringing down a naval Bill, such as this government has brought down and is endeavoring to force upon parliament, they went to work by way of presenting a resolution. Here is the resolution which was moved by Mr. Joseph Cook, Minister of Defence for Australia, in the House of Representatives, on the 14th of November, and remember this was before any Bill was introduced:

> That this House approves the new scheme of naval defence adopted at the recent imperial conference, and it is of opinion that immediate steps should be taken to provide the proposed Australian unit of the eastern fleet of the empire.

In introducing this resolution he said that he asked the approval of the House for the scheme in simple form leaving ways and means for further consideration. He said:

> Should the motion which I am moving be carried we shall turn over a new leaf in the book of our evolution. Our tutelary stages are past, our time of maturity is here. Let us hope that with it has come a deepening and increasing conviction of the immensity of the debt which we owe the mother country for sheltering us while we grew. In passing the motion we shall enter what has been called the Great Sea League of the empire. The Pacific will be allotted to us as the worthiest and most adequate contribution to the defence of the empire that the highest naval authorities can devise.

Having dodged that issue, this government are introducing the principle of a Canadian independent navy by a Naval Bill and endeavouring, with much casuistry and loud professions of loyalty, to carry it through this House. It would have been fairer to this House, and better for this country had the Australian plan been adopted.

The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) the other day charged some of the Liberal leaders in Quebec with voicing the idea of the separation of Canada from the mother country. But the separation issue is not confined, Mr. Speaker, to Quebec alone. I am assured that it was in Ontario that this idea first took root. The hon. the Postmaster General acknowledged that he was associated with a gentleman by the name of Elgin Myers, on the platform a few years ago in Montreal. The idea of the independence of Canada has been prevalent for a number of years, and I may say that I have here with me to-night a book which has been published by a gentleman who is a resident of this city, a Mr. John Ewart.

Mr. Ewart has pubished a great many speeches which he has delivered at Cana-

dian club banquets, and the study of this book shows that it was written largely for Ontario consumption. In this book the virus of autonomy, or so-called independence is strongest, and in it he suggests that the vast majority of his compariots in Ontario are in favour of his ideas. I understand he is one of the leading counsellors and friends of the right hon. the First Minister. In his book he rails against imperial federation, against the imperial conference, against the British people. Anything that has ever happened in this country, from the Quebec Act down to the fall of the Quebec bridge, is described by Mr. Ewart to our British connection, or to Downing street. On the matter of imperial defence, Mr. Ewart, by innuendo and those petty-fogging methods which are adopted by lawyers of his kind, lays down the doctrine that in case the empire should be at war, Canada's policy should be: Not a man, not a gun, not a dollar. His idea is separation, he does not call it autonomy. He calls it separation, independence. The only thing he would retain is the King. No doubt he does not wish to lose the initials after his name, the K.C. He made converts among the English speaking people of this country, so did Dowie, and the chiefs of Holy Rollers. In this book he immortalizes the Prime Minister. The Minister of Marine, and the Minister of War, also find a place in this temple of fame. The Prime Minister apparently believes that Mr. Ewart voices the aspirations of the young English speaking Canadians, because they listened to his trash at the Canadian club dinners without dousing him in the horse trough. Mr. Ewart calls this separation; the premier calls it autonomy. Mr. Ewart is his ideal. He had to be honoured. Instead of incarcerating him in a mad-house, because I consider any man a mad man who talks separation, which spells revolution, and the shedding of fratricidal blood among Canadians, instead of putting this sensation-monger in a straight jacket he was given employment by the government. On him is bestowed one of the highest honours that could be bestowed upon a member of his profession in this country. He was selected as counsel for this country before the Hague tribunal, and that was the endorsation given to him and his book by the right hon. Prime Minister, and the Minister of Justice. Thus they approved of the book, of the man. He was in London, I understand, while this imperial conference was going on. He had to have more time for the preparation of his brief for the Hague. He was no doubt too busy pulling wires behind the scene for this beautiful separatist navy. This policy bears the marks of his hands. Even the flag incident. He is strong on a Canadian flag in his book. Any ship in the world might be proud to fly the white ensign of the British navy for many brave deeds have been performed under its folds. Deeds for humanity, as well as for freedom and country. But he wants a Canadian flag. He says we must have separation—or you may call it complete separation, and a King. The King of England, or the King of Canada.

A Canadian King would mean a Canadian court, with Canadian lords and dukes and counts and viscounts. They call this autonomy. Are we to have the folly of the Maximillian Mexican empire duplicated here? Mexico had separation first. Then there was an attempt to set up an empire with an emperor and a court. It did not last long. The irate Mexicans took their emperor out one fine morning and shot him. Brazil had separation or autonomy, also an emperor, and he had to flee to escape the fate of Maximillian. The atmosphere on this side of the world is not healthy for local kings or home made emperors.

This government, as I have already said, endorsed Mr. Ewart and any one who reads his book will come to the conclusion that the idea underlying this policy and this Naval Bill is undoubtedly the same idea as is enunciated by Mr. Ewart. The trouble with a country of this kind, in fact one of the troubles of the British empire, is the plague of cranks who want to turn everything upside down and provide new constitutions. It is assumed by the Prime Minister in nearly all his speeches that there has been a constant struggle for liberty or so-called autonomy in this country. The policy of Great Britain has always been to allow the colonies to develop and thrive as free self-governing democracies. That was the old colonial policy ended with the American revolution. It is also the new colonial policy, which was inaugurated in this country by the Quebec Act, and which ante-dated Lord Durham by 200 years, the policy of Great Britain giving to her colonies absolute freedom. That was the principle always. Petty oligarchies set themselves up, they surrounded the governors, got the ears of the governors and endeavoured to stifle the will of the people. Any one who reads Canadian history, will find that in all the struggles in this country the British government had never departed from their policy. Let any one read the despatch sent by Lord Goderich on this principle, dated November 8, 1832, to Sir John Colborne, which has frequently been quoted. That despatch says that the people must not be interfered with in having a free election of their representatives or in having free government.

The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) some time ago, at Montreal, said that the time might come when we might

elect our governor. He took to cover when some one questioned this. He would not need to, it would not be the first time. In 1756 the British empire was far greater than it is to-day. The colonies of all the European countries had fallen by conquest to Great Britain. Canada, Cape of Good Hope, India, every desirable spot in the world was ours. The United States were then happy and flourishing colonies. The glory of the British empire was on every tongue. If we talk of autonomy, why they had more then than we have now. They wrote their own charters or constitutions. They had free, representative self-government. They were free democracies. Rhode Island and Connecticut elected their own governors. Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Connecticut could pass laws that were not even subject to revision or the imperial veto. The Navigation Laws gave absolute inter-imperial preference. This preference went so far as to confine colonial trade to British bottoms; colonial built ships, of course, being included. A monopoly in the manufacture of wool and bar iron (1719), felt hats (1732), molasses (1733), and steel furnaces was conceded to Great Britain. It was the trade and the wealth which this system gave which enabled Britain to face single-handed and overthrow the combined navies of the world, and which brought the empire triumphant through the seven years war. The policy of a self-sufficing empire dominated both Great Britain and the colonies. The colonies were not a bit behind in contributing to imperial defence. In 1741, 3,000 colonials shared the glorious victory of Carthagena under Vernon. During the seven years war, 25,000 men from the colonies were in the field. The colonial contribution to the navy at that time was over 400 ships of war. Pennsylvania and the other colonies spent millions of dollars in this war. In 1756 the loyalty of the colonies was unquestioned. In 1776 this great imperial federation which had reached a more advanced stage than the empire of to-day, was torn asunder, shattered to fragments. Students of history will tell you that the reason was that there was no statesman of the time with sufficient power and influence to evolve a form of government whereby a strong representative executive of the empire could reconcile the particularist or provincial tendency of the individual parts. No great constructive statesman appeared. I am of the opinion that had he been permitted, had not legislation, human ignorance and passion hurried a climax, Franklin would have worked out a constructive solution of the problem. But the false stigma of a colonial prevented the British people from giving proper heed to his counsel, and when the crash came he, of necessity, joined his own colonial brethren and showed the world by his constructive work on the American constitution, what might have been done had Britain only called in the colonials for advice and counsel in the crisis. The same crisis is bound to arise again in the empire; I doubt but it is here. The theory of taxation without representation is bound to clash with too ardent patriotism and imperialism. And we, Sir, into whose hands in a measure the destinies of the empire are confided, should study the history of the empire in the period preceding the American revolution, to equip us the better to work out our own future destiny, looking to a united and greater empire. The true light of past experience is to be found in those musty, torn, and tear bedimmed pages that tell the story of the saddest days of the empire.

Sir, you ask me why I refer to that unfortunate period. It is because I am opposed to this Naval Bill. The Prime Minister of Australia said the time had come to turn a fresh page in history, we, too, have turned a fresh page, and on it what do we propose to write?—the fatal word 'separation,' for this independent navy spells separation. Better contribute four, yes and ten times four, Dreadnoughts than place a Bill on our statute-book that means ultimate separation. Better do nothing at all than involve this country in a quarrel with the motherland over the fatal principle of no taxation without representation. Why not tell the mother country the truth? Why not tell this government of England. which is now tottering to its fall, that before any scheme for contribution to imperial defence can be safely considered other and greater questions must be settled, that when the time comes to consider an adjustment of the relations of the colonies to the empire, while kindred blood and common ideas can bind two peoples together as strongly as links of steel, each must feel that its material advantages and privileges are associated in that union.

The empire is not lost, far from it. Thanks to the efforts of the greatest constructive statesman the British empire has yet seen, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, one of the great parties in Britain to-day is formulating a plan for further solidarity along material and business lines, and in full sympathy with the colonies. The future of the empire must rest upon a business foundation. Let us not repeat the errors of 1776 by adopting this naval policy, this Naval Bill, which is turning the hands back on the clock.

Sir, one of the excuses for this Bill is that we are doing something for ourselves and at the same time for the empire, that we can no longer be charged with sponging upon the mother country. Let us ex-

amine this argument. Let us treat it in a business way. Let us cast up the accounts. It is very derogatory to our self respect that we remain open to this charge of not paying our proper share. Let us avoid sentiment when the business argument is advanced.

I have here in my hand a copy of the Navy League Annual, which contains the platform of the Navy League. Plank 2, which places the appeal for naval support on business grounds, says that the object of the league is:

To convince every taxpayer and every politician that judicious expenditure upon the navy is for the nation only, the ordinary insurance which no sane person grudges in private affairs, applied to risks appalling in nature and extent.

Let us see what the risks are. I have here a table taken from Lloyd's shipping register, which gives the tonnage of the merchant ships of the nations of the world of over 100 tons burden. Here is the steam tonnage, as the sailing vessel tonnage is now insignificant:

Table of steamers of one hundred tons registry or over from Lloyds registry, 1909.

Nation.	Tonnage.
British	17,702,714
German	3,889,046
United States (lake and ocean)	3,662,332
French	1,445,976
Norwegian	1,338,423
Japanese	1,150,858
Italian	961,132
Dutch	904,536
Russian	760,785
Swedish	774,288
Austrian	744,676
Spanish	686,875
Danish	677,098
Belgian	268,459
Brazilian	222,110
Turkish	112,849
Chilean	106,857
Portuguese	69,878
Total	35,478,872

Now, Sir, of this total steamship tonnage of 35,478,878 tons, Great Britain owns approximately about 50 per cent. Various authorities give our Canadian steam tonnage classification on the same basis as 200,000 tons and deducting our lake tonnage we have 100,000 tons on the ocean. In other words our tonnage is in proportion to British tonnage as 1 to 177. If we take an estimate of the value of British commercial ships and their earnings, we will get at the reason of the huge expenditure on the British navy from the business standpoint of insurance, and we will find that this is one of the greatest revenue producing industries of Great Britain, and the greatest contributor to the enormous wealth and revenues of that country. Great Britain takes toll as a carrier on every second ton of freight that is moved on the ocean. The value of the commercial fleet of Great Britain would figure about approximately as follows; 17,702,714 tons at $50 a ton or a total value of $885,135,700. Mr. Lloyd George in a recent speech stated that the net earnings of Britain's commercial fleet was £500,000,000 annually, but according to the figures I have taken his estimate may be considered low. The gross earnings will therefore be easily £1,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000. The revenue from this British commercial fleet is 50 times greater than the total revenue of the Canadian Pacific railway and the total revenues received by the Dominion government. The cost of the British navy last year was approximately £35,000,000 or £2 for every ton of commercial tonnage. This Naval Bill of the government proposes to expend $16,000,000 to start with and virtually $7,000,000 per annum which to my mind is a pretty high rate for this insurance. It might also be pointed out that one half our foreign trade is carried in foreign bottoms, and in making this statement I am only speaking from a business point of view and of course I am casting no reflection on Britain's splendid supremacy on the sea. The year book gives a total of 3,504 ships entering inward and clearing outward from our harbours last year and of these 3,504 only 969 were British, so that all our foreign tonnage is not carried in British ships. The above figures speak eloquently in favour of encouraging a great commercial fleet for Canada. They also tell us that our share for the navy should be, from a business standpoint, $1,000,000 per year. I submit, Sir, that from a business standpoint it would be good business for us in view of the danger to our foreign commerce and on the ground of prepaying our insurance, to invest in two Dreadnoughts as proposed by my hon. leader, costing approximately from $18,000,000 to $20,000,000. The life of a Dreadnought is from 20 years to 25 years so that by this contribution we would have our insurance prepaid for the next 20 years. I can see no harm in this case in giving such a gift from a business standpoint. It would be good business for us, and the insurance would not be nearly so high as the government asks us to pay under their proposal. It would be an honourable way for us to pay for the great national service rendered by Great Britain and what is more it would prevent us from interfering with the possible development of our own nation along industrial lines, and it would also prevent us from interfering in any way with Britain's world policy. The navy proposed by the government will cost $15,000,000 or with interest charges added $20,000,000 and it will cost us annually $7,000,000 for maintenance and will have to be renewed every ten years, because the life of the cruisers, and torpedo boats,

averages only seven years. Their machinery is so complicated that each year they cost half their price for upkeep. In addition to all that, a large number of Canadians will be taken from their peaceful industrial employment. Where are we going to get these men when we cannot find men for our militia, in which the rates of pay are higher than in any army in the world. A recent return to this House showed that only 20 per cent of the men in our active militia are Canadians. Certainly the voice of reason says to us: Keep out of the navy business. And apart from sentiment altogether, it would be cheaper and far better and more honourable for us to pay our debts by contributing at this time two Dreadnoughts to the British empire. In that I heartily agree with the resolution of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

It has been urged in favour of this Bill that it will encourage ship-building in Canada, and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), has quoted my speech of last session to say that I favoured this proposal of the government so as to encourage ship-building. What I did say, was that we should begin with the building of the carrier or merchant ship, and that perhaps we could continue that further and go on with the construction of torpedo boats and naval ships of the smaller class. Nothing has occurred since then to change my view in this respect. I must say, however, that we can never become a great commercial maritime nation by adopting the policy which the government proposes to us. The truth is that they are going about it in the wrong way. The path they ask us to follow is not the path that will lead to success.

Let us for example look at the history of Japan in this respect, and we will see that the Canadian government to-day proposes to do not what Japan did, but exactly what the Americans did; they propose to begin building the pyramid at the top. Why is Germany second in merchant tonnage to Great Britain; why is the United States at the bottom of the list and why is Japan a good fourth. I shall endeavour to give the reasons to the House. The United States is at the bottom of the list because they began their fleets both commercial, and naval, by building the naval fleet first, and the reason why Japan is now not only a great commercial shipowning nation, but also a great war fleet owning nation is because they commenced building their commercial fleet first. The ocean tonnage of the United States to-day —deducting the lake and river tonnage—is approximately 939,000 tons, while in 1810 the ocean borne tonnage of the United States was 981,000 tons, a very small decrease during the past 100 years. In 1861 the American tonnage was 2,500,000 tons, and surely something must have happened in the meantime to injure the commercial ship-building industry of the United States. What is the history of Japan in this respect? In 1894 the Japanese tonnage was only 200,000 tons the same as ours is to-day, but the merchant fleet of Japan has grown rapidly, and it now amounts to 1,486,000 tons, and to-day the Japanese merchant ships control the trade of the Pacific. This result was brought about by giving a tonnage subsidy, and a ship-building bounty to ships built at home, the subsidies being given for the building of merchant ships, and also for the operation of these ships at sea. Last year the Japanese government paid $6,500,000 in subsidies to their merchant fleet, and to ship-building. Their policy is to give so much a ton for building the ship in Japan, and to give also an annual subsidy to the ship if she is built in Japan, and is operated between Japan, and some foreign country. Last year, as I have said Japan spent $6,500,000 in these subsidies and, last year Canada paid over $2,000,000 in shipping subsidies, which, with the $6,000,000 annually we propose putting into this navy will amount to $8,000,000 a year that we will spend in subsidies, and still we will only have a poor navy and no commerical fleet. It has only taken the Japanese people about fifteen years to build up the great navy which they have to-day.

They first established ship-building yards in a small way. They began building merchant ships, and gradually as time went on they began to build torpedo boats and cruisers, and to-day Japan is capable of building her own Dreadnoughts, making the plates, the beams, the angles, the armour plates, the machinery, and the guns. The reason of that is that the Japanese have gone about the ship-building business in a sensible, business way. One shipyard alone employs no less than 9,000 men, which will give you an idea of the enormous extent of this industry in that country. The same thing happened in Germany. In 1885 Germany had neither a commercial fleet, nor a war fleet. A system of subsidies was adopted, the result of which is that the German tonnage, which was then 300,000 tons, is to-day second only to that of Great Britain. We all know that since 1885 the Germans have succeeded not only in establishing shipbuilding in a substantial way, but in building these great capital ships equal to Great Britain as far as their resources in material and supplies are concerned. They can build their own ships, make their own steel, and manufacture the armour plate, and the guns. The Japanese, by the wise policy they have adopted, have not control of the Pacific. The Germans have also

risen to such greatness in this respect that they challenge the attention of Great Britain. It is for us to consider, if we are going to spend so much of the money of this country on a navy, whether we should not adopt a policy which has been so successfully followed by these two nations, rather than the policy adopted by the United States, which experience has shown to be wrong. On various occasions the Americans have endeavoured to secure the adoption of a policy along the German and Japanese lines; but their tremendous expenditures on the navy, which a great many of their people consider useless, have prevented the adoption of such a policy. France also has adopted a policy of subsidizing ship-building and operating ships. In 1891 the French mercantile fleet amounted to only 300,000 tons, whereas to-day it amounts to 1,300,000 tons. Norway also has recently adopted the subsidy system. A ship subsidy Bill has been before the United States Congress on numerous occasions, and has been defeated because the people have had such enormous sums to pay for their navy. The result is that the United States tonnage in 1810 was virtually just as great as that of to-day. There is at the present time a Bill before Congress for the purpose of fixing a subsidy for the building of these ships, which proposes that they shall be fast merchant ships, with a speed about equal to that of our Canadian cruisers, and with considerable freight tonnage capacity, and when subsidized, they are expected to establish lines of communication between the United States, Brazil, Argentina, China, and New Zealand. These ships will carry freight, and will have gun platforms, on which guns of as great power as those of the Canadian cruisers can be mounted. They will thus be not only merchant ships of the latest class, but cruisers equal in speed and armament to ours. I think it would be wise for this government to consider the advisability of adopting a policy of that kind. The Canadian farmer, when he gives up his ox-team, goes and buys a good team of general purpose horses—he does not start a racing stable. In carrying out their naval policy, that is what this government should do, because cruisers built under these specifications would be able to carry our produce to the mother country in time of peace, and, in case of war, they would do the same thing, and at the same time have guns to fight the enemy's cruisers. The hon. members of this House know that I am deeply interested in ship-building, and I realize that it would be of great advantage to the maritime provinces to be able to regain once more the great industry of ship-building which they possessed twenty-five years ago, when Canada stood fourth in the great ocean-tonnage countries of the world. The policy proposed by this government is not founded on business principles, and if adopted will involve such a great expenditure that this country will never have the ship-building industry established along sound commercial lines like other nations. In order to build a fleet you may establish shipyards and dry-docks, but after you have built three or four ships, what will you do? You will have nothing further to go on with, and the men who have come here from Glasgow, Belfast, and the Tyne, and have built these ships with foreign material, will have nothing to do. The beams will come from Great Britain, the plate from Germany and the United States, the machinery from Glasgow, the guns from Birmingham, and when you are through, what will happen? Your yards will have nothing more to do. The guns and machinery will represent about one-half the cost, and the armour about twenty-five per cent, which will leave about twenty-five per cent to be divided between the material for the hull, and the labour of assembly.

And I say that all the Canadian people will get out of the building of this fleet will be about 15 per cent. I do not think that is good business. The proper way to establish ship-building is to establish it on commercial lines. If you establish it by giving a subsidy, say of $8 per ton, on ships built in Canada and in addition confine your mail and shipping subsidies to ships built in Canada, you will soon find Canadians ready to put their money into the enterprise and make it a success. You will soon find that business established on a sound basis and your ship-building yards will always have plenty of work for the artisans. Then, if necessary, to build say torpedo boats and small destroyers, you will have workmen trained to do the work rapidly and efficiently. When we have that industry established on a sound basis, you will also find establishments in this country willing to go into the manufacture of the material required. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company have a large mill for the rolling of plates, but they have it housed up in a shanty because, under existing conditions, they could roll in a month all the plates used in Canada for a year, But, if you can show a substantial policy of this kind, they would soon erect their mill, and in a short time we would not only be rolling our own plates but be able to furnish all the machinery required, and the time would not be far distant when we will make our armour plate because the nickel that goes into the armour plate of the world comes from this country. We will also be able to make our own guns and even tender for the building of warships for the British navy. The government should seriously consider this. If they should adopt the policy

they now advocate the door would be closed for the next 25 years in Canada as far as ship-building is concerned and as far as the hopes of the maritime provinces in that respect are concerned for the next generation. That is a consummation which no patriotic Canadian desires. What every one wishes is to see a ship-building industry established in the maritime provinces because such an industry will give an impetus to agriculture and every other development in this country. It will also bring a large influx of population which, instead of coming here from Glasgow and other ship-building centres and going back as soon as the ship is built—because it is only a few days journey back home, will make their homes here since they will have plenty of work all the year round and will thus form an important adjunct to our population. But, instead of doing this, the government are proposing to establish the navy on such unsound lines that no member from the maritime provinces would be justified in supporting it.

I now come to another point and that is the command of this navy. As this House knows the command in chief has been taken out of the hands of the King and placed in the hands of the Prime Minister of this country, because that is what an order in council means. When this question came up at the conference the Minister of War (Sir Frederick Borden) quoted the Militia Act. I would like to deal with that Act, and point out what has been done with it. It is said that the Militia Act did not permit our Canadian forces to be employed in the defence of the empire outside Canada. That statement has been made on many occasions. Let me say that the old Act did permit our military forces to be used outside Canada and so does the new Act.

Let me tell the House something about our militia and military affairs before going further. Let us for a moment glance at history and perhaps obtain some idea of what is at the bottom of this Navy Bill and what the results are likely to be. The militia was originally, in England, a parliamentary force. It was established previous to the time of Cromwell, but the army was reorganized in 1660 when Charles II. come to the throne. He was allowed a small standing army, and the same Act which established a standing army, established a militia, and placed the command of that militia in the hands of the sovereign. Two years later, with the dread of the standing army in their minds, the parliament of Great Britain declared that the King was the supreme officer of the militia, and by another clause gave the command of that militia over to the lord lieutenants of counties. While the King was declared to be the commander in chief in substance, he was not in fact, because the command of the British militia was in the hands of the lord lieutenants of the counties, who took their orders from parliament. That existed until the reign of Queen Victoria, when an Act was passed which gave the command in chief of the militia and standing army personally into the hands of the Queen. That was the Act in force when confederation was enacted. If any one will take the trouble to go back to the time when the Conservative party was in power in this country and will look up the Revised Statutes of 1884, he will find that the command in chief was personally in the hands of the sovereign. The member for Jacques Cartier, in his speech, touching the relations of the sovereign to the militia, expressed the ideas of the old Act. He was mistaken, there has been a great change in the relation of the militia of this country to the Crown. Clause 3 of this Act, of the Act of 1886, says:

> The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all the military and naval forces of and in Canada is vested in the Queen and shall be exercised and administered by her personally, or by the Governor General as her representative.

The House will observe the term 'naval forces' in that clause, and also that the command is personal, not legislative. Now clause 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of 1906 says:

> The command in chief of the militia is declared to continue vested in the King and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty or by the Governor General as his representative.

One clause enacts positively, the other is purely declaratory, and what is more, the command of the naval forces is cut out entirely. Why? Was this independent navy anticipated when the Militia Act was amended in 1904? Was this amendment prepared in anticipation of what we now have? It looks like design. The King so far has certainly been written out. Let us now take up the clause dealing with calling out the militia, for that is really the enacting clause of the statute. Clause 79 of the old Act says:

> Her Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof for active service either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion or insurrection or danger of any of them, and the militiamen when so called out for actual service shall continue to serve for at least one year, from the date of their being called out, for active service, if required so to do, or for any longer period which His Majesty approves.

That, Sir, was the Act that was in force when our soldiers went to South Africa. The King notwithstanding anything said to the contrary had the power then to order

militia regiments for foreign service in the cause of imperial defence. The Crown could call out the militia at any time for service anywhere. The new Act is different. The present government, not a Tory government, made the charge also an English minister. Let us examine the new Act and see what it says on this point, and we will begin to locate the thin edge of this separation wedge.

Clause 69, R.S.C., 1906, says:

The Governor in Council may place the militia or any part thereof on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Sir, you will see that the Act of 1904, and the revision of the same of 1906, has not only taken the command of the militia away from the King, but further it has taken away the authority of the Crown, to order the militia on active service. It does exactly what the Act of 1662, did to Charles II. in another way. Whilst the King is normally the head of our militia the only authority to order that force on active service is an order in council. In other words the Prime Minister has usurped the functions and prerogatives of His Majesty. The same idea is carried out in this Naval Bill. Was there any necessity for taking the personal command of the militia away from the King? Is there any necessity for depriving the King of the personal command of this navy? His Majesty has not shown any signs of seeking to become an absolute rather than a constitutional monarch. There is no indication, that the people of this country are to be deprived by the Crown of those British laws, and institutions, that freedom greater than any other country which we possess and which is given to them under the British North America Act. Let us see there may be something else. Has this separatist policy gone further? We found in the old Militia Act, the following provision:

Clause 78, says:

The officer commanding any military district or division or the officer commanding any corps of active militia, may upon any sudden emergency of invasion, or unsurrection or imminent danger of either, call out the whole or any part of the militia within his command until the pleasure of Her Majesty is known, and the militia so called out by the commanding officer, shall immediately obey all such orders as he gives, and march to such place within or without the district or division as he directs.

Now, Sir, that was a wise provision which enabled a commanding officer to call out his men in case of invasion or insurrection to take the initiative in preserving the statu quo and await his sovereign's commands. But, Sir, I search the new Act in vain for a similar provision. It is not there and why was it removed? Was its removal another step in the policy of separation when there could be established by civilians, and political clubs, a new constitution, free from that tyrannical British justice, and British guarantees? What is the result of this tampering with the Militia Act, with the King's executive authority? Let us see. The only authority to call out the militia now in Canada, is an order in council. Commanding officers can no longer oppose insurrection in the King's name. Five hundred resolute men with arms in their hands, under a bold leader could seize the person of the Governor General and the loyal members of the cabinet in this city, and they could easily overturn our constitution, and proclaim a separate kingdom or a republic or dictatorship. That is a startling fact, but nevertheless true. The old Act provided that the King or the officers commanding corps could call out the troops in such an emergency. to protect parliament, and the Crown's authority. If the council were prisoners, if they refused by collusion or otherwise, in such a case to call out the militia to defend the constitution what would happen? Nothing. The revolutionists would be in absolute control. If a commanding officer called out his militia men to oppose separation now, he could be treated as a rebel, and shot, and the law as it now stands would not give him the rights of a belligerent, in maintaining the statu quo, or the dignity of the Crown. Everything has been arranged so as to make a possible coup d'etat. Why? Honourable gentlemen may make professions of loyalty. They may pull up big red herrings out of the sea, and clothe them in the British lion skins, and roar themselves hoarse. But the country has a reason to ask then, why has the authority of the British Crown, the guarantee of our constitution, been eliminated from the Militia Act, and now from the naval force? That is a question that will need a lot of answering. It is a question which every peaceful Canadian should ask—Why have such great changes been made in the relation of the British Crown to the militia and armed forces been made without a discussion, and a full disclosure? That should in itself be sufficient to kill this Bill. Why has the authority of the King been usurped by the order in council or in other words by the Prime Minister? Is this navy going to be a royal navy, or another instrument under the absolute control of the Prime Minister? Where is this ambition going to end? We have a Laurier militia. Now we are going to have a Laurier navy. Let me warn the Prime Minister that there is but a step from the Capitol to the Tarpeian rock.

Now, during this debate reference has been made to the question of guarantees.

There is no doubt in the world but that some guarantees were made in the British North America Act. Consider the condition of the country at that time. It was torn by dissension and agitation, it was threatened with invasion from the south. All parts of the country had reached that state of political agitation when business was suspended and something had to be done. On the 10th of October, 1864, the Quebec conference met and lasted eight days. At that conference was written out the charter of our liberties. At that conference the various provinces represented exchanged guarantees, guarantees respecting the rights of religious minorities, guarantees with respect to language, guarantees with respect to property and with respect to commerce. All these guarantees were included in the constitution agreed upon in 1864. Now, Sir, after these guarantees had been agreed upon, it was necessary to ascertain whether the British government would assent to them, and at a meeting in Great Britain guarantees were also exchanged between the representatives of Canada and the representatives of the British Crown. I have before me a report made by the great men of that day, men whose names stand high, not only in the councils of the Reform party, but also in the councils of the Conservative party. The men who signed that report were the Hon. George Brown, a well known Reformer; Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George E. Cartier and A. T. Galt. Now, the question of defence was discussed in London at that conference, and they stated in this report what Canada would guarantee so far as defence was concerned. I will trouble the House by reading one or two sentences of that report:

> On the part of Canada, we expressed the desire that this plan for the defence of all parts of the province should be taken as the basis of arrangement; and that a full and candid discussion should be had as to the share of the cost that ought to be borne respectively by the imperial and provincial exchequers.
>
> We expressed the earnest wish of the people of Canada to perpetuate the happy existing connection with Great Britain, and their entire willingness to contribute to the defence of the empire their full quota, according to their ability, of men and money.

That was the pledge given by Canada to Great Britain at the time of confederation, when Great Britain agreed to pass the Act of Confederation. Sir, what did Great Britain do? Great Britain gave to Canada the following pledge:

> It will be gratifying to many devoted subjects of Her Majesty throughout British America, whose fears have been excited by the language too often heard of late years, on the subject of colonial connection, that we received from Her Majesty's ministers the assurance that the British government acknowledge the obligation of defending every portion of Canada with all the resources at its command.

I feel very strongly on the matter of these guarantees, and I think when any question arises in this country involving any change in the guarantees exchanged between the provinces or between Canada and the British Crown, we should go very slowly and not rock the boat too much. It is much better for us to maintain the statu quo in matters of this kind than to rashly enter upon changes. The guarantees are sacred. The ministers of the Crown will not grant an appeal to the people. They have not had a mandate from the people on this naval question, which certainly to my mind involves a reversal of our own policy, the adoption of a new policy, the possession of an independent navy. If they refuse us the privilege of going to the people ourselves to discuss this question then the least they can do would be to follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and submit this very important and serious question to the people. My leader has made the same suggestion. The guarantees which were exchanged at the time of confederation should not be lightly set aside. I am sure the people of Ontario are just as eager to maintain the constitution established as the result of the Quebec conference, that is the British North America Act, as any other portion of Canada, and if the rights of my province were threatened I would be the first man to raise my voice. While this navy may not perhaps involve a question affecting any province directly, it certainly involves the question of the separation of this country from the motherland. To that question, as far as I am concerned, there is only one answer, that is the word, no.

While the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier does not enter into any discussion of the greater issues involved, such as a contribution, it deals directly with this Bill, and, for the benefit of this House, I shall read and examine that resolution so that we may better judge whether we should vote for it or not. This resolution, as I have already said, deals only with this Bill, which after all, is the only thing that is actually before the House. The resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was proposed by him as a sub-amendment or substitutional amendment. Every one who understands the rules of proceeding from a school meeting up to parliament, knows that every amendment to the amendment is an amendment to the main motion. It involves three principles. Let us examine them.

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion that the Bill now submitted for its consideration changes the relations of Canada with the empire, and ought, in consequence, to be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.

In the first place the hon. member recites the unalterable devotion of this House to the British Crown. I cannot feel in my heart that I can vote against that. In the second place he states that in his opinion the Bill submitted for the consideration of the House changes the relation of Canada with the empire. Every body who has followed the debate, especially in the last two weeks will realize that that is the direction in which this debate has tended, and that hon. gentlemen opposite have not been afraid to rise and state that it is the ultimate object of such legislation as this to bring about separation from the British Crown. Therefore, I say as a sound constitutionalist, and as a believer in the British North America Act that I cannot find it in my heart to vote 'no' for that proposition, because I firmly believe that this Bill does endeavour to change our relations to the British Crown, and ultimately lead us to separation. He says it ought in consequence to be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite. Many people will take the ground that it is not British nor constitutional to have a plebiscite. We have heard some professors of constitutional history recite their views in this House, and some of those views to my mind were very misty and hazy, but it seems to me that any one who knows any thing about constitutional history knows that this our constitution was based largely on the American constitution. I have stated that the fathers of confederation at that time met and wrote our constitution at the Quebec conference. These men understood constitutions and constitutional history a thousand times better than we do and why? At that time they had written constitutions in other countries, some of which had failed, and some had succeeded. France had a written constitution. A few years before that the constitution was torn to pieces by Napoleon the Third. Italy had just been united as a limited monarchy under Cavour a few years before. Spain had been in the toils and struggles of revolution, and to the south of us the United States was fighting out the principle of the rights of states as against federal authority, which involved very serious constitutional changes. The fathers of confederation were seized of all these facts, they realized the importance of the work they had in hand, and the British North America Act which they prepared is, to my mind, one of the soundest and ablest state papers that ever emanated from any people. They knew all about these matters. They established in that Act the principle that we, the members of parliament, represent the people, the principle of representative government. In the United States they believe in representative government, and there is no man in this House who will say he does not represent his riding. The principle in England is the reverse, as far as representative government is concerned, prerogative comes from above; our prerogative comes from the people, we believe in representation by population. The United States government has a written charter, we have a written charter, and when any change is involved in the American constitution what happens? They put the amendment to the constitution before the people in a plebiscite. I believe it would be wise for us to adopt that principle in this case, especially as this is a matter which involves a very great change in our relation to the empire. We have a change here involving the setting up of a new empire, or a new King? One would think that we had no rights at all, that we had less liberties than they have in Great Britain. I would ask any hon. gentleman if we have not greater liberties than the people of Scotland have? They do not make their own laws, or impose their own taxation.

An hon. MEMBER. Or Ireland.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yes, poor Ireland. What about poor England or Wales? We have greater liberties than they have in any of these countries and we find that this Naval Bill challenges these liberties. As far as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is concerned I cannot find it in my heart to vote against his amendment. I will vote for it because it involves a great principle and a principle that I think every one ought to vote for. As far as the principle involved in the amendment of my hon. leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) is concerned, I shall vote for his motion because it meets with my heartiest approval. Because two good things are presented to us and because the lesser is included in the greater it is no reason why we should reject either one or the other. From the purely business standpoint and the sentimental standpoint the amendment of my hon. leader is one that should be adopted by us and that is that we should contribute to the cost of our insurance like men and be done with it. If a policeman guards my property I pay taxes for his protection. If you have ships to carry your trade away you establish the principle that you pay subsidies to those ships. If you do not wish to establish a navy of your own, if

you feel that the burden is great in opening up and developing the resources of the country, you do not need to go to that expense because there is one of the largest nations of the world that has had a long experience in the construction and management of battleships which is ready to do it for you which has guaranteed under the British North America Act that she will aid you. For that reason, as far as I am personally concerned, I intend to vote for both these resolutions. To every one who has read the pages of history it must be apparent that there are other very grave questions involved. We should adopt the soundest and wisest policy and move as slowly along this line at the present time as we can. We have Scylla on one side and Charybdis on the other and unless we have the wisest statesman to guide us we may get into very serious trouble with the old country or with some other nation. A year or two previous to the trouble between the mother country and the American colonies one of the greatest statesmen of the time—Franklin—wrote the following:

I am of the opinion that the foundation of the future greatness and stability of the British empire lie in America, and though like other foundations they may be low and little now, they are nevertheless broad and strong enough to support the greatest political structure that human wisdom ever yet erected.

These foundations are being laid in this country by us. It will be time enough when we have twenty or thirty million to take into consideration the question of any changes in our constitution. Let us remain a free and happy people and let it not be said that for over a hundred years the people who have lived in this country have been trying in an humble way to realize that prophecy of Franklin's and they have failed. For forty years we have lived a united people working out our salvation along those lines. Let us make haste slowly with regard to this stupendous question. Those questions that form the basis for debates in the schools and colleges as to whether Canada should be independent or annexed to the United States are all childish questions and the men who bring them up in this House or try to voice them throughout the country simply show that they are acting in a childish way. We have a constitution the equal of which cannot be found and we cannot hope to improve upon it at present. Let us maintain our constitution and in future years let it not be said in time of emergency that a great empire and little minds go together.

Mr. J. A. LORTIE (Soulanges). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before this debate is closed, I deem it my duty to express an opinion on this burning issue, on this intricate question which is now before us, the creation of a marine, an issue which, for several months past, has agitated all minds, either in this House or outside of it. The note I am going to strike is likely to sound harshly and to grate upon the ears of many people, while it will be in accord and in tally with the feelings of all true patriots who endeavour to preserve in their integrity the rights and privileges guaranteed by our constitution; rights and privileges secured to us by the indefatigable and incessant efforts of our great statesmen and faithfully adhered to by Sir George Etienne Cartier, Sir John Macdonald, Tupper, Angers and Monk.

As remarked by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Ecrément) in his speech, in seconding the address: 'We are at the parting of the ways in our history; we are entering upon one of those history-makers, one of those epoch-making periods in the history of Canada.' Are not such words, Sir, calculated to cause us to ponder, and do they not warn us to deeply think over the responsibilities we are going to assume and the action we are about to take?

The Bill providing for the establishment of a navy is, to my mind, the most important piece of legislation the Canadian government has been called upon to deal with since confederation. The creation of a fleet, the control of which passes automatically into the hands of the British admiralty in time of war, destroys our autonomy and effects our constitution, of which all Canadians are justly proud.

I notice that in the report of the imperial conference (page 24), there are three conditions mentioned as means of assisting in imperial defence.

The first form in which to assist in imperial government from expenses which bution of money or material.

A second form would be to provide local naval forces and place them at the disposal of the Crown, in the event of war.

A third one would be in undertaking certain local services not directly of a naval character, but which may relieve the imperial government from expenses which would otherwise fall on the British exchequer.

Tihs last condition is the one that has been so far carried out, it is the one, I say, that this country should stick to, while putting forth greater efforts for the development of our territory.

Look at the thousands of miles of railway we have built so far! We shall soon have three transcontinental railways which will cross the country in every direction. Besides, we have improved our waterways, by dredging our rivers, by making canals and providing better accommodation and facili-

ties at our ports. There are so many efficacious means of abridging distances from ocean to ocean and facilitating, in the event of war, the transportation of British troops and goods. Besides, are we not responsible for the protection and defence of our territory? Have we not undertaken to protect our coasts, our ports and our fisheries, so many ways of relieving the British government from expenses they would have to face otherwise?

We are a colony, but a colony with a territory as vast and as immense as that of Russia. When we assumed the responsibility of developing, protecting and defending a territory which is five or six times larger than the British isles, with a population of six or seven millions, did we not give an extraordinary proof of our gratitude and loyalty towards England? Could she now require anything more from us, for the present. Therefore we are wrongly charged with disloyalty when we ask to remain in the statu quo.

I want to remain in the statu quo: first, because the creation of a navy which will be part of the imperial fleet, involves too large and expenditure of public money, which will result in considerably retarding the development and progress of the country.

Secondly, because it completely changes our relations with the empire.

Thirdly, because the people have never been consulted on that point.

Are we now in such a financial position as to be able to build a navy? If I open the blue-books and examine our financial position, I find that the country is saddled with a debt of 472 millions. In his budget speech, did not the Finance Minister tell us that the public expenditure had exceeded the revenue by 45 millions? What will happen, when we are fairly embarked upon this scheme of militarism? Is not the example of all countries launched into militarism a sufficient warning to make us shudder with fear. With the construction of that navy, I have no hesitation in saying, without fear of misleading public opinion, that as early as next year, the deficit of our budget will be considerably increased and even doubled.

That debt of 472 millions shows that we are poor; we are a mere population of seven millions to meet such a large debt and provide for the new expenditures we shall have to incur for the development of the resources of Canada. Would it not be far better to devote our money, our revenue, our energies and our labours to the development of the country, instead of building a navy which will probably prove a source of danger for Canada in the future?

We have duties to discharge towards the empire under the British flag; we have faithfully fulfilled those duties in the past, and we are quite ready to continue so doing in the future. But, on the other hand, we cling to our flag; and we think that to impoverish Canada in order to indulge in sentimentalism and pseudo-marine, is far from being a practical and patriotic policy.

If we now turn our attention towards the great public works which are an absolute necessity, in order that our country may keep pace with its development and the increase of population, we find that we shall need fabulous sums of money. What will be the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific? Two hundred million dollars will hardly be sufficient to complete the work; an amount quite different from the estimated cost given by the Prime Minister and his followers. I still remember the pompous and emphatic tone assumed by the speakers when haranguing the people on the pubic platforms, when they exclaimed: 'We are going to build a transcontinental railway, from ocean to ocean, at the cost of $13,000,000. The public domain will not be sacrificed, as under the Conservative rule, in the building of the Canadian Pacific railway. We won't see a repetition of the famous plunders of the boodlers of those days. If our public lands have not been sacrificed so far, I may say that the public exchequer has been looted. So far, the cost of that undertaking exceeds 160 million dollars.

After such contradictions on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, could I not say, without fear of leading public opinion astray, that the government is going to spend three times more than is necessary for the building of the navy, which would increase that exenditure to 45 millions.

Here is the proof of my assertions. In January last, when introducing the Naval Service Bill, the right hon. the Prime Minister said: 'The estimated annual cost of maintenance is $3,000,000.' Now, upon the occasion of the second reading of the Bill, three weeks later, he stated that the cost of maintenance would reach $4,150,000. On January 10, the prime minister's right arm, the Minister of Militia, said that the estimated cost of maintenance would be $4,680,000; and he continued: 'I have here a paper prepared by Admiral Kingsmill. It reads as follows: Estimated annual cost by Admiral Kingsmill for maintenance, interest on the cost of the navy, $468,000; of the cost of the navy to provide for replacement, $1,560,000; maintenance of college, barracks, &c., $1,030,000; maintenance of training ships, $1,244,000; maintenance of Bristols and torpedo boats, $1,885,000; total of annual cost, $7,157,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that the construction of the Georgian bay canal is a necessity. According to the reports of

experts, the cost of that undertaking will be $100,000,000. The consensus of opinion in this country is that this is a matter of urgency. Should the building of that canal be delayed a few years longer, the western trade will be diverted from Canada to the United States. Why have we not started building that waterway? I leave the answer to the hon. Minister of Marine, who, at a banquet tendered by the Reform Club to the Secretary of State, said: 'The causes are want of money and the insufficiency of our resources.'

If our resources are insufficient for urgent works of paramount importance, if we find it impossible, for lack of means, to construct works which would yield us enormous revenues, is it not ridiculous, not to say absurd, to build a navy the pressing necessity of which for the country has not yet been shown, and which may, in the future, prove adverse to our interests?

Would it not be preferable and more logical, Sir, to devote those millions to the building of the Georgian bay canal, which would be an important step taken in the right direction for the development of our commerce and the progress of the country?

Besides those great works, those undertakings of first magnitude, are these not works of secondary importance which are more pressing than the building of a navy?

Are not the harbours of Quebec and Montreal in need of better accommodation and of more modern equipment, in order that they should be on a footing of equality with the neighbouring harbours? Halifax and St. John are far from having the requisite equipment to become national ports. The needs of the harbours on the Pacific ocean should not be ignored either. I am quite satisfied that the majority of the inhabitants of this country realize that there is a more urgent need of undertaking, improving and completing those works than building a navy? I do not think I am very far from the mark in estimating at 400 millions the cost of those works. In my opinion, therefore, from the financial standpoint alone, irrespective of other considerations, it is impossible for Canada to undertake the building of a navy.

What will be the cost of that navy? We have, it is true, the statements made by the Prime Minister, who says that it will not exceed $15,000,000. If the right hon. gentleman had never led public opinion into error, I would most willingly accept his word. But the history of the past is calculated to cast some doubt in our minds. I need no other proof than the history of the building of the transcontinental, in regard to which the people of Canada were led into error and completely deceived.

The creation of a navy involves other expenditures besides the building of the warships. There are many necessary expenditures. Besides the cost of the dockyards, equipment, uniforms, stores, ammunition and coal, have we not also to provide for fortified revictualling harbours, offering an armed refuge in case of damage suffered by ships. Those ports will be for repair of ships, with dry docks and floating docks. Moreover, in the memorandum of the admiralty, is not a pension for seamen mentioned?

What is the life or term of service of those warships going to be? Their lease of life is very short, according to the statistics in connection with such navy. Owing to the fact of keeping those ships on the open sea, as stated by shipbuilders, their life is about twenty years. On the other hand, owing to the rapid development of the naval science and of mechanics, the existence of these ships becomes still shorter. After ten or twelve years' service, they become obsolete, out-of-date, and ships of a more modern type and more up-to-date are required.

The creation of a navy, according to the scheme submitted by the Prime Minister, changes for the future our relations with the mother country. Our autonomous constitution, the Militia Act, and particularly section 69, militate against such a scheme. Section 69 reads:

> The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Emergency means war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended!

It is clearly enacted in the above section that the militia may be called out on active service only for the defence of our territory. Therefore by that section we are not bound to take part in the wars of the empire.

Therefore, our soldiers, our militia men are trained and maintained only for the protection of Canada, wherever those interests may be.

Did not the Minister of Militia collaborate in the framing of the Act of 1904, and did he not approve of it?

Listen to what he said then:

> The very fundamental idea of a militia force has always been and is now home defence. In every portion of the British empire, without any exception, the same principle is laid down which is found in the Bill before the House—that the militia of that part of the British empire shall be limited in their service to the particular part of the empire in which they live. I have taken the trouble to examine the old militia laws of the different provinces which made up the Dominion of Canada, and in every one of those provinces, we find the same limitations.

It has always been so, and it is foolish to talk about serving outside of Canada.

These words have been added 'for the defence of the country,' to indicate clearly that the militia cannot be taken outside Canada unless it be for the defence thereof.

Now, let us compare the following provisions with those contained in sections 17 and 18 of the Naval Bill:

17. The Governor in Council may place the naval force or part thereof on active service at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of an emergency.

18. In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the royal navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships and vessels, or any officers of seamen belonging to the naval service.

Mr. Speaker, more than once, since this discussion has been started, I have heard speakers favourable to this Bill, ask in this House : 'Why should there be any opposition to this proposal which is nothing but the continuation of the work of Sir George Etienne Cartier, the extension to the navy of the provisions of the Militia Bill:

Whoever has taken the pains of reading over the various provisions, even in a cursory way, will have noticed great differences between them. Our militia is a Canadian institution provided for the defence of our territory. The navy, on the contrary, is a British institution, inspired by England for the defence of the empire. That naval service has been initiated as the result of three imperial conferences; it is the outcome of the British scare of 1909 in regard to German pretensions, and which, to my mind, was imagined at the right time. So then, that navy is not a requirement of Canada; it is built to meet a wish of the mother country. The necessary inference to my mind, is that in time of war, it will automatically pass under the control of the British admiralty. So then, there will be no war remote enough going on in the world, whether just or unjust, whether in the interest of Canada or not, in which we shall be dispensed from taking part. In support of my statement, I may quote an extract from the speech delivered by the Minister of Militia on February 10th, page 3405 of Hansard:

Clause 18 or 19 does not mean that no action can be taken until parliament can be called—15 days hence. On the contrary, such action as the Governor in Council might think it their duty to take would be taken at once, but parliament would be called to approve or disapprove. That is responsible government, the principles of which I am beginning to think my hon. friends opposite do not entirely comprehend. It seems to me that no proper exception can be taken to that part of the Bill.

According to that statement, the section providing that parliament shall be called within fifteen days, does not mean that parliament will be called to decide whether the fleet should take part in the hostilities; when the House meets, the fleet will already have gone to the front, or possibly have been sunk. That provision of the Bill is only a sham, a deception to facilitate the taking of the pill 'navy' by the people. That deception has been incorporated in the Bill, not to provide for the retention of the fleet in the country, but in order to ensure the voting of the moneys required to defray all expenses incurred or to come.

The providing of that war navy for the safety of the empire, effects, to my mind, a radical departure in our country's policy. It amounts to the abandonment of our traditions as a nation, the disavowal of our past, the sacrifice of our autonomy. Now, Mr. Speaker, note what complete somersault has been effected in this connection by the hon. Minister of Marine, one of the fathers of this Naval Bill. What did the hon. member for Rouville (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) say on matters of this kind when the Conservatives were in power? At the time relations between Great Britain and the United States were rather strained over the Venezuelan question. At a certain moment the outlook was very threatening. If war had broken out, Canada, a British possession, would have been attacked from the first. Our government resolved on taking means to at any rate provide suitable arms for the militia, and purchased a million dollars worth of rifles of the latest pattern. When we were called upon to pay for these, the hon. member could not conceal his surprise, and expressed himself in the following terms:

There is one thing which seems strange in this connection; I have always heard it stated that if—though it would be most extraordinary—Canada should be engaged in war, we might rely on the protection of Great Britain; that the sole justification for maintaining the colonial tie was that should international entanglements occur, we might rely with certainty on Great Britain helping us. Well, Mr. Chairman, I regret to learn that in this case the government have bought rifles from England, not from a private party, but from the British government, and that the latter is now requesting payment. Is that the protection promised by Great Britain to Canada? Is that the position in which we are put as a colony? I think we might have expected an altogether different treatment from Great Britain. Now, I think all that can be done under the circumstances is to withhold from the government authority to incur such expenditure.

Parliament is requested to appropriate that amount of a million dollars when our debt already exceeds three millions. I take it that our indebtedness is large enough as it is and that there is no sense in our taking up a jingo policy and increasing thereby the public debt to the extent of a few millions, without being able to justify in any way such expenditure. I do not think that expenditure necessary in the meantime and, as far as I am concerned, I am strongly opposed to the voting of an amount such as we are called upon to contribute just now.

In my humble opinion, it is not in 1896 that the hon. Minister of Marine should have delivered such a speech. It is not at a time when we were called upon to defend our country that such words should have fallen from his lips; it is at the imperial conference of August, 1909. In 1896, the occasion was a critical one, the integrity of our territory was threatened; a powerful foe was at our doors; the United States. In 1909, there existed no such emergency. Now that universal peace is secured, that the German scare is over, according to eminent statesmen, now that Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd-George, and above all the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada, loudly proclaim that the German scare is a delusion, such denunciations would be in season. They might have the effect of preventing us from committing the blunder which we are about to make.

As a result of Britain's scare of the existence of that German peril of last year, members on both sides of the House abstained from all protest when the proposal of the 29th March was submitted. Was not that attitude on our part, that moral support, an evidence of loyalty to the mother country? Does it not go to show that whenever England satisfies us that there actually exists an emergency, that her supremacy is really imperilled, we shall as in the past be ready to fly to her aid.

Mr. Speaker, what I oppose and what I protest against, is, in the first place, the voting of a provision which binds Canada for ever to take part in imperial wars; it is the laying down of that principle which is implied in the creation of a war navy, as per sections 18 and 19 of this Bill; it is that free gift of 18 or 20 million dollars before it has been shown that the supremacy of Great Britain is actually and urgently threatened.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I protest against that independence cry proferred by hon. gentlemen on the other side, among others the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte), who, I think, was anxious to make amends for his famous speech against the resolution of March 29, 1909. I protest against insinuations to the same effect on the part of hon. members who have not had the courage of speaking out in this House like the hon. member for Nicolet, but who propose doing so when in the presence of their constituents in order to make up for voting against their convictions as they are about to do.

We Liberal-Conservatives who occupy seats on your left, Mr. Speaker, unanimously and in harmony with the great majority of the French Canadian voters of Quebec and Ontario, loudly proclaim that our country is not yet ready for independence, and that we are in duty bound to remain a British colony for many years to come, as long as our population will not have reached the 25 or 30 million mark.

Why should we launch out into an expenditure towards the building of a fleet destined to defend foreign territory, when even in recent years, exception was taken to our providing for the legitimate defence of Canada? Canada has not an enemy, neither on land or on sea. We should not provoke our neighbours by going in for armament; we should maintain that neutrality which has enabled us to make rapid strides on the way to progress. By taking up that proposal for the building of a war navy, we are embroiling ourselves in all England's wars. We are binding ourselves to participate in all her wars, just or unjust, without, on the other hand, having any voice in the councils of the empire. The principle 'No taxation without representation,' is forever discarded. The future of Canada, its relation to the empire, are thereby completely altered, and henceforth will evolve in a totally different direction from what we had hoped.

Before incurring any expenditure tying us down to imperialism or militarism, it would be very desirable, to my mind, that the people should be consulted. Who will have to meet that expenditure, who will be called upon to carry the burden of a war navy? Who will contribute those millions which the government intend spending uselessly? Is it not the people, particularly the needy classes, who will carry the burden of that undertaking? Wealthy business men will not bear the burden of such an impost; they will always be in a position to increase prices in such a way as to avoid contributing anything. Neither will big contractors, whose profits are always large enough to meet all emergencies and enable them to make money over the bargain. Who then will bear that burden? It is an easy matter to draw the conclusion. It will weigh exclusively on the working classes and the farming community.

Why should not these people be consulted? Does not the Liberal party who claim to be the sponsors of democracy, realize that imposing a burden of several millions on the people without consulting

them is the part of despotism or bureaucracy?

The plebiscite is not a new departure in our country; it is not even a new departure for this government. Has not the right hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues had recourse to a consultation of the people on the question of prohibition, a matter of very little importance in comparison with this.

This Naval Defence Bill is really a turning point in Canadian politics. In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, that 221 members should take on themselves to bind the country to militarism, that scourge which has brought about financial embarrassments in all countries affected by it, and that without obtaining the approval of the people who are the supreme judges in the matter, such action, I say, cannot be justified.

We representatives of the people hold from our constituents no mandate either direct or indirect authorizing us to add to our obligations, which are already burdensome, contributions in money and men towards forwarding the ambitious aims of the mother country. And since no recourse is had to a plebiscite, is not the inference that the people have nothing to do with settlement of such questions? Must it then be admitted that the people's part consists in meekly bearing as best they can the burden of imperialism which the government is about to lay on their shoulders. Of course, hon. gentlemen on the other side are opposed to the plebiscite idea lest, impelled by legitimate indignation, the people should condemn that imperialistic measure and forever prevent its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to state that I cannot vote for the Bill, because it will lead us to imperialism. Neither can I vote for the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, because it has not yet been clearly proven that Great Britain is actually and urgently in danger of losing her supremacy on the seas. Accordingly, I shall vote for the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), because I take it to be in harmony with our principles of self-government and likely to safeguard us against imperialistic tendencies.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (Northumberland, Ontario). Mr. Speaker, I have the very greatest sympathy for you, because, I notice that since the beginning of this debate, you seem to have grown older, and I am not much surprised at that. You look weary, Mr. Speaker, and sympathizing with you as I do, I shall not trespass on your patience for any length of time tonight. I have listened to most of the speeches that have been delivered in this House during the past five weeks on the Naval Defence Bill, which I consider one of the most important questions which has ever come before this parliament. I have heard a great deal about loyalty and disloyalty, and I would hate to believe that any minister of the Crown or any supporter of the government is disloyal. I do not believe it, Sir. I believe that every member of this House is a loyal man, and that our difference is after all only a difference of opinion. I give to every man the right to hold his opinions, and I claim that right for myself. We have listened to long speeches and to the reading of essays on this important question; speeches and essays that have taken us back almost to the time of the flood. No wonder, Sir, that you look weary. A good many hon. gentlemen have spoken of what took place 150 years ago, but I fail to see what that has to do with the issue before us, because I take it that we have been sent here to legislate for the present and the future, and not to bother about the past. Many mistakes have been made in the past, and we cannot remedy them now; let us do what we can in the interest of this great Dominion at the present time. I regret that the Prime Minister did not bring down a Naval Defence Bill so framed that every member of this House could have supported it. The right hon. gentleman did not choose to do that, and so I have to express my dissent to his proposal to build a Canadian navy. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the building of a Canadian navy for several reasons. I am satisfied, in my own mind, that Canada does not want a navy, and if Canada did want a navy, I would not approve of laying the foundation of it by building third-class cruisers, which will be out of date in ten years, and which will then have to be replaced at an additional expense of millions of dollars. In building this navy we are opening up an avenue for an expenditure of millions of dollars per annum, and I claim that the country cannot afford that at the present time. I believe that from the financial point of view we are not able at this juncture to lay the foundation for a Canadian navy. We are the banner colony of the great British empire, a fact of which every member of this House is proud. I hope we will always remain part of the British empire, and my hope is that this great Dominion shall become part and parcel of that empire with representation at Westminster. Now, Sir, I do not believe that any man who talks about separation from the mother country is sincere, because it would be the height of folly for us to dream of such a thing. The question has been asked often during this debate if we are not under an obligation to the mother country? Why, certainly we are. We have enjoyed peace and prosperity for many years; true, we had a little civil war which has passed into his

tory, but we have been at peace with our neighbours, and that peace is due to the fact that we have been protected by the royal navy. The mother country has protected us in the past, she is protecting us now, and she is prepared to protect us in the future. And, Mr. Speaker, as Britain protected us while we were young and weak, now that we are older and stronger, it is our duty to in some way show our appreciation. We have heard a great deal of talk about the German navy, and you will remember that in 1900, when the German naval programme was submitted to the German parliament the preamble of the Bill set out that Germany was going to build a navy stronger than the strongest. We all know that Britain to-day possesses the strongest navy in the world, and when Germany announces that she is giong to build a navy stronger than the strongest, we may assume that she is not going to build it as a mere toy to look upon. I believe, Sir, that the designs of Germany are upon Great Britain, and I believe that if a naval battle does take place, the scene of it will be in the North Sea. Germany is not going to divide her fleet; she will keep it in active service in the North Sea, and as Great Britain must keep a stronger navy in the North Sea than Germany has, the contribution of two Dreadnoughts to the royal navy is most important. I think that every Canadian here to-night should be proud to do something to show his appreciation of the good old mother country and what she has done for us in the past, and I think that every member of this House who has the welfare of the British empire at heart should vote for the amendment moved by Mr. R. L. Borden, the honoured leader of the Conservative party, which proposes to send the equivalent of two Dreadnoughts to the royal navy, and to send it at once. Now, Sir, I have referred to the matter from the financial point of view, and I want to point out what this country has set out for itself to do for the future. We have pledged ourselves to complete the National Transcontinental railway, which will cost millions of dollars; we have to deepen and widen the Welland canal, which will cost many more millions; we have to complete the Trent canal, which will cost other millions, and we have also to build the Quebec bridge.

An hon. MEMBER. And the Newmarket canal.

Mr. OWEN. Yes, and the Newmarket canal. Then, we are also committed to build the Hudson Bay railway, which will cost many more millions, and I notice that the Prime Minister stated the other day to a deputation that he would build the Georgian Bay canal as soon as the Minister of Finance could see his way clear to provide the funds. In face of all these obligations, I do not think we are financially strong enough to lay the foundation of a Canadian navy. Indeed, I do not see that we have any use for such a navy, because if we build the third-class cruisers which the Bill calls for, I cannot conceive of what value they will be after they are put into commission. For these reasons, I shall support the amendment proposed by my leader (Mr. Borden).

Mr. E. PROULX (Prescott). Mr. Speaker, if the subject before the House were not of such vast importance I would content myself with giving a silent vote, but I believe I owe it to my constituents on this occasion to state my reasons for the vote which I shall give to-night. We have before the House three policies: the one proposed by the government in the present Bill, to build a Canadian navy; the one proposed by the leader of the opposition, which I may call the Dreadnought policy; and the one proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) which I may call the do-nothing policy, at least for the present and until the people have pronounced upon it by means of a plebiscite. The government's position is based on a resolution which was adopted unanimously by this House on the 29th of March last. It is also based upon the view that there is no great crisis, and that Canadian loyalty is best shown by forming the nucleus of a Canadian navy, which will eventually place Canada in a position to protect herself properly and be a strong arm of defence in time of imperial peril. Singularly enough, this policy was approved of by the hon. leader of the opposition, and in fact by all the members of the opposition last March and up to the opening of this session. When the leader of the opposition was in London last summer he attended on the first of July the Dominion Day banquet, at which he is reported to have said:

> Some feeling was created in the British Isles owing to the fact that Canada did not, by resolution or by speech from the Prime Minister, vouchsafe the offer of one, two, or three Dreadnoughts. He (Mr. Borden) thought the resolution in the form in which it was passed, whilst its terms might not upon their surface seem as significant at the moment as the offer of one or two Dreadnoughts would have been, laid down a permanent policy for the Dominion of Canada upon which both parties united and which would serve a more practical purpose than any such offer of Dreadnoughts.

So we may conclude that the hon. leader of the opposition last July believed that the building of a Canadian navy would be a more permanent policy for this government to adopt than the giving of two or three Dreadnoughts. After he came back from England he spoke in his constituency

in Halifax, affirming the same opinion. He also affirmed it in Toronto last October. But when the session opened he appeared to have modified his views. I do not know whether the instruments of which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke some time ago in this House, as having been used on this side of the House, were used by his own supporters in the memorable caucus at the opening of the session. At all events, the hon. leader of the opposition has come now to this position, that he wants to offer to Great Britain the cost of two Dreadnoughts at present, and wait until the people have had an opportunity to pronounce upon a Canadian navy. So the opposition now preach another policy, which is called present and practical aid to the mother country. The gift of two Dreadnoughts, they claim, can alone meet the emergency. The opposition seem to believe firmly in Germany's hostile intentions towards England. They also claim for themselves the sole interest in Canada in the diffusion of loyal principles, and some of them declare that the policy adopted by the government will lead to the separation of Canada from the empire and the dissolution of the empire. It seems to me that the policy of the opposition depends on whether or not there is a great crisis in Britain's foreign relations. It has been proved many times in this House since the beginning of the debate that there is no great crisis and that the German peril does not in fact exist. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has quoted high authorities, and the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has quoted the authority of the First Lord of the Admiralty, and some important newspapers in England, disclaiming any real cause for the German scare. The authorities of Germany have also spoken. The other day the Chancellor of the German empire, discussing the budget, said that Germany had no hostile intentions towards Great Britain, and was building a navy only for the purpose of protecting her shores and her commerce. We have also important German newspapers disclaiming any hostile intentions on the part of Germany towards Great Britain. Some of these expressions have been translated by the 'Literary Digest' of New York, as follows:

Germany's Denial of Evil Intent.

Words can scarcely convey the indignation felt by many German periodicals as they grasp the purport of Robert Blatchford's warning to England against the German navy, recently quoted in these columns. 'A flagrant attempt to appeal to the worst nature in both countries at the very moment when the official leaders of both nations are holding out the hand of good fellowship.' Such is the characterization, for instance, of a German resident merchant, Mr. Charles Huchmann, writing 'The Nineteenth Century' (London). The sentiment is echoed in many of the leading German dailies. They agree that no motive in the new imperial chancellor is stronger than that of friendship with the English government and people. The letters of Robert Blatchford have prodigiously impressed the people of England.' to quote the 'Vossische Zeitung' (Berlin), which adds:

Blatchford is a sensational socialist journalist who has the ear of the English proletariat. In England the naval crusade has always been somewhat aristocratic in its temper, but to-day we have evidence of a determination to make the anti German agitation a working-class movement. It is likely to succeed. It is highly probable that every British workman will, before many years, imbibe the idea that the German Emperor is eager to conquer England.

The cunning of the agitation is thus evident. The English are not taught to hate the Germans. They are all the time assured that it is the German Emperor who has resolved to force his conquering fist upon the English. It seems idle to repudiate any such intentions. As long as a battleship on the high seas floats the German flag, this English agitation will continue. We can afford to ignore it, but it is calculated to be a source of peril to international peace for many years to some.

The socialist German dailies, on the other hand, tend to confirm, more or less indirectly, what Blatchford says. The 'Berlin Vorwaerts' is perpetually referring to 'mad schemes of conquest beyond the seas' which it attributes to 'exalted personages.' For this it is taken to task by that faithful organ of German imperial policy, the Berlin 'Kreuz Zeitung.' Germans never dream of invading England,' it says, 'and we feel sure that this latest scare is merely a rehash, for popular consumption, of the one that has done duty so many times before. It urges Germans everywhere to avoid any conduct calculated to irritate the English and to assist the German chancellor in his effort to cultivate the good opinion of the British government. The Berlin 'Tageblatt' quite despairs of ever disabusing the mind of the English of its inveterate suspicions. It reminds us that the English, 'being crowded closely together upon a small island,' are prone to panic 'because of their delicate geographical position and the resulting nervousness it produces.' The Berlin 'Post' observes:

It is fortunate for us that the English are willing to let us use flying machines in our tactical manœuvres. Should they take it into their heads that we contemplate an invasion of their coast by means of the aeroplane, we can think of no way of calming their agitation. Lord Cromer says Blatchford has obtained material for his latest panic from socialists in Germany. How true is that statement? It ought not to be forgotton that no German socialist is in a position to obtain information which is out of the reach of the German chancellor, and, in fact, which the chancellor says has no existence.

The real explanation of the latest English scare is the desire of many influential interests in London to prevent all understandings between the two powers. The attempt will unquestionably meet with some measure of success. The English distrusts us and they are likely to distrust us for a long time. That need not discourage us in our efforts to culti-

vate friendly relations with them. But we must be prepared for exasperations.

The government of Canada, in coming to a commercial understanding only the other day with Germany, has also tended to remove any friction which may exist between England and Germany. As my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has said, there have been many scares before. Russia was at one time a chronic bogey and there have also been French scares. Before the entente cordiale, England was very suspicious of the intentions of France. Canada, in building a navy, is simply carrying out the traditional policy laid down by Great Britain as far back as 1862. In that year, a resolution was passed by the imperial parliament enunciating the principle that the colonies exercising the rights of self-government ought to undertake the responsibility of providing for their own internal order and security and assisting in their own internal defence. This principle was embodied in the Naval Defence Act of 1865, which empowered colonial governments to provide men and vessels of war, the same to be available for service in the royal navy when an offer is made by the government of a colony to place them at the disposal of the imperial government.

The main objection of those who favour the attitude taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is that the building of a Canadian navy will involve a heavy expenditure. This was the main argument of the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Lortie) who spoke to-night. Well, it is true that a Canadian navy will cost something. It is calculated that it will cost about three per cent of our revenue. But is that too heavy a price to pay for the protection of Canadian commerce and the maintaining of our position in the British empire? Should the policy advocated by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) prevail, that would in all likelihood involve separation from the empire; and then, if Canada were independent or became part of the United States, the burden of the Canadian people for the purposes of naval defence would be much heavier than if she remained a part of the British empire.

In my opinion, if a consultation of the people were had on this Bill, the great majority in Quebec, as in the other provinces, would vote for doing something—either build a Canadian navy or give a contribution. The people throughout Canada understand their duty, and I do not think we need resort to a plebiscite to inform ourselves as to their views. The Canadian press is almost unanimous in advocating the building of a Canadian navy or doing something to help the mother country by way of gift or contribution; and the representatives of the people in this House have duties to perform, the most important of which is to provide for the safety, peace and good government of this country. We do not need to ask people for advice in these matters. Great questions have been decided before and important steps taken in the political history of our country without any resort to a plebiscite. When the Canadian militia was established in 1868, there was no plebiscite. Before the various Canadian provinces went into confederation, there was no plebiscite to ascertain whether the people in each province were in favour of that change.

We also have the objection raised that in this country we are not able to build a navy; and those who raise that objection are not the ones who are in favour of the statu quo but are those who want to make a gift or contribution to the mother country. For my part I think that the hon. members who raise that objection cannot have much pride or confidence in their own country or the capabilities of our own people. To decide whether our people have the ability to organize a Canadian navy, we need only study history. Take the great works which have been built in this country. Take the building of the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway, the Intercolonial, the Canadian Northern and the Transcontinental, take our Canadian banking and insurance systems and the development of our other great enterprises—all these bear testimony to the ability of Canadians to manage their own affairs and build their own industries. The hon. member from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) said he would be in favour of the government policy if two Dreadnoughts were added to the ships to be built. Well, in that respect I differ from him; but if there are other ships to be built than those proposed by the government, I would like these to be merchant ships. I believe that these should be built as a corollary to our war vessels. They would carry food to the British navy in time of war, free of cost, and have in this way real commercial value. They would afford also training to our seamen in the art of peaceful trade; and if we should build these ships to carry Canadian cereals, meats and dairy products for the consumption of the imperial navy, we would relieve Great Britain's burden, build up a mercantile marine, and remove competition from Canadian farmers in the markets of the world. Canada's reputation and self-respect would best be maintained, so long as she remains within the empire, by continuing to control her own national politics. Australia and New Zealand are doing this, South Africa is also doing it, each part of the empire is

doing it in its own way, and is thereby best promoting its own national strength. Mr. Goldwin Smith is reported to have said:

If Canada has a navy, it will be necessary to determine very clearly with whom rests the declaration of war.

This is what seems to worry the hon. member for St. Anne, Montreal, who spoke the other day. The existence of a Canadian navy will not in any way affect Canada's liability to be involved in British wars. Whether we have a navy of our own, or pay the British government for our protection, or continue to pay nothing for naval purposes, so long as Canada is part of the British empire it will be liable to attack by any nation with which Great Britain is at war, and we may be sure that the enemy would not hesitate to strike that part of the empire which was most vulnerable and least prepared for war. But when Canada shows its willingness to bear a fair share of the defence of the empire, the King will not, if he wishes to secure the co-operation of Canada, agree to a declaration of war without consulting the government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the House any longer. I will conclude by stating that I am opposed, both to the amendment of the leader of the opposition, and to the amendment to the amendment of the member for Jacques Cartier; I shall have much pleasure in voting for the policy of the government and in doing so I think I am acting in the best interests of my constituents.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). In rising to address the House at this hour it is not my intention to discuss the motion of the Prime Minister, nor yet the amendment offered by the leader of the opposition. Out of deference to the wishes of hon. gentlemen present, I shall refrain from offering any reason, and shall give a silent vote to-night in respect to these two propositions. However, circumstances have convinced me that I should not give a silent vote in respect of the amendment to the amendment offered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). That hon. gentleman proposes that the Bill before the House should be referred to the people by a plebiscite and that their judgment on the naval policy of the government should first be obtained. There are some who think that a proposal couched in terms similar to the terms of that amendment ought to be supported by those who favour the principle of responsible government, and of keeping close to the people in all matters of legislation, and there may be some who will argue that those who vote against that proposal are not in favour of trusting implicitly the electors of this country. From both propositions I dissent. There is no one who values more highly than I do the necessity of this House standing in all matters of legislation close to the people. I am not one on the other hand who would say that there are not times, and perhaps the present is such a time, when matters of fundamental importance should before going into effect be referred to the people to ascertain their will. I cannot agree with those who have argued on the other side of the House, that at the proper time, and under proper circumstances it is not incumbent on us, before launching legislation of this character, first to appeal to the people in a constitutional way. Particularly I cannot agree with the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence when he argued strenuously sometime ago that there was absolutely no precedent for referring to the people a proposition such as is embodied in the amendment of the leader of the opposition. Permit me to quote a few sentences from the speech of the Minister of War, from which I must dissent. He first quoted these words of the leader of the opposition:

No permanent policy should be entered upon involving a future expenditure of this character until it has been submitted to the people, and has received their approval.

Commenting upon these words of the leader of the opposition, the Minister of Militia used the following language:

I will venture to say that no such misconstruction of responsible government was ever heard in a British parliament. The people sent us here for the purpose of dealing with all important public questions. Is it to be said that every time an important question comes up we shall go back to the people, particularly after parliament has unanimously agreed to a certain line of policy?

Those words were uttered by the Minister of War on the 10th of February last. Now, Sir, I contend, in contravention of that position, that this parliament has already sanctioned that principle, and that particularly the Minister of War has affirmed the very principle that he now so loudly denounces. I refer to a motion which was offered in this House in 1881 on behalf of the party which now sits opposite to us, which was couched almost in the same language as that of the resolution of the leader of the opposition. Speaking in the House of Commons in 1881, Sir Frederick Borden himself stated that in his opinion before the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill passed this House, it would be well for the government to appeal to the people. Mr. Béchard, then a member of this House, and a supporter of the Liberal party, moved the following resolution, to be found on page 712 of the 'Hansard' of 1881:

The contract should not be ratified until after the people have had an opportunity of

expressing their opinion through the medium of a general election.

This very principle is embodied in the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition in this debate. Not only was that principle so embodied at that time, and made a part of the policy of the Liberal party, but the very members of the government who to-day denounce this principle as unprecedented, as a monstrosity on responsible government, spoke in favour of it, and supported it by their votes. Mr. Béchard, whose words must be taken to represent the sentiment of all those who favoured his motion, used the following language:

I contend this whole subject should be laid before the people for their decision at the polls. The ground on which I base my contention is that in a question of such great consequence for the weal or woe of the country, the people should have an opportunity of pronouncing on this new policy and scheme submitted by the government. True, this Pacific railway question has been before the people for years, and that it has been the settled policy of the country to build a road connecting the eastern with the western provinces, and that this road should be continued to the Pacific coast; but it is equally true that the policy now before us to attain that end is completely new to the people.

Those were the words expressed by Mr. Bechard in which every member of the government who was then in the House concurred. He went on to say:

We do not know what is the real sentiment of the people at present with reference to this scheme. . . . I believe it is difficult for any one of us to say what is the real sentiment of the people with regard to the question, and I think that the only way of ascertaining it would be an appeal to the judgment of the people.

And, Sir, with those words, with the resolution that those words supported, the hon. the Minister of Militia in this House concurred, he voted in favour of that resolution, and so did the following gentlemen who are now members of the government: Sir Frederick Borden, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the hon. William Paterson. So that when these gentlemen now come before us, and vote against the amendment offered by the leader of the opposition they vote not only that they have changed their policy, but that they have fundamently altered the whole principle of policy on which they act.

Having said that much, I have affirmed that at the proper time, and place it is not only right, but the bounden duty of this House before fundamentally altering the constitution of this country at all events first to give to the people an opportunity of expressing their views. Notwithstanding I find it impossible for me viewing the situation as I do to support the amendment offered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). In the first place, I must decline to vote for that amendment, because I conceive that before we appeal to the people on any question we must first assert our own position on that question. I believe that we have a delegated duty, and the responsibility is on us to say, yes or no, on every proposition that comes before this House. Having said that the situation may be changed, but we cannot until we vote unload that responsibility on our constituents or on the people of this country. That is the principle of responsible government as I understand it. I say that with all deference and respect to those who view the situation differently. If that reason stood alone, if I conceived that I must first cast my vote or I refuse to discharge the sacred responsibility that is on me, and if, on that ground alone, I had to stake my position, and my vote, I should have to decide to vote against the amendment offered by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). But, I have other grounds to offer. In the second place, viewing as I do the usage of parliament, conceiving an amendment to an amendment, to a motion to mean a negativing of the amendment itself, I cannot on that ground support the amendment to the amendment. I may be wrong in that view, but, inasmuch as I find, and I believe it to be my duty to my constituents in order to represent their views to support the amendment offered by the leader of the opposition, I feel that I cannot vote for any amendment to that amendment, because in doing so, in my view, I offer a prefernce over the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). That I refuse to do to-night. If those two stood alone, I conceive I would be well fortified in the position I take in voting against the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). But there is an additional reason. I do not conceive it to be so powerful or so controlling as either of those I have advanced. The member for Jacques Cartier advanced reasons which led him to make that amendment, and he uttered sentiments which not only can I not endorse, but from which I must dissociate myself as clearly, distinctly and firmly as I can. I do not contend that those who feel it their duty to support that amendment necessarily associate themselves and necessarily affirm the principles, and sentiments uttered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, but so utterly diverse were they from those which I conceive on subjects that to me are of more than ordinary consequence that I cannot divorce myself too far from, or too strongly state, and too clearly indicate to my con-

stituency, and to this country that I disaffirm his position utterly. I refer not to all that was said by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, but chiefly to the sentiment wherein he called in question, and in my view laid at the door of British diplomacy a charge of treachery to this country. In so far as his utterances on that subject were concerned, I must do everything in my power to dissociate myself from any sympathy with them. Therefore, on the main ground that it would be in my mind placing myself in the position of truant to the trust which a great constituency has reposed in me, I refuse to vote for the amendment to the amendment offered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I refuse to place myself in a position which I conceive to be rebellion to a great trust imposed so.

Having disposed of my own position, having without fear, and without hesitation, and after such careful consideration as in my view the serious consequences, the great import of this question demands of every member, having discharged to the best of my ability the duty that I believe rests on me, then, Sir, the situation is changed, but for the present I cannot believe under our form of government, under the plainest rules, at all events, rules that are more than plain to me, I cannot conscientiously or fairly or consistently support the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. THOS. MACNUTT (Saltcoats). There is little new that I can add to this debate, and I intend to be very brief. I believe we are safe in assuming that the empire will be threatened with war at some time or other. The natives are arming and the millennium has not yet arrived. Great Britain has been in the past, and is at the present time, well prepared to defend herself. While her colonies were growing, she in effect, said to them: Go on and get strong, we will protect you, and when you do get strong we expect you to do a little to assist in the general defence of the empire. The question is: What is Canada going to do? I do not think that Canadians intend to take the stand of sheltering themselves behind the guns of Great Britain or the Monroe doctrine any longer. I think they realize that it is up to them to do something to assist in the defence of the empire. What line should they take? There are three propositions before the House. The first is that we build a Canadian navy. Some hon. gentlemen opposite describe this as a tin-pot navy, but if it is there are many units of navies connected with other nations that might be so described. It will be, as I understand, allied with the British navy, and prepared to take its part in co-operation with the British admiralty. I am no naval expert. Although this debate has developed a great many naval experts, I do not pretend to be one of them. But, I have the opinion of some who are experts. I believe that the wars of the future will not be fought entirely with Dreadnoughts. There must be other war vessels as well. Trade routes, coaling stations, transportation and lines of communication must be protected. This will be done, not by Dreadnoughts, but by fast sailing cruisers, and the government of Canada intends by this Bill, which will no doubt be carried by this House, to create a navy of that description. It should be a proud day for Canada, if a war should unfortunately occur, when she is able to protect with her own fleet, the numerous vessels laden with Canadian wheat, flour and cattle, en route to the seat of war, without which England's Dreadnoughts would avail little, and thus maintain her identity as a self-supporting unit in the British empire.

Had the Canadian contingents been drafted amongst the British troops in the South African war, Canada would have lost much of the prestige which was the result of the contingents being known as distinctly Canadian, and thus getting credit as Canadians for the good work done by them.

Taking the purely commercial side, the estimated cost per head of the present population would be about sixty cents per year, becoming less as the population increased, and the impetus that would be given to the ship-building industry alone should in itself commend the project to the people.

It has been said that some of the people of this country are not loyal. I believe that Canadians are more loyal in a way than the English people themselves. Their loyalty is in their bones. They may not give any reason particularly for it, but they feel it, they have shown their loyalty and they are prepared to continue to show it, and to sacrifice themselves, and even sacrifice their lives for their country if need be. I desire to call the attention of the House to a couple of clauses taken from the summary of the result of the Imperial Conference, and I think that the opinion here set forth is one which should impress the House:

> Taking, first, the plan for the expenditure of £600,000; after discussion the admiralty suggested that the Canadian government might provide a force of cruisers and destroyers comprising four cruisers of improved 'Bristol' class, one cruiser of the 'Boadicea' class, and six destroyers of improved river class. As regards sub-marines, it would be advisable to defer their construction because they required a highly-trained and specialized complement.
>
> The 'Boadicea' and destroyers might be placed on the Atlantic side, and the 'Bristol' cruisers divided between the Atlantic and Pacific ocean. The number of officers and men for this force of 11 ships would be 2,194,

and the cost of the vessels suggested, including repairs and maintenance, interest and sinking fund on capital expenditure, and pay, &c., of personnel, at Canadian rates, would not, it was anticipated, exceed £600,000 a year.

That was the suggestion of the admiralty, and that is exactly what this government proposes. I understand that it met with the support of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and many others. I am a western man, and I do not know very much about what is going on in the east, but the first shot in the west that was fired with regard to this question was by the Hon. Robert Rogers, of Manitoba, in opposition to this plan, and it looks as if he had been able to force his views upon hon. gentlemen opposite, who have certainly reversed their policy in the last few weeks. There is something else that I would ask the permission of the House to read. It is the opinion of a gentleman who is a prominent Conservative, who was provincial treasurer of Quebec, and is president of the Montreal Conservative Club, Mr. Atwater, who says:

What the Englishman admires is a fellow who can stand up for himself, and what I found they admire in Canada is the effort she is making to build up a fleet of her own. They admire and respect the capacity of Canada and any nation or dependency to look after itself. Hitherto there has been a patronizing air about the English with regard to Canada, because they knew that if we got into trouble they would have to look after us, but if Canada gets her own navy and can look after herself that will all change. The sooner we get our own navy the better—it is a necessity that must come, and there is no use delaying it. We must look after ourselves in a naval way just as we do in military matters. There is no doubt that is the feeling amongst the English people, and they regard it as a matter quite outside the domain of party politics, as it should be.

So, said Mr. A. W. Atwater, K.C., ex-Provincial Treasurer, who returned on Monday evening from a two months' stay in England, during which he witnessed the general elections, and had ample opportunity to gauge public feeling on this and other important matters.

'The general opinion I got during my stay in England,' said Mr. Atwater, 'was that we should earn the respect of the people of the mother country more by showing our ability to defend ourselves than we could by any mere money contribution, unless it was to a very large amount and a permanent contribution. And that would not commend itself to many Canadians, nor could it be advocated by any party here. The opinion of all observers of imperial affairs was that they would have more respect for any portion of the empire which prepared to defend itself than for one which proposed to give a more or less—probably less—adequate sum towards the upkeep of the imperial navy.'

'And with this I quite agree,' said Mr. Atwater. 'As a matter of keeping our own self-respect, as well as the respect of the mother country, we should secure our own navy, and the sooner we get it in good working order the better. It will take a long time to do this, even with the assistance of England's enormous experience in naval affairs. And it seems to me that Canadians should join in this work irrespective of all party affiliations.'

This naval project, said Mr. Atwater, was attracting much attention in England, and the people there were struck with the idea of the overseas dominions building ships and manning them with their own crews for imperial defence. In just the same way the mother country was deeply impressed with the manner in which Canada and the other dominions sent their soldiers to fight in South Africa, where a mere money contribution would either have gone unnoticed, or been regarded as a pusillanimous manner of accepting the duty of defending the empire. Great Britain was very wealthy, and a contribution of even ten million pounds would be a mere matter of empire bookkeeping, and would not tend to reduce their taxation. But actual physical participation in the empire burden fired the British imagination, and excited their admiration.

I think, Sir, that the foregoing sizes up public opinion in the old country. There is one part of this Bill which strikes me as being of great importance and that is the provision for training ships and a naval college. We all know that the old time Jack Tar has to some extent lost his mission at the present day, when vessels are propelled by steam. There is no climbing aloft, the engineers and the stokers look after the propulsion of the vessels, and the sailors have simply to be fighting men who can handle the heavy artillery. The establishment of these training ships will enable a great many of our splendid sea-faring population to learn the duties on board a modern man of war, and in this way Canada ought to be able to provide a large and efficient body of men to man these ships. I should judge that in the old country they are not so anxious for vessels as they are for men, and in support of this opinion I quote from 'The Navy', the organ of the British Navy League, which in a recent issue says:

The shortage of men is very serious. Although nucleus crews are within the smallest possible limit, there were at the end of November but 1,600 men in Portsmouth naval barracks, including stokers under training. This is about one-third the requisite number. As the position of Portsmouth is in no way exceptional, and a similar scarcity of men prevails at Chatham and Devonport, it is obvious that even the 15,000 extra men spoken of would be scarcely adequate to the requirements of the moment.

This would indicate that the mother country would prefer men to a grant of money or even the buying of ships for the royal navy. What we want is to have the facili-

ties for training our young Canadians on sea as well as on land, and the proposal of the government certainly gives an opportunity for this. The amendment of the leader of the opposition calls for a contribution to the old country which evidently the old country does not want very badly, and it also provides for a referendum to the people with regard to the navy. The amendment to the amendment calls for a straight referendum. Now, last election in my constituency I was in a peculiar position. I had two opponents, one a Conservative and one an independent. The policy of the independent candidate, who was a very respectable man, and who was endorsed by a newspaper edited by a clever writer, was in favour of the referendum, and although his party was well organized in the district, yet he received only 347 votes and lost his deposit several times over. In view of this I think I am free to say that the people whom I represent do not want a referendum, and if we are to accept that as a fair sample of public opinion in the other constituencies of the Dominion, the people of Canada generally are not in favour of the referendum. It stands to reason that if every time the government had constructive legislation before the House it was to be referred to the people there would be nothing but referendums, and as we have elections to the House of Commons about every four years, I think the people generally are pretty well satisfied with the constitutional machinery at their disposal. I feel that in voting for the Naval Bill as presented by the government I shall express the feelings of the people whom I was sent here to represent.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Monk).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Blondin,	Lortie,
Broder,	Monk,
Chisholm (Huron),	Nantel,
Currie (Simcoe),	Paquet,
Doherty,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Forget,	Verville,
Herron,	White (Renfrew),
Jameson,	Wilcox (Essex),
Lewis,	Worthington.—18.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McAllister,
Armstrong,	McCall,
Arthurs,	McCarthy,
Aylesworth,	McCoig,
Barker,	McColl,
Barnard,	McCraney,
Beauparlant,	McKenzie,
Béland,	McLean (Huron),
Best,	McLean (Sunbury),
Bickerdike,	McMillan,
Black,	Maddin,
Blain,	Magrath,
Borden (Halifax),	Major,
Boyce,	Marcile (Bagot),
Boyer,	Marshall,
Bristol,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Brown,	Martin (Regina),
Bureau,	Martin (Wellington),
Burrell,	Mayrand,
Campbell,	Meighen,
Carrier,	Meigs,
Carvell,	Michaud,
Cash,	Middlebro,
Champagne,	Miller,
Chew,	Molloy,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Murphy,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Nesbitt,
Clark (Red Deer),	Neely,
Clarke (Essex),	Oliver,
Congdon,	Owen,
Conmee,	Papineau,
Cowan,	Pardee,
Crothers,	Parent,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Pickup,
Delisle,	Porter,
Demers,	Proulx,
Devlin,	Prowse,
Douglas,	Pugsley,
Dubeau,	Rankin,
Ecrément,	Reid (Restigouche),
Edwards,	Richards,
Elson,	Rivet,
Emmerson,	Robb,
Ethier,	Roche,
Fielding,	Ross (Middlesex),
Fisher,	Ross (Rimouski),
Fortier,	Roy (Dorchester),
Fowke,	Roy (Montmagny),
Fraser,	Russell,
Gauvreau,	Rutan,
Geoffrion,	Savoie,
Gervais,	Schaffner,
Girard,	Schell,
Gladu,	Sealey,
Goodeve,	Seguin,
Gordon (Nipissing),	Sexsmith,
Graham,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Guthrie,	Sinclair,
Haggart (Lanark),	Smith (Middlesex),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Smith (Nanaimo),
Harty,	Smith (Stormont),
Henderson,	Smyth,
Hodgins,	Sperry,
Hughes,	Sproule,
Hunt,	Staples,
Kidd,	Stewart,
King,	Stratton,
Knowles,	Talbot,
Kyte,	Taylor (Leeds),
Lachance,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Lafortune,	Templeman,
Lake,	Thoburn,
Lalor,	Thornton,
Lancaster,	Tobin,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Todd,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Tolmie,
Lapointe,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Lavergne,	Turgeon,
Law,	Turriff,
LeBlanc,	Wallace,
Lemieux,	Warburton,
Lennox,	White (Victoria, Alta),
Loggie,	Wilson (Laval),
Lovell,	

Low, Macdonald, Macdonell, MacNutt, Wilson (Lennox & Addington), Wright.—175.

Amendment to amendment negatived.

On the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden,

Mr. WILLIAM THOBURN (North Lanark). Mr. Speaker, with your permission and the permission of the members of this House, I would like to offer a few remarks on this most important question. You will agree with me that the air of this chamber has been surcharged for the last two or three weeks with rumours of war, Dreadnoughts to the right of us, Dreadnoughts to the left of us, Dreadnoughts volleyed and thundered—that is, as far as the speeches of hon. members of this House are concerned. I have been much interested in what I have heard on both sides of this House. From some of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite it is very difficult to understand just where they stand on this question. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. M. Y. McLean) the other day spoke as follows:

I notice that in nearly every speech hon. gentlemen opposite profess disappointment with the provisions of the Bill now before the House, on the ground that it is not comprehensive enough, that it does not go far enough. I, too, am disappointed, but I am agreeably disappointed; for, I am free to confess, I did have a lingering fear, if I might so express it, that the government would ask this House to commit the country to an elaborate scheme requiring an immediate expenditure of millions of money which, I think, could be more profitably devoted to developing the latent resources of the country.

Now, how is it possible for the government to carry out their policy of expending five millions of money to build the navy they propose to build when the hon. gentlemen lives in constant dread of their spending any amount of money for such a purpose? The hon. gentleman went on to say:

I also believe that whatever we do should be done entirely in the interest and for the benefit of Canada, and not in a payment of any supposed debt which we owe the mother country.

Members on this side of the House have been accused of disloyalty. I fail to see where the loyalty of the hon. member comes in when he says that everything that is done should be done, not for the benefit of the mother country, but for the benefit of Canada. A few weeks ago, when one of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House was referring to the great benefit which Canada had received under the preferential tariff, I asked him what great benefit Canada had received from that. I thought the question was a proper one, to which I should have received a fair answer; but the answer I received was a story which the hon. gentleman told about a school house, where there was a hole in the wall and a flag was put up to hide the hole. I could not imagine why the hon. gentleman referred to that unless he felt like crawling into the hole instead of giving a straight answer to my question. But the hon. member for South Huron has answered that question better than I ever heard it answered in this House:

Now, Sir, I would like to bring the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite down from the realm of pure sentiment in which some of them so much delight to dwell, to plain facts, every day facts. If I can do this, they will find that Canada has never received one dollar from Great Britain for which she has not given a good big dollar's worth in return. It may be said, and it has been said in this House, that Great Britain furnishes us our best market for our surplus products. That is quite true, but it is equally true that this is a mutual obligation, because Great Britain requires our products just as much as we require her market. And she has never given us the fraction of a cent more for our products, for our apples, our cheese, our butter, our bacon, our bullocks, our cereals, than she could get them for elsewhere, or because they were Canadian. On the contrary, she has persistently, for years, maintained against this country a barrier to our live stock going into her markets. Now remember I do not blame her for this. If she considers such a policy in the interest of her own people she has a perfect right to pursue that policy, and we have no reason to complain. But what I want to point out is this, that Great Britain adopts the policy which she considers in the interest of her own people, irrespective of the results which it may have upon Canada; and so I say in that respect, as well as in every other respect we should follow her example.

I am glad to have such a frank statement from the hon. member for South Huron. When I think of the millions of dollars of textile machinery standing idle in this country and the thousands of people out of employment as the result of that preferential clause in our tariff, I say that the government should remedy this state of affairs in the interests of the workingmen of Canada, especially in view of the statement of one of their own loyal supporters that Britain has never given us a fraction of a cent more for our products than she has given any other country.

Some hon. members opposite have tried to lead the people of this country and Great Britain to believe that we on this side are opposed to granting any aid to the mother country in time of war. Such is not the case. The members of the loyal Conservative party in Canada are ready and willing to grant aid to Great Britain and grant it immediately if needed. I cannot understand why hon. members opposite should accuse hon. members on

this side of not wishing to grant aid to Great Britain in time of need. I hold in my hand the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) and I fail to see in it one word which would lead any one to accuse members on this side of not wanting to support the mother country in time of stress. I shall not take up time reading the whole of that amendment, but will just read one clause:

In the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities, as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. THOBURN. I am not going to detain the House much longer, but hon. members opposite should remember that some of them have occupied the time of this House for three long hours, and for all the information they furnished this House or country they might have taken only a very few minutes. I hold in my hand a photograph of the latest war vessel added to the British fleet, and my blood warmed when I saw that photograph and compared that vessel with the type of vessel which hon. gentlemen opposite propose to build; and I thought it would be a credit to Canada if such a vessel were being built by this government instead of the little river boats they propose to construct. Let me give a description of this vessel in a very few words. Recently the new battleship of Dreadnought type, His Majesty's ship 'Vanguard', left Barrow amid a scene of great enthusiasm to go to Devonport. Her dimensions are: Length 500 feet; displacement, 19,250 tons, indicated horse-power, 24,500; speed 22 knots per hour, and she was built in a little over 19 months; and the thought occurred to me what a grand thing it would have been for Canada if that were Canada's tribute to the motherland, and if, instead of reading 'His Majesty's ship Vanguard', we could have read 'His Majesty's ship Canada'.

With the amendment of the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) I cordially agree. I stand by my leader on this great question. The great Conservative party of Canada stand by our leader on this question. More than that, I believe that the vast majority of the Canadian people stand by him.

My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) expressed his sincere desire for peace between Great Britain and other nations. That desire I cordially endorse, and I do not know that I could do better on this occasion than repeat the statement made by His Most Gracious Majesty the King regarding peace throughout the world. I find in the English press, dated March 3rd, that at a reception to the Archbishops of York and Canterbury and the members of the convocation of each diocese, King Edward made some noteworthy comments on peace, in reply to the address presented to him.

Mr. NESBITT. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to quote the King.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has already been ruled in the British House and in this House the other night that the name of His Majesty the King, or His Excellency the Governor General cannot be used in debate.

Mr. THOBURN. I can read the item without referring to the King.

Mr. SPEAKER. That would be an evasion. The practice has been not to allow any reference to any remarks by His Majesty.

Mr. THOBURN. Then I can express my own sentiments with reference to the matter. Your recognition of my efforts to maintain the peace of the world gives me pleasure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT. My point of order is that the hon. gentleman cannot refer to the King in the way he is trying to do.

Mr. THOBURN (reading):

Upon peace the health, happiness and material progress of all nations depend. It is my constant prayer that our country may be spared the perils and miseries of war, which, in this modern age, must involve the ruin of millions.

Mr. NESBITT. Mr. Speaker, I want a decision on my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) raises a point of order.

Mr. NESBITT. The hon. gentleman is still disobeying the rules, he is still referring to what the King has said.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. member for Lanark to acquiesce in my ruling that the name of the King or his representative cannot be used in debate before this House, and therefore cannot be quoted. Any evasion of that rule is out of order.

Mr. THOBURN. I will accept your ruling. I did not know that it was out of order to quote what His Majesty had said at a meeting in reference to the peace of the world. I did not think that it would be objected to by any hon. member in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Borden).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Arthurs,	McCall,
Barker,	McCarthy,
Barnard,	Maddin,
Best,	Magrath,
Blain,	Marshall,
Borden (Halifax),	Meighen,
Boyce,	Middlebro,
Bradbury,	Northrup,
Bristol,	Owen,
Broder,	Perley,
Burrell,	Porter,
Campbell,	Price,
Chisholm (Huron),	Reid (Grenville),
Cowan,	Rhodes,
Crocket,	Roche,
Crothers,	Russell,
Currie (Simcoe),	Schaffner,
Daniel,	Sexsmith,
Doherty,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Donnelly,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Edwards,	Symth,
Elson,	Sproule,
Fraser,	Stanfield,
Goodeve,	Staples,
Gordon (Nipissing),	Stewart,
Haggart (Lanark),	Taylor (Leeds),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Taylor (New Westminster),
Henderson,	Thoburn,
Herron,	Thornton,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew),
Kidd,	Wilcox (Essex),
Lake,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Lalor,	Worthington,
Lancaster,	Wright.—74.
Lennox,	
Lewis,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McCoig,
Aylesworth,	McColl,
Beauparlant,	McCraney,
Béland,	McKenzie,
Bickerdike,	McLean (Huron),
Black,	McLean (Sunbury),
Blondin,	McMillan,
Boyer,	Major,
Brown,	Marcile (Bagot),
Bureau,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Carrier,	Martin (Regina),
Carvell,	Martin (Wellington),
Cash,	Mayrand,
Champagne,	Meigs,
Chew,	Michaud,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Miller,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Molloy,
Clare,	Monk,
Clark (Red Deer),	Murphy,
Clarke, Essex),	Nantel,
Congdon,	Nesbitt,
Conmee,	Neely,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Oliver,
Delisle,	Papineau,
Demers,	Paquet,
Devlin,	Pardee,
Douglas,	Parent,
Dubeau,	Pickup,
Ecrément,	Proulx,
Emmerson,	Prowse,
Ethier,	Pugsley,
Fielding,	Rankin,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Forget,	Richards,
Fortier,	Rivet,
Fowke,	Robb,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Middlesex),
Geoffrion,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gervais,	Roy (Dorchester),
Girard,	Roy (Montmagny),
Gladu,	Rutan,
Graham,	Savoie,
Guthrie,	Schell,
Harty,	Sealey,
Hunt,	Seguin,
King,	Sinclair,
Knowles,	Smith (Middlesex),
Kyte,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Lachance,	Smith (Stormont),
Lafortune,	Sperry,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Stratton,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Talbot,
Lapointe,	Templeman,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tobin,
Lavergne,	Todd,
Law,	Tolmie,
LeBlanc,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lemieux,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Lortie,	Turriff,
Lovell,	Verville,
Low,	Warburton,
Macdonald,	White (Victoria, Alta),
MacNutt,	Wilson (Laval).—129.
McAllister,	

PAIRS

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Borden (Sir F.),	Foster,
Brodeur,	Ames,
Paterson,	Crosby,
Harris,	Beattie,
Gordon (Kent),	Osler,
McIntyre,	Maclean (York),

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now on the main motion.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I rise to move an amendment to the motion before the Chair, but as the hour is so very late, and we have already had two votes, perhaps the leader of the House will consent to my moving the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I had understood that it had been arranged between the whips that we would conclude this debate this evening, but if my hon. friend thinks he cannot do justice to his amendment to-night, we on this side of the House do not wish to curtail the freedom of debate and will consent to an adjournment.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 10, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 153) for the relief of James Albert Green.—Mr. Prowse.

Bill (No. 164) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill (No. 158) for the relief of Ada Ann Green.—Mr. Nesbitt.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Hydrographic Survey in connection with irrigation works.—Mr. Oliver.

QUESTIONS.

LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is the government aware that on or about May 30, 1909, the alleged damages on the electric machinery at the Mill Street station on the Lachine canal, are said to have been caused by the incompetency of those in attendance, amounting from $500 to $600? If so, have many reports been made to that effect, and what is the intention of the government in respect of the responsible parties?

2. Is the government aware that the lights on the Lachine Canal have, it is alleged, in many instances, been put out on account of neglect of duty on the part of those in attendance?

3. Is the government aware that the men in charge of the dynamos in the same station are said to leave their work for hours during the nights when in charge?

4. What are the duties of Mr. Fitzpatrick, employed on the Lachine canal, how many hours overtime has he made during the fiscal year 1908-9, and what was the nature of his work?

5. How much money was spent by Dennis O'Brien for his transportation during the same fiscal year, and for what purpose?

Mr. NORTHRUP.

6. What is the salary of Cousineau and Brennan on the Lachine canal, their allowances, and what kind of work do they perform?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. The engineer reported that two armatures of the old Thompson and Houston arc light dynamos had been burnt out during the past season of navigation, and the amount expended for repairing them was about $500. The accident was not due to the incompetency of Daley and Macey, but owing to the old and out of date system in use on the eastern section of the canal. It is contemplated, in the near future, to adopt the 3-phase alternating current system, which is now in use on the western end of the canal.

2. On some occasions the lights were out, but on every such occasion the engineer endeavoured to fix the responsibility upon the guilty party.

3. No, but a man named Lynch has been dismissed from the service for having left his post during the day time and allowing his generator to run without any one being in charge of it.

4. Mr. Fitzpatrick is employed on the Lachine canal as diver, but when not engaged in that capacity, he is called upon to assist other employees on the canal, viz.: storemen, carpenters, machinists. During the fiscal year 1908-9, he made 564 hours of overtime removing submerged obstructions from weir, gates, sluices, mitre sills, &c.

5. During the fiscal year 1908-9, Mr. Dennis O'Brien received the sum of $665.75 for visiting the different works on the canal, whenever necessary, at least twice weekly.

6. J. Brennan is employed as carbonman at $45 a month, and receives an allowance of $10 for transportation along the electric light line. J. Cousineau is employed as assistant lineman at the rate of $45 a month.

COMPANY PROMOTERS.

Mr. LEWIS:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Justice been called to the recent revelations in the columns of 'Saturday Night,' of Toronto, regarding the manner in which the investing public has been victimized by company promoters?

2. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation which will safeguard the interests of the public as against the class of promoters referred to?

3. Will the government introduce legislation to prohibit the use of public subscriptions for promotion expenses, or in some other form put an end to the system by which the moneys of innocent investors are allowed to be gathered in by unscrupulous promoters, and expended without benefit to the subscribers?

4. With whom lies the responsibility for the prosecution of such individuals as have been exposed by 'Saturday Night,' as in the reported case of G. H. Munroe and other individuals of the same class?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH:

1. Not otherwise than by seeing some of the articles referred to.

2 and 3. Some amendments to the Companies Act have been under consideration, but it is scarcely probable that legislation on the subject can be dealt with during the present session.

4. The responsibility for the prosecution of offences against the criminal law rests upon the authorities of the province, who are charged with the duty of seeing to the administration of justice in the province.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY SLEEPING CARS.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Are the two sleeping cars now in course of construction for the Intercolonial railway, under the contract with the Silliker Car Company of Halifax, to be paid for out of capital account or out of current revenue account?

2. If these cars are renewals and payable out of the revenue, why are they not being built by the railway authorities in the new shops equipped for construction work in Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Out of revenue equipment account, provided for out of revenue.

2. Owing to the fact that repair work accumulated somewhat, awaiting the completion and equipment of the new shops, it was thought advisable to devote all the energy of the staff for the present to placing the existing rolling stock in first-class condition.

MAILS IN COUNTY OF FRONTENAC.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mail to and from Whitmount post office in the county of Frontenac?

2. What other post offices are on his route?

3. Is the service to Whitmount and the other post offices on the route a daily, triweekly or semi-weekly service?

4. What is the annual revenue of each post office on this route and what is the remuneration of the mail carrier?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1 and 2. Whitmount post office is served on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays by Howard M. Wenborn, contractor for the mail service between Kingston and Willetsholme. The other offices served by this contractor are: Willetsholme, Pittsferry, Eric and Barriefield. The contractor is paid $400 per annum. Whitmount is also served on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, by Thomas Driscoll, contractor for the mail service between D'Arcy and Kingston, during the time the ferry is in operation between Howe island and the main shore. The other offices served by this contractor are: D'Arcy, Howe Island, Eric and Barriefield. The contractor is paid $580 per annum.

3. The service of Whitmount is daily when the ferry is in operation and triweekly the balance of the year. Eric and Barriefield receive a daily service and D'Arcy, Howe Island, Pittsferry, and Willetsholme three times a week.

4. (a) D'Arcy, $12 revenue; Howe Island, $35 revenue; Whitmount, $36.08 revenue (11 months); Eric, $44 revenue; Barriefield, $251 revenue; Pittsferry, $53.70 revenue; Willetsholme, $61 revenue. (b) Included in answer to questions 1 and 2.

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. SPROULE:

Referring to the report of the Civil Service Royal Commission, composed of J. M. Courtney, C.M.G., of Ottawa, Thos. Fyshe, Esq., of Montreal, and P. G. Bazin, Esq., of Quebec, which contains the following statement:—'Your commission have now to draw attention to a deserving body of men who carry on their work at great hazard to themeslves, namely, the railway mail clerks. A railway mail clerk suffers many hardships in his daily avocation. He is placed in a car next to the engine, although the vibration may be greater than it would be if the car were otherwise placed, yet the ceaseless strain in his daily work tends to the shattering of his nerves and leads to other physical defects. The commissioners recommend the the Railway Commissioners be authorized and requested to have plans prepared for proper standard mail cars to be placed on the several lines of railways in Canada,' has the government provided for carrying out that recommendation? If not, is it their intention to do so?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

The department, at a time considerably previous to the recommendation made by the commission in reference to mail cars, had approached the different railways in regard to improving the character and size of the cars in which the railway mail work is performed. All new cars are now built under the supervision of a departmental officer, who is thoroughly conversant with the requirements of the service both as regards size and equipment. No car is built by the railway without first notifying the department, so that they may receive the services of the above officer, and when finished, before being placed on the road, are inspected by such officer, and the department notified as to whether such cars are suitable or not.

NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING.

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. Does the government intend to use Canadian stone in the construction of the new

government departmental building on Sussex street?

2. Have the architects been instructed by the minister to specify Canadian stone?

3. If so, what kind of stone will be specified, sandstone, limestone or granite?

4. Will the plans be prepared by the government architects, or others chosen outside the government service?

5. When will tenders be called for the said departmental building on Sussex street?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. All these matters are under consideration.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, any one who has observed the evolution of this Bill now before the House and has watched its history since it first saw the light on the 3rd of February last, must, I am sure, be convinced that at its conception some irate goddess was present to throw the apple of discord into Canadian politics. We have spent a considerable time in the discussion of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment, on the motion for the second reading of this Bill, and now that the decks have been cleared and both amendments disposed of, we are face to face with the Bill itself. I have no hesitation, Sir, in expressing my frank opinion that the measure at present before the House is one quite beyond the competency of this House to pass, and, I believe that if this House presumes to pass the present measure, and if the humblest township council in my constituency should the following day pass a by-law to repeal it, one enactment would be just as valid as the other, and each equally ridiculous. Of course it must be admitted that there are two views as to the position occupied by this House. On the one hand there is the view of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, as laid down by him in addressing the Ontario Club in Toronto on the 5th of January last, and quoting from the 'Globe' of the 6th of January, I find that the right hon. gentleman stated his views with regard to the powers of this parliament in the following language:

> We are under the suzerainty of the King of England; we are his loyal subjects; we bow the knee to him, but the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our own Canadian parliament.

I quite admit, Sir, that if that view of the law is correct, then this Act is beyond question within the competency of this parliament. But, there is another view of the law, and I venture to say that this other view is held by every judge, every lawyer, every statesman in the empire with the single exception of the Prime Minister of Canada. It would be idle for me to occupy time here to-day to try to convince the members of this House that we are legislating here exclusively under the powers conferred on us by an imperial enactment passed by the parliament of the motherland. That which gives can take away, and however improbable it may be and however unfortunate the results might be if the imperial parliament were to repeal the British North America Act, still it is idle for any of us to pretend for a moment that the imperial parliament has not that power. If there were any doubt on the subject, it would surely be settled by the history of such questions as our Copyright Act, with regard to which it was held that this House had no power to pass legislation which was repugnant to legislation passed by the imperial parliament. Our courts in Canada have again and again held to the same effect. While some hon. gentlemen may think there is magic in the words 'exclusive right' in the British North America Act with regard to certain subjects of legislation conferred on this parliament, the courts of the land have held, and their decision has never been contested that when the word 'exclusive' is used in the British North America Act, it merely means exclusive as between this Dominion and the provinces. A certain amount of power is given to the Dominion exclusively, and certain other powers are given to the provinces exclusively, but over and above the exclusive powers of both this Dominion and the provinces of Canada is the paramount power of the imperial parliament to legislate on any question on which it sees fit to legislate. If there were any shadow of a doubt on this point, it would be set at rest by the Imperial Act of 29 Victoria, the Colonial Laws Validity Act, which provides:

> Any colonial law which is or shall be in any respect repugnant to the provisions of any Act of parliament extending to the colony to which such law may relate, or repugnant to any order or regulation made under authority of such Act of parliament, or having in the colony the force and effect of such Act, shall be read subject to such Act, order, or regulation, and shall, to the extent of such repugnancy, but not otherwise, be and remain absolutely void and inoperative.

Without occupying further time on this point, I submit that it is perfectly clear that the position taken by the right hon. the First Minister at Toronto on the fifth of January last is one that he would hardly care to defend on the floor of this House.

Then, if the other view be taken, that we are subject to the legislative powers of the imperial parliament, we are subject and bound in the same way that it is bound, with regard to one of the great

sources of power, and that is the royal prerogative. There is sometimes a great deal said about the royal prerogative by those who, one is inclined to suspect, do not quite understand what it means. Those who have studied the subject know that the royal prerogative is not a matter of to-day nor of yesterday, but that in the dim and distant days of the past, before parliament was ever dreamed of, there was a mass of law, which, with the subsequent accretions, makes the common law of England to-day; and the executive officer who administered that law was the King, who thus acquired prerogatives; and to-day the King possesses every prerogative possessed by any King of England for the last thousand years, save and except so far as that has been limited by statutory legislation.

It may be said by some hon. gentlemen that we in this country have from time to time limited the royal prerogative, and so we have. We have limited it in the past and we can limit it in the future; but it depends altogether on what branch of the royal prerogative we propose to touch. The standard works on the royal prerogative point out that among the subjects to which it extends there are some which are local in England—for example, the power to pardon an offence. Similarly the exercise of the power of pardon in Canada is local, attached only to this country, and we have a right in the proper way to regulate the exercise of that prerogative—not by this House, but by the constitutional advisers of His Excellency in a manner with which this House has nothing to do. All that this House can do is to punish the constitutional advisers of His Excellency if they do wrong; but the power of pardon is altogether outside of the legislative branch of our system.

Then, there is another branch of the royal prerogative which extends throughout the whole empire, which is the basis of the empire, upon which it may be said that the empire rests. Surely it cannot be contended that this parliament has any power under the British North America Act to interefere with a prerogative which extends throughout the empire and is one of the foundation stones on which the empire itself rests. One has only to remember the situation of the King in olden days to see how this prerogative arose. The King lead his people to war, fought at the head of his people, often stained the battlefield with his blood, and consequently as the warchief of the people acquired certain prerogatives, such as the right to make war, the right to make peace, the right to make treaties, the right to send ambassadors to other countries; and there is nothing in the statute-book of Great Britain, and there can be nothing in the statute-books of this country, giving us the right to interfere with any of these prerogatives of the King.

Then, the king had other prerogatives acquired as the great landlord of the country. Among these was the right of forfeiture and escheat. An escheat arising within the bounds of Canada might be held, as it has been held by our courts, to be a colonial matter, and the Crown, as represented by the Lieutenant Governor of a province, might exercise that right. But it has been held, in a case in which an estate in England, belonging to a man residing in New South Wales, who had committed a felony, was forfeited to the Crown, that the Crown, as represented by the authorities in England, was entitled to a portion of the estate. The man went to New South Wales, and while there committed a crime, and the question was, how was his estate to be escheated, if at all? But the courts held, that inasmuch as the royal prerogative was not confined to the soil of England, but extended to wherever the flag of England floated, forfeiture in New South Wales was as complete as it was in England. So that unless we take the position that this parliament has a right to deal with matters which appertain to the royal prerogative applied to imperial matters we have a right to say that this Bill is ultra vires.

How am I justified in saying that this Bill deals with matters which can only be dealt with by the royal prerogative? Simply because if you look at the statute-book of England, you will fail to find one word that limits or fetters the royal prerogative with regard to control of the navy. The army and navy formerly stood on the same footing. The people of England for centuries have had such an inherent dread of the danger of a standing army to their permanent liberties, that they have always kept control of the army by legislation, so that even the Mutiny Act had to be passed every year. But the navy has always been the idol of the people of England, for they have felt that they owe their supremacy on the seas to the navy, and they have been willing to leave the control of it in the hands of the sovereign. A thousand years ago the king's prerogative extended to the navy to such an extent that he could levy a tax for its support. The old Saxon 'Chronicle' of 1008 tells us that Ethelred taxed every 300 miles of land with the cost of a ship. Later, in the days of the Plantagenets, when a navy was required by Richard, we find that some of the vessels were built and paid for out of the royal purse, which in those days was practically for the public, though they had no control over it. Many of the vessels of the royal navy, in those days, were mercenaries, hired and paid for out of the royal purse alone, and parliament never pretended in any way to interfere.

In the reign of Edward III., the Lord

High Admiral of England was appointed, and he continued until 1708, until the death of Prince George of Denmark, the last High Admiral. But his place was taken by the board of commissioners with the same power, so that practically, with only the difference of a change of name, the Lord High Admiral continued from Edward III., 1700, until the present day. Even in the days of the Spanish Armada, when the Crown rallied the ships to protect the land, it was the royal power that acted, and although there were 170 ships in the royal fleet at that time, only some 34 were actually vessels of the royal navy. The others were hired and paid for out of the royal purse. Thus the royal prerogative continued all down the line.

Coming to modern days, we find that the Board of Admiralty in England controls the navy. Whatever the Lord High Admiral did in days gone by, he does still, and parliament in no way interferes, except to furnish the funds for maintaining the navy, and leaves the control of the navy, as it always has been, in the hands of the sovereign. If there were any doubt about that, an Act was passed, 28 Victoria, to make better provision for the naval defence of the empire, and any pretense which this Bill has to validity at all must be based on the Act, 29 Victoria, and the Act of 1909 of the imperial parliament, which recognizes and is founded upon this Defence Act of 1865. What is the imperial statute of 1865 with regard to navies being founded by colonies? It is provided in the third section as follows:

> In any colony it shall be lawful for the proper legislative authority, with the approval of Her Majesty in Council, from time to time, to make provision for effecting at the expense of the colonies all or any of the purposes following:—First, for providing, maintaining and using a vessel or vessels of war——

That seems to be the object of this Bill.

> —subject to such conditions and for such purposes as Her Majesty in Council from time to time approves.

In this statute we have thus a clear and unmistakable expression of the opinion of the imperial parliament as to the rights which the colonies had regarding the founding of a navy. Then, in 1909, another Act was passed to amend the Act I have just read, entitled the Colonial Naval Defence Act of 1865, and I presume it is a fair conclusion to draw that, if after the excitement of last year, if after all the imperial conferences on the subject of defence, if after the famous resolution of the 29th March, 1909, had been submitted to the imperial authorities—if after all these the imperial parliament saw fit to pass an Act to give certain powers to the colonies, it is a fair presumption that the colonies would not have those powers if that Act had not passed. Otherwise, we must assume that the imperial parliament was ignorant of the laws they had adopted, and had passed a Colonial Defence Act for the purpose of giving the colonies powers they already possessed.

This Act of last year gives the colonies the power to provide that volunteers raised in the colonies shall form part of the royal naval volunteer reserve, so that the most important part of this Bill is clearly based on the imperial legislation of last session. I have contended that all along the line the sovereign, by his prerogative power is the commander of the navy. If we look at the British North America Act, clause 15, we find a significant expression used. The British North America Act does not profess to give any new powers to the King. It seems to follow in the footsteps of the famous statute of Charles II., which recognized the power the King already had; and so this section 15 of the British North America Act provides that the command of the navy shall continue in and be vested in the King. The clause is as follows:

> The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and militia forces of and in Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

There is no pretense that when the Act was passed the imperial parliament conferred on her Majesty any powers she did not at that time possess, and therefore, by the careful choice of language, instead of declaring that the power is vested in the Queen, the clause expressly says that it is hereby declared to continue, and be vested in the Queen. But perhaps more significant language in connection with that legislation is this. If we look at the preliminary draft of the union of the British North America Act colonies, in which practically everything was provided for with a few minor exceptions, we find the following:

> The command in chief of all armed forces raised in the united colony, or in any province, for service by land or by water, shall be vested in Her Majesty, Her heirs and successors.

So that this country apparently, in the first instance, had made a provision to give Her Majesty the command in chief of all our forces. But when the Bill came before the statesmen of the motherland, they struck out the clause conveying the idea that any new powers were conferred on Her Majesty, and they determined on a clause which said that the command shall continue to be, and is vested in the Queen. I do not wish to elaborate on that subject, but it does seem to me that when we find in England a total absence from legislation—because the only statute that will be found relating to the navy along this line at all is the famous statute of Charles

II., but that does not profess to confer any powers, because it is merely a declaratory statute declaring what the land of England always has been, and what I submit, it has been from that day to this—when we find a total absence of any legislation conferring new powers on the King, we may take it for granted that the command in chief of the navy was always vested in him. Perhaps a little light may be shed on this, if we look at the proceedings in a neighbouring colony. In Australia there was a movement to found a navy just as in this country. Without taking up time in going through the preliminary steps up to 1902, I may say that hon. members in this House are aware that in the imperial conference of 1902 the proposal was made that Australia should, as it were, go into partnership with the motherland in founding a navy, and the first step taken was this. An agreement was made between the office of the Lord High Admiral of the United Kingdom, and the Commonwealth of Australia, and New Zealand, and that agreement was subject to ratification by the Commonwealth parliament, and it came before the Commonwealth parliament, and is embodied in the statute which I hold in my hand—a statute passed subsequent to the Colonial Conference Act, which provides that a colony can build, equip and maintain vessels subject to such conditions as Her Majesty in Council might approve. What did the Australian parliament do? I shall only read the preamble of their Act:

Having recognized the importance of sea power in the control which it gives over-sea communications, the necessity of a single navy under one authority, by which alone concerted action can be assured, and the advantages which will be derived from developing the sea power of Australia and New Zealand, have resolved to conclude for this purpose an agreement as follows:—

And that is the agreement under which Australia proceeded to found her navy.

The Australian Naval Defence Act was passed in the same session—statute 20 of 1903. There is a clause in that Act which has been referred to several times as showing that what the Australians have done is the same as we have proposed to do under this Bill—that is, in case of war, parliament has control of the vessels. Why, Sir, the clause in that Act does not relate to vessels at all, but relates to the forces. It provides that when the forces are called out, parliament must be notified. Here is the section:

53. In time of war, the Governor General may, subject to the provisions of this Act, place the defence force or any part thereof under the orders of the commander of any portion of the King's regular forces or the King's regular naval forces as the case may be.

The interpretation clause of the Act provides that the defence forces do not include vessels at all, but only men who have been enlisted, and who are serving in the Australian forces—not in reference to the navy itself, but merely a provision as to what they can do with the forces they have enlisted. Then, last session, the session of 1909, the parliament of Australia passed another defence Act, which is in addition to the one I have read which was amended in 1904. The defence Act of last session contains no provision of any kind about the ships, but only explains the powers of the government with regard to enlistment, training and discipline, after the men are enlisted. In that Bill, relating to naval and military defence, there is not a word about the navy. But another Bill was brought before the House, the Colonial Loan Bill, and that provides for the raising of a large sum of money—if I remember rightly $17,000,000. Under this Bill it is provided that the money is to be expended along the line of an agreement made last year between Australia and the imperial authorities. Now, if we look at the blue-book of last year, we shall find what the line taken there was as to the agreement between the colonies, and the motherland. After providing for the fleet unit, and other matters it says:

Further, as it is a sine qua non that successful action in time of war depends upon the unity of command and direction, the general discipline must be the same throughout the whole imperial service, and without this it would not be possible to arrange for that mutual co-operation and assistance which would be indispensable in the building up and establishing of a local naval force in close connection with the Royal navy. It has been recognized by the colonial governments——

That would include Canada, I presume.

—that in time of war the loyal naval forces should come under the general directions of the admiralty.

And so, Sir, the money which the Australian government has asked the people to borrow to establish their navy is to be spent along the lines of an agreement with the admiralty the words of which I have just read. Thus we find no authority from the sister colony to justify us in our contention that it is right and proper for Canada to have a navy of her own, which will help the imperial authorities in time of war, or which may decline to fight or run away and hide as parliament may decide.

I think I have shown that there is grave doubt as to the power of this parliament to pass this legislation. And if there is a shadow of doubt, I submit, it is the duty of the government to refer the matter to the Supreme Court, that there may be no possibility of conflict between us, and the motherland on so important a question. It

is well known that the unfortunate rebellion which led to the loss of the thirteen colonies of America arose over the subject of defence. I can understand how delicate a position the home authorities would be placed in, if the navy which is provided for in this Bill were to be called into use for the purposes of the empire. I can understand the tremendous sensibility there would be on the part of the imperial authorities if they had to consider the veto-ing of such an Act, even if they thought it improperly passed, for fear they might in that way weaken the ties which exist between us, and the motherland. Therefore, I think I am justified in asking the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to submit the matter to the Supreme Court of this country, that it may be decided beyond peradventure that we have the right to do what no other colony has attempted to do, and what, unless this Bill is saved by some agreement between the government and the King in Council of which this House has no knowledge, is in contravention of the terms of the Colonial Defence Act of 1865.

Having said so much on the question of jurisdiction, another question naturally arises when one considers this Act—and I am, in the first place, looking at it as it presents itself to a person at first blush on the arguments used in its support when it was presented. So far as I am aware, none of the hon. members who have spoken on the Bill have touched the point I now wish to raise. On that point we in this country are in a position which is not altogether pleasant or satisfactory—the question of naturalization. I have here the Naturalization Act and also the Imperial Naturalization Act of 1870. But I suppose there is no doubt in the mind of anybody that the law is as I am about to state it—that Canada has no more power to naturalize a man and make him a British subject, except within the bounds of Canada itself, than has the city council of Ottawa. That is a serious matter, and yet the fact is beyond peradventure. A German comes here bringing his son with him and settles in the county of my hon. friend (Mr. Clare), who spoke so well yesterday, a county represented in part also by the Minister of Labour (Mr. King). Father and son become attached to this land and fulfil the conditions of our naturalization laws. If, in an unhappy hour, that which we hope may never occur, should occur and war should break out between Great Britain and Germany, then should these men volunteer in the Canadian navy and be unhappily captured by the German fleet, what would be their position—when put upon trial for their lives, not as belligerents, but as traitors? There is no question about it. They may come to Canada and be naturalized so far as men can be naturalized under our laws, but the only rights given under our laws are such as can be conferred within the bounds of Canada. It is true, the imperial authorities, as a matter of courtesy, of grace—purely a matter of courtesy and grace—are in the habit of issuing passports to Canadian citizens, whether they be such by birth or naturalization, under which they have the support of Great Britain in every part of the world—except, so far as foreign-born citizens are concerned, the land of their birth. That is, the very place where the man who comes here wants to be protected is the place where he cannot be protected. Would it be fair to have a Canadian navy under such conditions that, if we were at war and any man of foreign birth—for the same would apply in the case of the United States as I have just suggested in the case of Germany—were to serve in that navy, it would be under the conditions I have stated? Are we prepared to have a navy under such conditions that when the proclamation is issued for men to serve in it, we must say 'except Germans,' 'except Frenchmen,' except American'—in fact, limiting it to Canadians born? Yet, unless we are prepared to do that, is it right for the government to propose to set afloat a navy under such conditions that a man of foreign birth desiring to enlist and do his duty to the country of his adoption, must fight not as a belligerent, but as a traitor with the rope around his neck? I think that if one-tenth of the assiduity applied to other things had been applied by the government to obtaining for us in Canada the same rights that they have in Great Britain with regard to these foreigners we should have obtained those rights before now. For it is well known that every country the world over considers that when a subject is born in that land he is a subject to the day of his death, and his son after him also; and the reason for the difference in the rights of a German, for instance settling in Canada or England, is that the status of a German coming to England, and being naturalized, possessing all the rights of a British subject, and protected in those rights by the British government, is wholly owing to treaty. Are we to expect foreigners coming to this country to have a love for this country, to have an affection for this country and a respect for this country, when we ask them to fight on our navy in the position of felons with a rope about their necks? I believe that at this moment the people of this country recognize that the greatest problem we have before us is to assimilate the great population flowing into our northwest. We all recognize that no other country has ever had to face so difficult a problem as to take these im-

mense hordes of people from different countries, born under different flags, coming into Canada and to assimilate them and make true Canadians of them; and I venture to say that the best way to make true Canadians of them is to raise their respect for Canadian citizenship and make them desire to possess it. But if we must admit that the Canadian naturalized foreigner is on a distinctly inferior position to the United States naturalized foreigner, then I am afraid we can hardly expect from these new-comers that respect for our country, that respect for Canadian citizenship, and that respect for the privileges of a British subject of this great empire, that we would love to instill into him. I hope the government will take this matter into consideration and impress it on the imperial authorities. If I understand aright Germany has given the same right to Great Britain that she has accorded to the United States, and the only trouble is that the power which extends this right of naturalizing subjects requires a residence of five years, in the adopted country, and we have not been willing to extend the term of residence in Canada to five years, and until we do that we shall be deprived of this boon. I think that even if the appalling result were reached that at the next election we should find that some of these aliens were unable to vote, even that would be compensated for by the fact that by the next election they would be full fledged British subjects with all the rights of any other British subject who lives under the flag.

Now, I will proceed to make a few remarks on the Bill introduced by the right hon. gentleman. I listened carefully to the right hon. gentleman's speech, I have since studied it very carefully, and while I admire its eloquence, while I could even be moved in some passages by its pathos, I must confess that even if I take a little more time of the House than some hon. gentlemen might be willing to accord me, I am only following in the foot-steps of the right hon. gentleman who in 26 columns of the Hansard', had only nine and a quarter that even remotely referred to any subject that could relate to the Canadian Naval Bill. What were the reasons given by the government for this Bill? Only three reasons can be found. I challenge any hon. gentleman to read the speech and find more than three reasons why this House should support the Bill. The first reason was that this House is already committed to the principle of the Bill by the resolution passed on the 29th of March, 1909. The second is that this Bill is carrying out the reform policy which has been laid before the people of this country in the last eight years and that this Reform government has been carrying out ever since; and the third is that the spirit of autonomy, which in some way floats about and appears to harass some of our members, compels us to pass this Bill. Beyond these three reasons, I challenge any hon. gentleman to find a reason advanced by the right hon. gentleman in moving this Bill, or any mandate from the people suddenly to plunge this country, not merely into an enormous expense—though that is the least objection—but to put this country in the position of entirely altering its relationship with the motherland and with the rest of the empire. And when we find gentlemen standing up in this House and deliberately telling this House that they support this Bill because it is the last step towards independence, I think we who are opposed to the Bill are justified in regarding it with very grave suspicion.

Now, as to the resolution of the 29th of March, of which we have heard so much, I am afraid that in what I have to say I may be standing alone, differing from both sides of the House. But I wish to speak impartially, I wish to speak intelligently, and I hope that hon. gentlemen will do me the justice of listening carefully to the point I wish to make. In this famous resolution there are four clauses. As to three of them I will say nothing, because I am not aware that any member of this House to-day differs from the sentiments expressed in three of the clauses. But the one which the government relies upon as a justification for this Naval Bill is the one to which I would like to call attention, and I would ask members of this House to consider, not as a matter of politics at all, for there are no politics in the view I am taking of it now, but merely as a matter of the intelligent use of the English language. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen to read that clause and tell me what it means. It evidently is not perfectly clear, it is not a lucid clause, because the right hon. gentleman considers it means one thing, and the leader of the opposition considers it means an entirely different thing; and when we find two gentlemen of their ability agreeing that it is at all events susceptible of two meanings, there is some justification for going a step further and saying that if it does not mean what the right hon. gentleman says, nor what the leader of the opposition says, then it does not mean anything under heaven that anybody can see. That may seem a preposterous statement, but it is the simplest thing to prove, if people would only come down from the consideration of matters beyond the jurisdiction of this House to a few words in an English sentence. We will try and see what it does mean. This is the clause:

This House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service.

I will stop there for a moment. Now, is there any doubt about the meaning of that? This House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service. That might have two meanings. The words 'Canadian naval service' might refer only to this naval militia, which is to be a part of this Bill, or it might include vessels as well as militia. But when we go further in the clause and find that it is to be along the lines of the admiralty plan, then these words must mean that the House will approve of the necessary expenditure to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian navy; and I think that is a fair rendering of these words. Now let us read further:

A Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy.

These words are clear enough, surely 'In co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy.' Now, no navy can co-operate with itself, no navy can be in close relationship to itself; therefore it is clear that these words signify a Canadian navy as distinct from the imperial navy. I think there is no question that is the fair meaning of the words; inasmuch as no navy can co-operate with itself, there must be two navies. We have two navies, one imperial, under imperial control, and the other under Canadian control. What comes next?

In co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference.

Let us see what were the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference. If we look at the blue-book of the imperial conference held in 1907, which was the last one when this resolution was passed, at pages 129 and 130, we will find what the idea of the imperial conference was. Lord Tweedmouth laid down his views:

I have here drawn up a short statement of what may be called the general principle with which the admiralty desire to meet the representatives of the self-governing dominions of the King beyond the seas.

His Majesty's government recognize the natural desire of the self-governing colonies to have a more particular share in providing the naval defence force of the empire—

And observe this:

—and, so long as the condition of unity of command and direction of the fleet is maintained, they are ready to consider a modification of the existing arrangements to meet the views of the various colonies.

So long as the condition of unity of command and direction of the fleet is maintained. We have our two navies provided for, the imperial navy and the Canadian navy along the lines laid down by the admiralty, and the admiralty lines are that there must be one navy, because there must be unity of command and a common direction. So, we have the navy carefully provided for, and in order that it might have meant something, I think it would have been well if the resolution had gone a little farther and said that the navy should always sail due north by due south. It would have been just as reasonable as the kind of language that appears there, because those two clauses are absolutely contradictory of each other, and it will be absolutely impossible to carry them into effect. There are a few more words which will perhaps help us. I have not the slightest doubt that they had a great deal of weight with hon. gentlemen opposite and with the country. In the resolution of the 29th March, 1909, there are the concluding words. This is a navy which was to be under Canadian control and subject to unity of command and the direction of the admiralty, and in addition we find in the resolution which was passed last year that it is to be:

In full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

Are not these words enough to bring tears to one's eyes? They would, if they meant anything, but like the rest of the clause they do not mean anything. Suppose His Imperial Majesty the Kaiser of Germany were reading this resolution of the 29th March, would he not be quite willing to subscribe to it? He might say that he was in full sympathy with the declaration that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce. He might not want the commerce of Great Britain to be secure, but he could assent to the proposition that the supremacy of the navy of Great Britain is essential to the security of her commerce. He would agree as every one does that the navy is essential to the safety of the empire. If he did not want the peace of the world, if the peace of the world that he wanted, was a peace spelled in a little different way, he might take the words in this general high-flown proposition to mean just as much, and no more, as those which are to be found in the rest of this clause. So, we find the government in this position: They have this resolution passed by this House, and they go over to the old country and tell the authorities there that they are going to have a navy based upon that resolution, which being an absolutely mean-

ingless resolution, leaves them in a position to do nothing or to do anything as they see fit.

One word more as to this resolution of the 29th March. I was one of those who were not present in the House on that night, and I have never considered myself bound by that resolution, not that I care particularly, because the other three clauses are absolutely unobjectionable. I do not think anybody would dissent from them, while this clause I have just quoted is absolutely meaningless. If it had undertaken to endorse the principle of A, B, C, D, and so on to the end of the alphabet, it would have been just as effective. This resolution was brought up on the 29th March, which was a private members' day. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) introduced this resolution on a private members' day, at a time which many hon. members of this House did not think was altogether the proper time for that debate. It was within his rights as a private member to introduce it if he saw fit. But, in introducing it, he was careful to explain that this was a subject which should be kept outside of party politics. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) assented to that proposition. He, too, was quite willing that this question should be kept outside of party politics, as was said to be the case in England. Those who differed from him, those who wished to see a different kind of resolution adopted by the Canadian parliament, thought it would be a most unfortunate time to divide the opinion of this House, the German scare being then on the horizon, and when individuals were discussing a motion brought in by individuals upon a subject which was declared not to be political, but outside of party politics, it was thought wiser to allow those gentlemen to settle their motion in any way they liked, and those gentlemen only who were in the House when that motion was passed would be bound by it. To show the soundness of that position, let me give you this illustration. Would any hon. gentleman sitting behind the right hon. leader of the government, or sitting behind my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, be prepared to put his conscience into the hands of his leader and say to his leader: I agree to any proposition that you may agree to in the absence either of a convention or a caucus? Would any hon. gentleman place his conscience so fully in his leader's hands that he would accept and vote for any proposition no matter what it was about, that his leader should assent to? There would be very few members of this House who would be prepared to go as far as that. Unless a member is prepared to go to that length he could not possibly have any justification for saying that any member who was not present when that resolution was assented to should be bound by it. Late that evening the hon. gentleman who spoke last on the other side of the House, in the exercise of his legal rights, and I am finding no fault with him, addressed the House in the French language. Without the least disrespect to the hon. gentleman who so spoke, because he had a perfectly legal right to take the course that he did take, it is hardly reasonable to expect that an hon. gentleman who did not understand that language which was spoken after eleven o'clock at night should be listening to words that were wholly foreign to his ears. Therefore, as a matter of fact, on this occasion, practically all the members were outside of the Chamber believing that they could do no possible good if they were in the House. Suddenly the bell sounds, the House is adjourned and it is announced that the resolution is agreed to. The fact is that a large number of the members of this House had no more to do with that resolution than the Shah of Persia, because they neither discussed nor assented to it. So much for the first ground taken by the government that this Bill should be carried because it is in pursuance of the resolution of the 29th March. Then, the next ground taken by the right hon. leader of the government was that this Bill was in pursuance of the policy which was laid down by the present government eight years ago and faithfully adhered to ever since. Not only had it been adhered to for some years, but the suggestion was made to the House that Robert Baldwin. and Louis Hippolyte Lafontaine were in some way or other interested in this policy, as it had been the policy of the party ever since its formation, and those who followed then were bound to assist in carrying through this Bill. As a matter of fact this has not been the policy of the government for eight years. Eight years ago these conferences commenced by the invitation which came from Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, then colonial secretary, to Lord Minto at that time Governor General of Canada. Similar invitations were sent to the other colonial dominions beyond the seas and they were cheerfully assented to by all these dominions except Canada. Canada sent a reply, which I shall not take the time to read unless my version of it is disputed, that Canada was getting along very comfortably, that there were no questions to discuss except trade questions, and it would be idle to spend time in discussing the problem of defence, as the colonies could not possibly agree. Then. again in 1902, the right hon. the leader of the government undertook to send a Canadian representative to England to discuss the question, but this certainly

did not commit the government to anything like the policy we have before the House now, because all Canada said at that time was that she had been doing about all she could afford to do. This was contained in the paper read before the conference of 1902:

At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well. On the sea coasts of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that at an early day a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.

There is another clause, but it really goes very little farther. The whole point was that Canada had some good material in the way of men which might be utilized in the navy, and that Canada was perfectly willing to assist in developing this raw material. This was in 1902, but nothing was done until 1907. The government had consistently shown their unwillingness to do anything from 1902 to 1907. Now, we have the conference of 1907 and what was done there?

I do not wish to occupy the time of the House reading; every one who has read the blue-book will remember the rather humiliating spectacle Canada presented at that time. There they had the statesmen from all parts of the empire, they had statesmen from the land under the southern cross and from the South African veldt, from the ancient colony of Newfoundland and from little New Zealand, and they were all anxious to contribute and to add to their contributions. At that time Australia was giving £200,000 a year to assist the empire, little New Zealand was giving £40,000, Cape Colony was giving £40,000, Natal was giving £35,000, and tiny Newfoundland, £3,000; in all £328,000 per annum was being paid by other colonies for the upkeep of the navy, and Canada was contributing not one copper. But it would seem that our Minister of Marine was a little ashamed of that, for he made a speech in which he explained that Canada had been doing a great deal. Why, he said: we have been looking after the fisheries—which is perfectly true, of course; we have been looking after the fisheries for our own benefit, because it paid us to look after the fisheries, and we would be foolish spendthrifts if we did not do so. And our Minister of Marine said: We have been doing some hydrographic work, and incurring expenditure in wireless telegraphy, and he told them we had an armed vessel on the lakes; a one-armed vessel I should imagine. And our Minister of Marine gave these expenditures as a justification why Canada should not do anything at that time. And, after these men from all parts of the empire, burning with zeal for the empire, all inspired with the same idea of doing something to maintain the supremacy of the empire, every colony but Canada recognizing its obligations and wishing to fulfil them; after that conference had discussed this question day after day, then at last in utter despair, when no motion could be passed to meet the approval of Canada, one was brought up by Dr. Smartt, and I will read it, and I will ask any gentleman on the other side of the House who is prepared to support this Bill: how he can look any one in the face and say that the government of Canada was right in opposing Dr. Smartt's motion, and at the same time is right in to-day bringing down the Bill which we have before us. This is Dr. Smartt's motion, and I suppose a more inoffensive motion was never moved in any deliberative body:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

Could any body ask for a more inoffensive motion than that? It was greeted with applause by all the representatives from all parts of His Majesty's dominions except the Dominion of Canada, and the Prime Minister of Canada replied:

I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned we cannot agree to the resolution.

There was some discussion, and at last Dr. Smartt said:

Dr. SMARTT. I think it is a great pity we do not pass something. We have done so much in the way of pious affirmation, that I am anxious we should do something of a practical character.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It can be passed if there is a majority. For my part I must vote against it.

Sir JOSEPH WARD. To do any good we would require to be unanimous about it.

Dr. SMARTT. Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL. It is not much good to have a resolution at all if we cannot be unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we had better not proceed any further just now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We, of the different dominions beyond the seas, have tried

to be unanimous up to the present time. I am sorry to say this is a question upon which we could not be unanimous. Therefore, Dr. Smartt can move it if he chooses or withdraw it, but if he presses it I should have to vote against it.

And so this government comes before this House to-day with a naval defence scheme which they say is the honest, faithful policy they have adopted and carried out for eight years, is the very government that in the year 1907 voted against any contribution even in a form that would be agreed upon by the local legislatures. And, Mr. Speaker, if we go back a little further we will find the impression made on the authorities of the motherland by the representatives of the Dominion of Canada. I submit it to the members of this House, who, however we may differ in our political opinions, should at least be equally possessed of self respect and pride, and I would like to ask the members of this House if there is a man on either side of the House who can feel his cheek flushed with honest, loyal, just pride when he hears the opinion of the Dominion of Canada expressed by Lord Tweedmouth at page 420 of the conference report, 1907. Lord Tweedmouth said:

> There is at present no proposition from Canada to make any change at all.

We were not doing anything, we never had done anything, we were the only one of all the over-seas dominions that had not done anything, and strange to say all these that had been doing something were ready to add to what they had been doing, even down to little Newfoundland, but Canada was the only colony which wished to do nothing in the future, just as she had done in the past. Lord Tweedmouth continued:

> But I think it is proposed that matters shall go on very much as they have gone on—

And here is where Canada shines:

> —except that the Canadian representatives announce that they are anxious to do all that they can to expand the interests of the navy throughout the dominion, and in that way think that they will be really giving a great help to the empire as a whole.

That was to be the contribution of Canada to the upkeep of the navy; that was to be the contribution of Canada towards the supremacy of the greatest empire the world has ever seen and which every one recognizes depends for its existence on the navy. The contribution of the largest and the richest and up to late days the proudest of all the over seas dominions was that we were anxious to do all we could to expand the interest of the navy throughout the Dominion. I sincerely hope that the right hon. gentleman will not any longer continue the policy which he says he has followed for the last eight years. If this which I have just read is to be the result of the impression as to his policy made on the minds of statesmen in other parts of the empire, then the sooner the right hon. gentleman changes his policy the better. In 1909, another conference was held, but I shall say nothing about that further than to mention that in this conference the delegates from the various parts of the empire found that the same difficulty existed which then existed in 1902. The papers are not as voluminous concerning this conference, for instead of giving us a shorthand report of the conference of 1909 as in 1907 and 1902, only a summary is given, and one can quite understand that the statesmen at the head of the empire, knowing that countless millions of youths were growing up in different parts of the empire whose minds they wished to be filled with patriotic loyal sentiments as they grew up, prefered that no more literature of the stamp of the report of the 1907 conference should be put in the hands of these British youths. But this does appear from the 1909 conference: that while all the other dominions were all willing to do something, and Australia was taking steps to furnish the unit that was desired by the British admiralty, there were two things agreed upon by the admiralty and insisted on again and again and again, viz.: if you are going to build a navy start with your Dreadnought and Indomitable, because they are the only ships that by themselves are of any use, the others being to support them, and for a different purpose altogether—while the admiralty insisted on a Dreadnought or an Indomitable being the nucleus of a navy, and while they insisted on unity of command, and that the admiralty must have control, Canada refused both of the essentials that the admiralty requested. And so to-day we stand, with this Bill, in the humilating position of being compelled to admit that the admiralty has not asked us for one single thing along the lines of naval development which we have given them, and that as a matter of fact we have given them the very things they do not want. The right hon. gentleman will hardly claim it, I think, as a faithful honest following out of the policy he says he has pursued for the last eight years, and if it is, in view of what we have seen I would be inclined to think that the sooner we drop that policy and adopt a new one the better.

But, the right hon. gentleman seemed to enthuse his supporters with the recollection that the spirits of Robert Baldwin and Louis Lafontaine were looking down upon them. And who were Robert Baldwin and Louis Lafontaine? They were, I should have thought about the last men in this

world or the world beyond that the right hon. gentleman would refer to. The memory of these two statesmen, in the opinion of gentlemen on this side of the House, is held in reverence, and I cannot do better than to quote the opinion of Robert Baldwin given by Sir John A. Macdonald who certainly was head of the Conservative party in his day, and who, when Robert Baldwin retired from public life—and there could be no question that he was trying to get rid of an opponent—offered him the chief justiceship of the Court of Common Pleas in the province of Ontario, and spoke of him as 'that loyal honest-minded soul Robert Baldwin, of whom I always love to speak'. That is the opinion held of Robert Baldwin by Sir John A. Macdonald, and Louis Lafontaine was a worthy colleague of Robert Baldwin. And what became of them? They were the leaders of the Reform party of that day, and the grandfather of the hon. gentleman who fills the position of Minister of Labour, having returned from a temporary, but I believe necessary sojourn in the adjoining republic, and being elected to the legislature, one of his first acts was to bring in a measure to abolish the Court of Chancery, which had been founded by Robert Baldwin, and, which was the apple of his eye. That resolution was supported by twenty-seven out of thirty votes from Upper Canada, with the result that Robert Baldwin seeing his own friends would not support him resigned his office before the next election, and was followed by Lafontaine, and when at the next election Baldwin went back to the very constituency of North York, which is apparently a preserve of the government, because the present Minister of Justice, and the late Postmaster General both sat for it, Robert Baldwin was ignominously defeated by the electors of North York, and a man named Wartman, an ignorant Grit who could hardly sign his own name was elected. The right hon. gentleman has reason to be proud of Baldwin and Lafontaine, because two nobler men than they never lived in this Dominion; but, Sir, it comes with ill grace from the head of the party which drove Baldwin and Lafontaine from public life to appeal to his supporters to endorse such a measure as this on the ground that it is an honest carrying out of the policy of Baldwin and Lafontaine.

Then the right hon. gentleman spoke on the subject of autonomy. I do not intend to occupy much time on that subject, because it has been pretty well threshed out by other speakers. But there is one view of the subject which, as far as I am aware, has not yet been presented, and it is this. The right hon. gentleman asked what is the spirit that inspires the Liberal party? He even referred to the rebellion of 1837, and asked what was it that quelled it? He said it was the spirit of autonomy. Practically everything good that has ever come to this country ever since has come by means of autonomy. It did not seem to enter his mind that if autonomy is such a vast good to this country, there ought to be a little gratitude to the source from which it came. Did the right hon. gentleman consider who gave us autonomy? We did not win it for ourselves. We did not discover this country and capture it. We merely came and enjoyed what others had worked for and won; and all this boasted autonomy comes from the head of the empire. If the boon of autonomy is so great, surely there ought to be a little gratitude on the part of the recipients of so great a boon to the source from which it came.

At this time the question is not a question of fear of war, for war is actually raging between Great Britain and Germany. When we find by to-day's telegrams that the imperial expenditure for the navy this year will be $203,000,000, an increase of $27,000,000 over last year, and that 2,000 more men will be added to the navy. When we find the Germans with feverish haste building warships; it is idle to talk about an emergency or a crisis or a war that is coming. The war is on at the present time. I do not know that the case can be put in better words than these:

> War is deprecated. But as a matter of fact war is in progress. The conflict in ship-building is war. If the mother country were engaged in a deadly conflict, Canadians could not get across the ocean fast enough to the aid of the motherland. But we must remember that our aid is needed now just as much as if a physical instead of a ship-building war were on. It is Canada's duty from every point of view, from our affection for the land of our fathers, and for our own self-interest, to take prompt and practical action.

And that language, which I am sure will receive the approval of every hon. member of this House, is from the Toronto 'Globe,' of the 24th of March, 1909. It is just as well that we should consider the exact situation at the present time. I for one have the most profound respect for the ruler of Germany. I regard him as one of the ablest statesmen in the world to-day, and I do not believe that a truer patriot lives than the Kaiser. I respect him for his love of his country, and his determination to do all he can for it. But Germany is circumscribed on every hand. When we realize that her population is increasing by about a million a year, while the greater part of the world is to-day in the occupation of other nations, that Great Britain controls most of the desirable parts of the world, that the United States by its Monroe doctrine excludes Germany from the whole of South America, you can depend upon it that sooner or later Germany, the greatest land power in the world—and we

cannot blame her for it—must have overseas outlet for her surplus population, and markets for her enlarging trade, and that means that she must have a navy. If at the time of the Boer war the German navy had been as great as Britain's, does any one suppose that the result of that war would have been what it was? But she had not the control of the sea, and could not send an army to South Africa. Germany knows that as a matter of self-preservation she must have so strong a navy that no other navy in the world can control it; and everybody knows that little Britain owes her ascendency to her supremacy on the seas, and that the day she loses that supremacy she becomes a second-class power, and that day Canada will be obliged to leave her, whether she wishes it or not, for either independence or annexation to the United States. When we find that Great Britain is straining every nerve in the present existing war, and that Germany is straining every nerve in the present existing war, when we know that if a conflict began to-morrow, and we had not done something already to assist the empire, we could do nothing; when we know that the vessels that we propose to build would be useless at such a time, should not every Canadian recognize that, whether we believe this or that to be the wiser policy, the authorities in the old land who are on the spot are surely better judges than we? And would it not be better, even if we erred, for us to do what at all times to come would be a source of pride, and satisfaction to us, even if the money were wasted, than to do something now that under any circumstances can be of no possible benefit either to ourselves or to the motherland? The right hon. gentleman has spoken of the proper conception of the empire. He described it in his speech as 'vessels from all parts of the empire rushing on a common foe.' That description appeals to every one; but when you descend from poetry to prose, from theory to fact, what is the meaning of this phrase? What is the meaning of a Canadian navy rushing on a common foe? Your torpedo boats cannot leave the coasts which they are intended to defend, your unarmoured cruisers could not fight, because no civilized country fights with them. They can only be used either as scouts for Dreadnoughts, and you have no Dreadnoughts, or to prey on the undefended merchantmen of the enemy. Is it not a proud reflection that we are building a navy that cannot be called on to fight, and that must either run to cover or go abroad as pirates, cruise up and down the trade routes, and when they find some unprotected merchantman of the enemy, seize it and bring it in as a prize? Surely Canada is not so needy that she has to build her railways and her canals with money obtained in any such way. The right hon. gentleman made one reference that amused me at the time, although it had nothing to do with the question before the House.

The right hon. gentleman went back to the days of Peter the Hermit to find an illustration of the disorganization in which he says His Majesty's loyal opposition exists in this country to-day. He depicted the followers of Peter the Hermit as having been in a disorganized state, and consequently mowed down by the enemy. But who were the followers of Peter the Hermit? Every one who has read history knows that they were honest, sincere men, who set out with the most laudable object of wresting the sacred sepulchre from the hands of the infidels. They were honest, sincere men, animated by a most praiseworthy motive, but they were overthrown and defeated because they came in contact with organized troops of bandits who plundered and slaughtered them. That is the historical fact, and it is not my simile but that of the right hon. gentleman, when he compared his followers to those organized bandits.

The right hon. gentleman said that he was neither an imperialist nor an anti-imperialist, but a Canadian first and last and all the time; and in that sentiment, I am entirely in accord with my right hon. friend. I am a Canadian, too, first and last and all the time; but I cannot forget the fact that Canada is a part of the British empire, so that it is impossible for me to be a Canadian without being a British subject. Therefore, when I say that I am a Canadian, I declare at the same time that I am a British subject; and one of the greatest grounds of my pride in being a Canadian is that at the same time I am a subject of Britain. The right hon. gentleman says he is not an imperialist nor is he an anti-imperialist. But is it possible for any Canadian to be neither the one nor the other? If you are a Canadian, you must surely wish that Canada should either continue to be a part of the British empire or not. If you wish to continue a part of the empire and to contribute to its growth and success, you are an imperialist; but if you do not wish that empire to grow and prosper, and if you do not wish to continue a part of it, you are an anti-imperialist. You must be either the one or the other, and no amount of high flown sentiment will alter that fact. I am not finding fault with any man who believes that the destiny of this country is annexation or independence, or anything else; but I do say that no man can be a Canadian and not be an imperialist or an anti-imperialist. He must wish either to remain in the empire or to be out of it. It is just as well to remember that when Great Britain lost her American colonies, the whole difficulty arose over the

question of defence. History is philosophy teaching by experience; and although some hon. gentlemen in this House have spoken about matters of history and British diplomacy from the standpoints of books published a number of years ago, it must be remembered that history has been entirely re-written within the last ten or fifteen years, and to-day we have the strongest proofs that at the time of the American revolution nine-tenths of the wrongs were committed by the revolting colonies. It is proved that although the motherland was not always wise, careful and prudent, she was a long-suffering, patient mother after all. And on the other hand, American historians, in their later books, admit that the difficulties with the American colonies took their rise when Britain became the owner of Canada. When Canada was owned by France, the American colonies were afraid of the French power and aggression, but the day that Canada became a part of Britain they at once prepared to secure their own independence. So that it was eventually to the removal of this dread of French aggression that the American revolt was due.

A similar misconception has heretofore existed with regard to diplomatic questions, and any hon. member who will read the latest works on the subject will find, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) said in Toronto a week or ten days ago, that British diplomacy has been, if not invariably, on the whole most successful. On the whole, British diplomacy has been exercised with wisdom and success for the benefit of Canada. Any one who will take the trouble to study history cannot fail to recognize that Canada would have been thousands of miles from the Pacific ocean to-day had it not been for the might of Great Britain and the dread of its war power.

Without occupying the time of the House longer, I would like to say that it seems to me that when a Bill such as this comes before us, and there is doubt as to its constitutionality, it would be wise to defer action until the opinion of the highest court in the land is taken. Can there be any doubt that before many years this difficulty between Great Britain and Germany must be settled. Germany must conquer Britain or Britain must conquer Germany, or a truce must be had between the two. No one wants to go on grinding the people indefinitely by taxation for war purposes. When the proper time comes we can decide intelligently what is best to do in the interests both of Canada and the empire. But of all times this is the most inopportune, when the plans of war vessels are changing more rapidly and more frequently than ever before. We had better wait a few years until a definite policy has been arrived at in these matters, and we will be in a position to take a course which will have some character of permanency. We could do our duty much more effectively both to this country and to the motherland if our government would be willing to consult the imperial authorities and see if some plan cannot be discovered which would meet the views and exigencies of both countries. We are told that it would not be wise for us to send our money to the old country to be spent there on a navy over which we would have no control. I sympathize deeply with that view, but it seems to me that the best course would be for this government to meet the imperial authorities who are anxious for the co-operation of the colonies—for they well know that the future of Britain depends on the colonies—and try to agree on some plan. I am not prepared to suggest any plan, but if the statesmen whose duty it is to overcome difficulties—the statesmen of the Australian colonies, and Canada, and the British Isles, and wherever the Union Jack floats—if they would sit down at a common board, determined to devise some scheme by which all parts of the empire would share in the burden, and not impose the whole burden on the motherland, I am satisfied that a practical result would follow.

I say, Sir, that I have that respect for the statesmen of this country, and for the statesmen of the colonies in general, and of the motherland, to believe that such a scheme could soon be worked out. And I venture to say that if such a scheme could be worked out even now with this emergency before us, an object lesson would be given to the world that the nation that strikes Britain must reckon with the forces of the greatest empire the world has ever seen. It will be worth while to have it known that, not only the men and treasures of the British islands, but the men and treasures of this Canada, which is one of the most richly endowed countries on the face of the earth, and the men and treasures of the other parts of the empire, are also at the service of the empire—not the British empire in the narrow sense but the empire of all of us, an empire in which all are joint partners, and in whose affairs all take part—to maintain the security that is essential to progress. I have confidence in the right hon. Prime Minister that, sitting at the board with other representatives of the empire, such a scheme could be worked out before they rose.

Mr. Speaker, in amendment to the motion that the Bill be now read the second time, I move:

That the word 'now' be struck out, and the words be added at the end of the motion, 'this day six months.'

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). In rising to second the motion of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), I desire to explain briefly my reason for doing so. I have no intention of prolonging the debate unduly, but I feel that I should not be doing my duty if I did not at least speak a word to voice the opinion of the constituency I have the honour to represent in this House. The question of national naval defence came before this House in the form of a resolution placed on the order paper on the opening day of last session by the hon. member for North Toronto, (Mr. Foster), which resolution was, later, debated in this House, when the discussion took a wider range, and included the greater question of imperial naval defence. Since that question was brought to our attention, I have given it some thought, consideration and study. Let me confess that when the question first came before us, I did not grasp its gravity, its magnitude, its far-reaching importance to Canada, and to the empire. But I listened to the debate in this House on the 29th of March, last. I followed that debate with great admiration, for the effect of the speeches were to lift the question out of the field of petty politics, and place it on that wider field within which questions of national defence should be discussed. I was glad to note that throughout the debate it was the desire of the House to treat this question in the wider way. There are some questions that we can afford to bring down to the field of party politics, and discuss them along party lines, and, in dividing the House, to divide according to party affiliations. But, when it comes to the question of the defence of our country, then, so far as possible, the question should be kept entirely outside the field of party politics.

But, there are times when it is necessary to take sides even on questions of national or imperial defence. I regret that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came to this House at the beginning of this debate, armed with a speech to be used for the purpose of creating party differences on this question. He came here with a speech which, I believe, he wished to use as an attack upon the leader of the opposition, but, finding no provocation in that quarter, he looked for some person to attack, and struck at the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). At that moment he created a discussion along party lines that might well have been avoided. But there are other reasons why it is necessary sometimes to divide on party lines, even on defence matters. From what I have read and from what I have listened to in this House, I believe that other nations than our empire have found it necessary at times to take partisan sides on questions of defence. But they never found it necessary until their government failed to do its duty. So, we come to the point: Has this government done its duty in the matter of the defence of our country, and of the empire? If so, I say, we on this side have no right to make this a party question or to propose to the people a distinct and separate policy and divide the House. In order to arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not this government has done its duty in this matter, it will be necessary to make a short review of the history of the question. I shall endeavour to be as brief as possible. I will not go back to the days of Peter the Hermit as the Prime Minister did; I will go back only to the conference of 1902. That conference, as we all know, was called by the Colonial Secretary of that day, Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. It was made up of representatives of the various portions of the empire, and the object was to take steps for the inauguration of a defence policy. We sent as our representative to that conference the right hon. Prime Minister. When he arrived, he was, no doubt, received with kindness, as were all the other statesmen from the various parts of the empire. When the members of the conference were called together, Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain set out what the object was, telling the representatives that, in order that the British fleet might continue to be supreme upon the high seas, it was necessary to work out some policy whereby all the colonies of the empire should participate in the maintenance of that fleet. He stated to the conference how gladly and willingly the British taxpayers had borne the cost of maintaining that fleet, but in a gentle way, in a manner that could not be called beggery by any means, he presented the idea that they would be glad to receive any financial support which the various colonies might see fit to give. The first paper read at that conference was by Sir John Forrest, Minister of Defence for Australia. It was a splendid paper. If time permitted, I would read it, but I greatly desire to make my remarks as brief as possible. Lord Selborne then presented the views of the admiralty. The conference then broke up into small conferences, and, after the delegates had discussed matters along these lines, the whole body was reassembled and Lord Selborne brought in the report of the council. Did we find Canada at that time doing its duty? Let us see. We find that Cape Colony came forward and said: We have been giving you £30,000 a year; we will make it £50,000.

Australia said: We have been giving you £106,000 a year, we will make it £200,000. Natal had been giving £12,000, she made it £35,000. Newfoundland had

been giving £3,000, she raised it to £4,800. New Zealand had been giving £20,000, she raised it to £40,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, did Canada do her duty? What do we find? Do we find our Prime Minister rising and saying: I have the honour to represent the greatest colony of the empire, and I am not going to sit back and let these other colonies get ahead of Canada in assisting towards the maintenance of the British navy. It has protected our trade and commerce, our peace and liberty. I am going to make an offer commensurate with the wealth and population of Canada? But did he do it? Did he offer one cent? Not one cent, Mr. Speaker. But he put up all kinds of excuses, and time and again hon. members of this House have placed on 'Hansard' his excuses. He said that Canada had in mind the building of a navy. I wonder if he told them that Canada or he wanted an independent Canada navy. I do not believe that Canada had in mind the building of an independent Canadian navy. He put up the argument that we were developing our public works, he said we were developing the militia of this country, and he even went so far as to say that he had sent some brave boys from Canada to fight for the empire in South Africa. I wonder did he tell the whole facts in that case? Did he tell the conference that these boys did not get away when they wanted to go, that he would not permit them to go when they wanted to go? Did he tell the conference that it was only after he was forced by public opinion and sentiment that he and his government permitted these boys to go to South Africa? The result was that the Canadian soldiers, through the dilatory acts of this government, were the last to arrive on the battlefields of South Africa.

Now, I come to the conference of 1907, and again I ask you: Did Canada do her duty in that conference? Every one who sat in this House during the session of 1907 will remember how exceedingly averse the premier was to going to that conference. It was only after the leader of the opposition, and the opposition generally, in this House agreed not to put any obstacle in the way of the government legislation, nor to bring up any contentious matter, that the Prime Minister consented to go. But he did not go alone, he took with him his Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The first question that came up at that conference was the formation of an imperial conference to meet every five years, and what do we find? We find the Prime Minister of Canada fighting against such an arrangement, he did not want a conference called every five years. I can well realize his feeling. He did not want to go to that conference and sit with those loyal statesmen from the other parts of the empire; he would find such a conference uncongenial to him. On that occasion, Lord Tweedmouth set out the position. He told them that they were called together for the purpose of trying to do something in support of the imperial navy. But did we find the Prime Minister of Canada offering to do anything on the part of this country? No, but we find him sitting there listening to all the other colonies offering to increase their contributions, while he sat silent and did not offer one cent. When we find that even little New Zealand, with a population of only 900,000, was willing to contribute so freely, we would naturally suppose that when it came to the turn of Canada, our country, through her representatives, would be willing to do even better, but she did not even do as well. We would have expected that Canada, in view of what the British fleet had been doing to maintain the peace of the world, had been doing to protect our trade and commerce, had been doing to extend civilization all over the world, we would have expected, I say, that Canada would come forward and offer at least to do something. But she did nothing. We know the enormous sums of money that Great Britain has spent in this country, notwithstanding that the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) stated in this House, and I was sorry to hear him say it, that Canada owed nothing to England. I would ask him, as he has already been asked across the floor of this House: Did not England establish a great naval station in Halifax? Did she not establish another on the Pacific coast at Esquimalt? Did she not establish another at Quebec? Has she not expended immense sums of money freely to extend civilization and Christianity throughout this Canada of ours, which, along with other contributions, amount in the aggregate to something like a billion of dollars? But our delegates at the conference were apparently entirely oblivious of all these facts, and were unwilling to do anything for the upkeep of the imperial navy. When Australia increased her contribution the Prime Minister sat silent, saying not a word, but he called upon his Minister of Marine and Fisheries to explain the position of Canada.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries explained what Canada had been doing. He had got it into his head that we had to fight off our friends to the south, that we had to look after the American fleet—all of which was not founded upon fact. Now, we come to the resolution of March last. Did the right hon. leader of the government do his duty to Canada when he brought in the amendment? We all remember that when he brought in his amendment it was in no way

agreeable to this side of the House. It was ungrateful. It did not recognize what Britain had done for Canada, and we resented it. We would have refused to accept it, but in order to keep it out of politics the hon. leader of the opposition endeavoured with the Prime Minister to get something that we could all agree to and we acceded to the amendment on this side of the House. Clause after clause was pared out of the resolution. It was amended in such a form that we felt that we might for the time being accept it, because we realized that if we divided the House upon that question at that particular time, it would have a bad moral effect with other nations and throughout this country. Therefore, the resolution was allowed to pass in its amended form. But that resolution clothed the Prime Minister with authority to go to the conference of 1909 and do somehing that would be a credit to Canada. Did the right hon. gentleman go? No. I suppose he did not have the courage to go. He did not desire to repeat the experiences that he had had in previous conferences. He called council together, I presume, and he said: The opposition has forced upon us a resolution which compels us to send some person over to the defence conference that is to take place. So he called for volunteers, and he said to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden), an hon. gentleman who is courageous, who has never failed to get out of a tight position: You will be a desirable representative. The Minister of Militia said: Yes, but I do not desire to go alone. The Prime Minister, I presume, had told him to look around and choose out such ministers as he thought should go with him. In looking around, he said: There is my man, that man who presides over a department in regard to which the Royal Commission stated that organization, discipline, zeal for the public service and all sense of economy were conspicuous by their absence. He concluded that he would be a proper person to represent Canada at that conference. When they arrived there they found that the other colonies were willing to continue in the support of the empire, but we find that these gentlemen, after putting up almost all kinds of excuses, failed to do anything more than suggest that they might establish a navy of their own in Canada. The representatives of the admiralty stated what he desired should be done. He laid before that conference what would be the best in the interests of the empire. He stated first that a contribution would be the best. Canada did not see fit to make a contribution. Then he stated that a fleet unit would be acceptable. Did Canada undertake to build a fleet unit? No, they said: We can afford to give only £400,000 or £600,000, and if you can suggest anything that we can build that will be of any use to you, we may begin. Has the Prime Minister done his duty in bringing to parliament the Bill which is now before us? If he had done his duty in the conference of 1902, in the conference of 1907, and now by the presentation of this Bill to parliament I claim that we on this side of the House would have no right to oppose the Bill, but I am willing to leave it to the judgment of Canada and of the House as to whether the Prime Minister has done his duty up to the time he presented this Bill. When he presented this Bill to the House did we find him carrying out the suggestions of the admiralty or the provisions set out in the resolution of March 29 last? Not at all. Therefore, I claim that we would fall short of doing our duty if we did not offer to this House a policy whereby we may be able to do something that will be of material assistance to the great empire to which we belong. It appears that the government have determined to go on with the construction of this navy, and apparently they have set their hearts upon it being a Canadian navy. It must be an independent Canadian navy. It must be constructed in Canada, out of Canadian material, by Canadian people, and manned by Canadians. That is the whole argument, and when they make that argument that is all the argument they possibly can make. They do not stop to consider what effect this navy would have in a naval contest. They do not stop to consider whether or not it would be of any assistance to the British navy. When the right hon. gentleman was making his speech on the second reading of this Bill he was asked from this side of the House what would be the cost of this navy. He answered $11,000,000 or $12,000,000. He was asked also how long it would take to construct the dock-yards and install the necessary machinery to go ahead with the building of this navy. He said about a year. Who, for one moment, can give any credence to that statement that they can develop dock-yards and install the necessary machinery to construct the navy in one year? He also stated that it would be four or five years before they could construct the vessels that they purpose to construct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a calculation as to what the cost of this navy will be. We have the statement of the right hon. gentleman that it will cost $11,000,000 or $12,000,000. I have no doubt that when he made that statement, if he had been asked from this side of the House what information he had to base his calculation on, he would have answered, as he did when the Transcontinental railway debate was going on, that he

had mountains of information. The right hon. gentleman states that it will cost $11,000,000 for this navy, with 33⅓ per cent added if it is constructed in Canada, but the people of this country have learned to place very little faith in estimates which he may give. The right hon. gentleman told this House in 1903 that the Transcontinental railway would not cost us more than $13,000,000, although his Minister of Finance stated that it would cost $28,000,000, and in order that he might mislead the people of Canada he prepared campaign literature stating that it would only take $13,000,000 of the peoples' money to construct that railway. This pamphlet which I have in my hand was circulated in every home throughout the Dominion, my own home amongst others, and if you will look at page ten you will find $13,000,000 given as the right hon. gentleman's estimates of the cost of this National Transcontinental railway. But, Sir, we find to-day that this railway will cost $250,000,000, and if we take the right hon. gentleman's guess that the navy will cost $11,000,000 and work it out on the same basis as his estimate for the Transcontinental railway, then the people of Canada may expect that the navy will cost about $220,000,000, exclusive of maintenance. And, as to the time it will take to build the navy, we know that it will take ten years to build the Transcontinental instead of the five years which the Prime Minister said it would take, and therefore on the same basis it will take 12 years to construct the navy. And, Sir, before that navy is constructed it will be obsolete, utterly worthless as an instrument of offence or defence; and fit only for consignment to the scrap heap. Then, the right hon. gentleman told the people of Toronto recently that it was easy to criticise a government but it was hard to construct, and that although the Tories criticised his government it was a government of construction. Well, I need not go into the history of the two political parties in this country, but I may say there is just about as much sense in that statement as there is in the other celebrated statement of the Prime Minister who told us the other day that when England is at war Canada will be at war, but it does not follow that when England is at war Canada is at war. Let me point out briefly the record of this government so far as constructive ability is concerned. They undertook the construction of a great Transcontinental railway, and we all know what scandals have surrounded that; they undertook the construction of the Quebec bridge and after they expended over $6,000,000 of the people's money on it it fell into the St. Lawrence. What great constructors they are? They have constructed other things.

Mr. LENNOX. The Laurier tower.

Mr. STAPLES. Yes, they constructed the Laurier tower and a gentle zephyr from the south blew the whole thing away, and it tumbled down. What a great constructive government this is? Now, Sir, this government has decided to go its own way irrespective of the other colonies of the empire, and to take its own time to work out a scheme of naval defence. They have decided to construct two navies, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, and it will be no more possible for those navies to unite than it was for the Russian navy to unite before the days of their humiliation when they had one fleet on the Baltic and another on the Pacific. At all events, this government has decided to construct two navies, and I have no doubt they will adopt the suggestion of the Toronto 'Globe' and call the Pacific coast navy the 'Hornet' and the Atlantic coast navy the 'Wasp'. And having their navies constructed let us consider for a moment what their fighting power will be. I question very much if the 'Wasp' would be capable of capturing Captain Bernier on the Arctic. I am inclined to think that if Captain Bernier had his fleet well armed and manned with Esquimaux males and females that the Minister of War with his fleet would not be able to capture them. Does any one suppose that the sting of the 'Wasp' would be sufficient to penetrate the armour of Captain Bernier's ship? The fact is that this navy will be an enormously costly affair and will be of no use to Canada or to the empire. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about loyalty in this debate, and while it has been hinted that some of the leaders of the government are disloyal, the only way I can judge of that is by their utterances, and having read the speeches of the Prime Minister and some of his supporters I certainly think there is a note of disloyalty in them. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) stated that the mass of the people of the province of Quebec are not disloyal, but hon. gentlemen on the other side have endeavoured to misconstrue his words and they have alleged, wrongfully I submit, that the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) has stated that the people of Quebec were disloyal.

I have never had the pleasure or honour of living in the province of Quebec, but I have met many of the people of that province, and I have yet to find from one of them one disloyal utterance, outside of the expressions of the leaders who sit on the other side of the House. In the constituency, which I have the honour of representing there are many good French

Canadians, who are good and loyal citizens. There are also French men and women who have come direct from France, and they have made good and loyal citizens of that western country. Let me give you an instance of the loyalty of these people. A couple of years ago they were holding a celebration in a town, I think on the 14th day of June, and at that celebration the French flag was flown. I had no objection to that, because at the same time the Union Jack was flying, and in its proper place. One of the young Frenchmen who had not yet learned what the Union Jack meant, who had not learned that it stood for liberty of language, and liberty of conscience undertook to haul it down. What was the result? No sooner had he laid hands on it than the presiding priest of the parish took it from him, put it in its proper place again and challenged him or any other person to lay hands upon it again. I have no doubt that the right hon. gentleman, when it becomes necessary for him again to appeal to the people of this country, will, as he always does, in opening his campaign, go down to the province of Quebec. He loves to go there and speak to his own people. I do not find fault with him for that, even if he goes so far as to remind them that the same blood that flows in their veins runs in his. Perhaps he will appeal to them in similar language to what he did when he opened the last campaign, when he told them that he was anxious to be returned to power in order that he might have a chance to complete his great work, when he would be content to say with the prophet of old : 'Lord, now let thy servant depart in peace'. That was an appeal that might melt any heart of stone. But when the time comes—and I hope it may be long distant—when the right hon. gentleman will be called from this wicked world to soar aloft and enjoy that peace which passes all understanding, but I fear that when he climbs the golden stairs and knocks on the door of St. Peter, there will be a little detention. I fear that when the great book is opened, which contains a record of the sins of omission and the sins of commission of all men, there will be some pointed questions put to the right hon. gentleman. He will no doubt be told that he was the Prime Minister of Canada who told the people of Canada that he would build them a Transcontinental railway for $13,000,000, whereas it cost them $250,000,000. He will be told that he was the Prime Minister of Canada who promised the people that if he were elected to power in 1896, he would wipe off the statute books the protective tariff which was bleeding the people white. He will be asked, are you the late Prime Minister of Canada who undertook to construct a great public utility, which, after $6,000,000 of the people's money was put into it, fell with a crash to the bottom of the St. Lawrence, taking with it not only the people's money, but some 128 souls. I fear he will be also asked the question: Are you the Prime Minister of Canada who undertook to put the capstone on the great works you were so anxious to finish, in the shape of an independent and separate navy which would probably be the means of breaking up the greatest empire of the world, which has done more to extend civilization and Christianity than any other empire that ever existed? He may also be asked: Are you the Prime Minister of Canada who thought of changing the design of the flag that would float over that fleet—the flag that has given liberty to all parts of the world? But, Mr. Speaker, is it not too late. I say to the Prime Minister that there is yet time for absolution, there is yet time for repentance. Let him begin now by taking this iniquitous and dangerous Bill and tearing it asunder. Let him not be contented with giving it a six months' hoist, but let him hoist it to the four winds of the earth. I have heard in this debate that there is some doubt as to which flag shall float over the navy which this government intends to construct. I for one, a Canadian born, and a son of Canadian-born parents, will stand for the Union Jack—no other flag will do. The right hon. gentleman may have in his mind a flag of more modern design; he may have in his mind a flag with stars and bars, which as beautiful maybe; but the flag that has waved a thousand years is good enough for me. These are not my words, Mr. Speaker, but they express my sentiments, and they are good enough for me.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I should have spoken earlier in this debate; but as I am only now recovering from a somewhat prolonged cold, I have had to defer what I had to say. Moreover, what I have to say may not be acceptable to either side of this House. I cannot approve of the amendment which has just been submitted to the House for giving the Bill the six months' hoist, nor could I have voted for the amendments that were voted on yesterday proposing to send this question to the people. I believe absolutely in the responsibility of parliament, and it is up to this parliament and to the government to make the fullest and amplest provision for the defence of the country. The question of the safety of the nation or of the empire is of the first importance, and cannot in any sense be removed from parliament and

sent to the people. The men who made the parliament of England as we know it, men like Pitt, Fox, Canning, were seized of this principle, that the responsibility for the defence of the country and the empire rested on parliament and could not be taken from parliament and sent to any other quarter. I believe in such a thing as a referendum on a constitutional issue, but never yet in British history has the proposition been made that parliament should abandon the defence of the country to the opinion of the people. Holding this view, I must say that parliament is seized of this question, and, under the circumstances, must act. And, for the same reason, I cannot vote for the amendment which has just been submitted. The responsibility is on this parliament to deal with the defence of the country now—not at a future time.

I believe that the foundation of national greatness, the permanence of any nation and the influence its people may have upon the history of the world, absolutely depend, and have through the ages depended upon sea power. Pericles and Themistocles, who were the two first and greatest statesmen of Athens, more than four hundred years before Christ, saw this solution of the problem of national greatness. When that little city of Athens was emerging into influence throughout the then world, and its spirit of democracy spreading, these great men realized that nations became great as they became strong in regard to sea power. They had only small ships, the little triremes of those days, but these statesmen saw that sea power was the basis of national greatness. Themistocles said: 'Give me a navy, and I can be in any place to-morrow, but with an army I can only be in one place'. And so we find it in the course of history. This was true of the Italian cities of the middle ages, it was true of the Dutch republic, it was true of Great Britain, and, coming down to our own day, the rise of Germany is absolutely based on the possession and development of sea power. The nation that neglects the development of sea power makes a great mistake and soon must crumble and decay. If Canada is ever to become a community of first class importance, if she is to hold her own on this North American continent, she must develop sea power And we are especially fitted for that development. Not for a moment do I, as a Canadian, propose that we should give up our right to develop our own sea power, or ask, or subsidize some one else to defend us, or to supply for our benefit power at sea. This we must do for ourselves. We have the opportunity before us to dominate this great North American continent, but, if we hope to do it, it must be because we develop our sea power. We occupy what I call the intercontinental way between Europe and Asia. The great track of commerce to-day is across the Atlantic, across America, and across the Pacific, and the maintenance of sea power on both oceans is essential. The possession of sea power is a national necessity to the people of the United States, and they are now spending millions upon it. But the United States is mainly concerned in the maintenance of sea power on the Pacific as against Japan. We are all beginning to see now, especially as the construction of the Panama canal goes on, and a great new route of trade is about to open, that sea power is an essential thing to any nation. I have especially contended that the Canadian people, who have aspirations as high and far-reaching as any other people, will never realize these aspirations unless they develop and maintain power on the sea. We come of peoples who have been identified with sea power. I have heard that a good deal of objection has been raised in the province of Quebec to the proposal to build a navy. But my observation leads me to believe that, if the people of Quebec are strong in certain directions, it is because they are descendants of those Breton fishermen and sailors who first discovered Canada, and are prepared to-day to maintain their integrity as Canadians on this continent by exercising that sea power that they inherited from their fathers. Not only is sea power, as I said, an essential, but it is growing and more and more a necessity in connection with a nation. As I pointed out, that which makes Germany a menace to the English speaking empire is that Germany has at last recognized the importance of sea power and intends to have it. And I do not see how Germany can be denied the exercise of the greatest power in this respect that she can attain. She knows that she cannot expand otherwise, and following the example of other great nations, especially the example of England, she is developing sea power, until to-day she is the greatest force in the world. And she has developed her sea power within a dozen years. Germany amounted to nothing as a naval power twelve years ago, but in twelve short years she has become a great sea power, and in three years more she expects to be equal to England in this respect, and then to assert her right to expansion. I pointed out how rapidly Japan had come to the front because she had developed sea power. To-day she has practically told the people of America, and especially the people of the United States—and is ready to tell the countries of Europe: If you, especially the people of America, intend to assert the principle that America is a white man's country, then you must recognize the supremacy of the yellow man, and especially of the Japanese, in Asia, and this we are able to assert because we made up a navy,

we have trained our sailors, we have built up our country, and we rely upon sea power before anything else.

Now, if this is the teaching of history, how does it affect us? Simply in this way: If we wish to succeed in America, if we wish to be in the empire, and to assist in holding that great fabric together for what it can do for humanity, we must join with England in maintaining sea-power and sea-power of the highest kind, and sea-power at home. I believe that is the verdict and determination of the Canadian people. Give them an intelligent leadership, and they will respond and assert the doctrine of sea-power, and will be prepared to make any sacrifice to maintain it in connection with the empire. Not only do I believe in sea-power in connection with the empire, but I believe that an essential part in the development of sea-power consists in building ships in your own country; and I take the credit of having been one of the very first in this House to assert the idea that it was time Canada should begin to build her own ships. I went so far as to say that I believed in bounties on shipbuilding. We want to build ships for our great trade on the Atlantic, and the Pacific. If we can build great transcontinental railways, we can provide great fleets to operate in connection with them on both seas, and what we require is to build those ships in our own country, and thus develop our sea-power. But we must make a start, we require dockyards, and other adjuncts to that business, and it is because the proposition before the House is a move in this direction that I cannot support the motion to give it a six months' hoist or to say that it is a question which should be submitted to the people. It is high time that we should start a shipbuilding industry, and in some way work it out. If you want to become a sea-power, you must not only find a way to build your own ships, and provide your own docks, but you must also train your own people to become seamen; and thank God, we have the best supply of material to man a fleet that can be found any where on the globe. And if we can build the ships—and I lay the responsibility on the government—we can begin to train our sailors to man them. We can, and we could furnish seamen to man a portion of the British fleet. As Canadians it is our duty not to talk so much about constitutional issues, whatever they may be, and not to evade our responsibility as a parliament, but to begin to train and develop our seafaring population so that, if need should arise, we could turn over to England at least 5,000 men competent to assist in manning the British fleet, and if necessary, furnish 10,000 to 20,000 men in the hour of danger. Let us take our share of responsibility; let us do our part in developing our possibilities as a sea-power.

I want to refer for a moment to the real situation in England. I believe that peril does more or less exist to-day, and I believe that the best remedy to the present situation in England is reflected in an article in the London 'Saturday Review' of three or four weeks ago. The German admiral, who has been attending the German Navy League, delivered an address before one of the meetings of that league, and in that address he tried to draw the sting out of what was a legitimate inference to be drawn from one of the speaker's claim. He claimed that—here is what the 'Spectator' says:

> Grand Admiral Von Koster ended his speech by declaring that the Germans did not think of having a navy equal in size to the English. What they wanted was a force sufficient to protect them against all conceivable attacks. Their programme was to carry out the navy law in all its parts.
>
> The true significance of this remark is very pertinently set forth by the correspondent of the 'Times.' He points out that the president of the navy league and his colleagues have repeatedly explained that this means a great deal more than appears in the ordinary words of the German naval programme. If the minimizing speech of the president of the navy league is construed without sentiment, it appears to us that what the navy league in reality means by a navy strong enough to protect Germany from all attacks is a navy challenging our command of the sea, and if necessary of winning it from us in a naval conflict.

That is what Germany is after to-day. She is bent on the creation and development of a navy able to challenge and wrest from Britain the supremacy of the sea. That is the German policy, but that, they are not able yet to accomplish, as the 'Spectator' points out. The 'Spectator' further points out that if England were to adopt what is called the Bismarckian policy, if she were to take advantage of Germany's present weakness, and not wait until she has, in three or four years, perfected her navy, she would strike at once. The 'Spectator' says that is what the Germans would do in a similar case. I am going to read two more paragraphs which really give the situation:

> In raising the question which, as we have said, haunts a certain number of German minds, i.e., that we may do the so-called common sense thing and not wait for German naval preparations to be complete—we admit that we are touching delicate, nay, dangerous ground. We should, therefore, like to take this opportunity of stating once more that we are certain that the British people would never be induced to adopt what we may call the Bismarckian plan of insisting that the struggle for sea-power shall take place while the Germans are notoriously so much weaker than we are. But even if we thought it would be possible to induce the British public, which we are sure it is not, to change their minds in this respect, and to attack the Ger-

mans before their navy is complete, we should refuse absolutely to advocate that course. The best proof we can give of the sincerity of our words is the fact that we, and what is far more important, all other responsible advocates of a supreme navy in this country are pledged to the alternative policy—the policy of so greatly increasing our own armaments that Germany will not be able to catch us up.

What is the policy which Englishmen are trying to carry out, and which I want to see our country adopt? This is the policy which England has in view:

The policy of so greatly increasing our own armaments that Germany will not be able to catch us up, and that our present relative supremacy will be maintained. If that is done there can never be any valid reason for precipitating a war.

Here is something for the peace at any price men to consider:

If, however, we advocate a Bismarckian policy for Britain, it would not be necessary to ask for more Dreadnoughts to be laid down. We should have a far shorter and easier, and apparently cheaper, way of dealing with the German navy. It is because we are one and all determined to have nothing to do with a Bismarckian policy that we insist that our shipbuilding programme must be greatly enlarged. We want to deal with the German competition, not by the short way, the war way, the way of attacking her while she is relatively weak, but by the longer way and the peaceful way of so greatly increasing our own armaments that she will have to abandon the struggle and a conflict will be avoided.

To summarize the matter again, and it cannot be summarized too often, there are two ways of securing that command of the sea which all Britons are agreed must be secured to us. One is by destroying the German fleet before it has attained dimensions sufficiently great to put our sea-power in jeopardy. The other way, and the way all sane British imperialists and defenders of our sea-power advocate, is a scheme of naval construction so large as to neutralize, and more than neutralize, German competition, and to maintain our present relative position of supremacy. All friends of peace and of the maintenance of existing relations with Germany should rally, then, to the cause of a supreme navy, and should make it clear that it is in this way, and in this way only, that we intend to deal with and defeat German rivalry. The policy of disarmament by agreement, as Admiral Von Koester shows, is purely chimerical.

That is the policy Englishmen are working out to-day, to keep ahead of Germany and maintain and increase their sea power. When Germany comes to see that this is the determination of England, and when she comes to see that Canada, and the other dominions of the empire, are one with her in maintaining that position, and in keeping ahead, Germany will finally have to abandon her design of competing with Great Britain for naval supremacy; and nothing will have such an effect on the German nation as a clear cut declaration from the Canadian people, and from the Australian people, that they are with the empire, and for the maintenance of the empire, and that in Canada at least we believe in sea-power, that we intend to develop sea-power, and in that way to strengthen the empire, and make German competition for supremacy hopeless. In that way only I believe will British supremacy be maintained and war averted. It is because I believe in Canada being able to assist in the defence of the empire by developing her sea-power, that I cannot afford to take the position that we ought to do nothing. We ought to do everything, and my only contention is that we are not doing enough. I would like to see a Canadian Dreadnought, or two Canadian Dreadnoughts on our coasts. But, if that is not to be, then let us make a start to-morrow, or next day, on something. But I do wish to see a start made. I wish to see a declaration going out to the world that the Canadian parliament assumes to the full its responsibility for the defence of the empire, and, without consulting the people by a plebiscite, that we in this House intend to lead our people in the maintenance of British supremacy. Therefore my regret that the Bill is so weak. I say that we are not spending enough money, that we are not building Dreadnoughts. But we are asserting that Canada is willing and ready to make sacrifices. As has been stated in the House here to-day, we see that the British war budget now amounts to over $200,000,000, an enormous increase on only the last year. That is a heavy expense; but people who wish to maintain their position have got to spend their money, and we might as well spend our money in strengthening the naval force of our country, in making sailors of our Canadian boys, in having a naval college, in training seamen for the British navy.

Now, a word or two in connection with this German scare. After hearing what the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) said this afternoon, I do not see how Great Britain can continue to restrain Germany in her desire to expand. A way must be found in Europe to allow the German people to expand without coming into conflict with other nations. I hope that way will be found, and if it is found the situation will be eased considerably. But in the meantime it is our duty to develop some kind of a navy in this country to develop Canadian sea-power, to school our sailors so that they may be of use, almost immediately, to the British navy, to organize a navy of our own, to have a shipbuilding establishment of our own, to have a naval college of our own. Above all, let us say that we not only believe in the empire, but we are determined to remain associated with the empire, and

to that end, that we are determined to develop sea-power of our own on this continent, that we are determined to consecrate all our energies to maintain British supremacy, to keep Britain ahead of every competitor, so that she may remain what she is to-day, the guardian and the protecting influence of civilization in its onward march throughout the world.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. G. WALLACE (Centre York). Mr. Speaker, while this question of such great importance to the Dominion of Canada is under discussion I wish to take this opportunity of voicing my sentiments on behalf of the county which I represent. I was sent here as the representative of the people of Centre York, probably one of the most important counties in Canada, to voice their sentiments on every question that comes before parliament. During the progress of the debate I have listened attentively to nearly every hon. member on both sides of the House who has spoken upon the naval question. I agree to a certain extent with the sentiments expressed by members on both sides of the House. I do not wish to make a claim that I represent the only loyal constituency in Canada, because I certainly do not, but I represent a constituency which, I think, is as loyal, and patriotic, and as devoted to the British empire as any other portion of this Dominion. Elected on these principles, and as I had not the opportunity of expressing my views on the amendment to the motion for the second reading of the Navy Bill brought down by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I desire to avail myself of the present opportunity of placing my views upon this question before the House. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) this afternoon, and I regret to say that I think it is my duty to differ from him on this question. On a good many questions I entirely agree with him, but, as I understand his sentiments, he would vote against the six months' hoist proposed by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and I feel it is my duty, as a representative of one of the great agricultural constituencies of Canada, to dissent from the position which he has taken. I understood the hon. member for South York to say that he would vote against the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). In voting for that amendment I feel that I represent the views of my constituents. While I have no mandate from the people to express my views on the navy question, because at the time of my election there was no navy question before the people, I feel that when any question comes before parliament I should be prepared to take the full responsibility of such action as I consider the circumstances warrant. I believe that there is an emergency at the present time, and that Canada should endeavour to do something to safeguard the interests of the British empire. This will not be done by the creation of a Canadian navy. The Bill introduced by the Prime Minister is entitled an Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada. This force is divided, as the Prime Minister said, into the permanent corps, reserve force, and volunteer force. The Militia Act, in a general way, was followed except in this particular that the Militia Act provides that every man between eighteen and sixty years of age, is liable to military service. while under the Naval Bill, as I understand it, no person is liable to service on sea. It provides for entirely voluntary enrolment. The Bill, though a very important measure, is very meagre with respect to information. We got very little information from the Prime Minister as to what the government really intend to do on this question. He told us that the terms of engagement would be determined by the Governor in Council, and that commissions would be issued in the name of His Majesty. The Bill declares that:

(a) 'Active service,' as applied to a person in the naval forces, means service or duty during an emergency;

(d) 'emergency' means war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended.

That is one clause that I wish to direct the attention of the House to. Emergency means war, real or apprehended. I think that is right, but I remember very distinctly that in October, 1899, it was brought very forcibly to the knowledge of the government, during the South African crisis, that there was war real or apprehended. I remember distinctly the sentiment expressed at that time by the Prime Minister. I remember the Prime Minister, as quoted in the Toronto 'Globe,' saying: That the government had nothing to do with Britain's wars. The government did not intend to do anything in regard to the South African war, a very few days before the soldiers were enrolled in Canada. But the sentiment of the people at that time was entirely with Great Britain, as it is to-day, and it was in favour of Canada sending a contingent to South Africa. I did not wish to bring this matter before the House, but it was brought up by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). He quoted the opinion of a gentleman on the navy question who was in the first contingent. In October, 1899, I had the honour of applying for a commission in the militia force

of Canada. I was one of the first men to apply for a commission in the Canadian contingent to South Africa. Unfortunately more men applied for commissions than could be taken with the force, and there was no room for me. I went to South Africa as a private for which I claim no credit, because I only did what any loyal Canadian would do. But, I take second place to no man in regard to my loyalty to the British empire, and in saying that I do not say that any other man is disloyal. I went there and tried to do my duty.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) quoted a very eminent authority as to why we should have a defence force for Canada, and while that authority may be very competent from a military point of view, I do not think it would be held to be equally so from a naval standpoint. Canada can turn out probably as good soldiers as there are in the world, but I doubt very much if our sailors can equal those of the British Isles who, I may say, are sailors by instinct. I have no mandate from my constituency to vote in favour of a Canadian navy, but I do think that I would be acting according to their wishes if on an occasion like this, when as I believe there is an emergency, I should support an effort by Canada to render some substantial assistance to the navy of Britain. I believe that if the government, at the present juncture, decided to send over two Dreadnoughts, which would be of some real assistance to the British empire, they would be supported by the people of every province in Canada. I would do anything in my power for the maintenance of British connection, but I honestly believe that the Bill introduced by the Prime Minister for the creation of a Canadian navy, as we have been told by the member for Nicolet and other hon. gentlemen on the other side, is solely with the object, not of helping the British navy, but of building up a fleet in Canada which would be useful to us whenever we should become independent. I believe that the creation of this navy is the first attempt since 1867 to sever the ties which bind us to the British empire, and in that view I am absolutely opposed to it. We all should be loyal to Canada, and any man who is loyal to Canada is loyal to the British empire. Believing as I do, and as gentlemen on the other side of the House have informed us, that this Canadian navy is a step in the direction of separation from the empire, I shall have nothing to do with it. I have no mandate from my people to vote for an enormous expenditure such as is here proposed. I have seen hon. gentlemen opposite vote for huge expenditures regardless of the returns which the country will receive from them, but I do not believe it to be the duty of a member of parliament to take such a course unless with the endorsation of his constituents. We have seen members on the other side of the House vote for the Newmarket canal, a useless undertaking which will entail a large outlay; we have seen them vote for the National Transcontinental railway, the expenditure on which will be millions more than the government said it would be, and we see them now ready to vote away millions for a Canadian navy which will be absolutely of no use to Great Britain in time of trouble. I certainly know that my strong desire is to represent British sentiment, and feeling as I do on that score, I believe that the best way to help the British empire in the present crisis is for Canada to send an immediate gift in cash, or its equivalent in effective fighting ships. I believe, Sir, that the sentiment of this country demands that we shall assist Britain in her hour of need. I believe that if this Canadian navy is not built now, the sentiment of the people of Canada will demand that something more beneficial to the empire shall be done, and I, therefore, have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for East Hastings.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). This debate has been dragging its weary length so long that I feel it would be unpardonable for me to take up the time of the House at any great length. I will put my views, and as far as I understand them the views of my constituents, in as few words as possible, and let it go at that. I would not speak at all were it not that I consider this a very serious step which is being taken by the representatives of the Canadian people assembled in this parliament. We are now establishing a precedent which will be referred to in years to come, and looking at it from that standpoint, I believe it to be the important duty that any member in this House who has strong feelings on the question should put them on record. Having considered the question very carefully, I find that I cannot support the Bill before the House. A great deal has been said on the government side of the House as to some change of sentiment that has taken place among members of the opposition, and charges have been made on the other hand that the government have not carried out the policy laid down by the House in the resolution of last March. Well, I do not attach a great deal of importance to such arguments, because, if the government, with the increased opportunities that have been theirs during the year that has passed, have thought it better to change from the resolution of last March, and if they think that the Bill they have introduced

is more expressive of public sentiment in this country than the resolution, then they would be justified in changing. If, on the other hand, the opposition should have the opportunity of ascertaining the public sentiment of the country, would they not be justified in bringing their views up to date, and crystallizing them in a resolution of the House? I find that the government have changed from the resolution of last March in some very important particulars. That resolution made particular provision for Canada coming to the assistance of the empire in the case of an emergency, and, if I understand aright the Bill before the Chair, that has been eliminated. I think there was nothing in the resolution of last March that would lead the members of this House to believe that there was to be any removal from British control of whatever naval arrangements we might make. But by the Bill now before us the control is to be entirely vested in the government of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen say, 'hear, hear.' They are very pleased, apparently to have removed from the Canadian navy British control or the power of the British people to have anything to say. In that I do not find myself in very hearty accord with hon. gentlemen opposite. Some of them have gone so far as to express the conviction that this is the last step in the separation of Canada from the empire, and they make no bones of expressing their satisfaction that we have reached that stage.

Now, Sir, this question naturally divides itself into two propositions: our duty to the empire as a permanent policy, and our duty to the empire in case of emergency. If there is no emergency, we are not called upon at the present time to do anything along that line. If there is no emergency, then there is no need of our being in a hurry to adopt a naval policy. We should take a year or two, and that would not be too long for any government, to take the matter up thoroughly, to go into every phase of the question, to ascertain Canada's capabilities in building a navy, to look thoroughly into the cost, to ascertain the kind of ships we ought to build, and, having a well thought out scheme, have it put in the form of a Bill and brought before this House. Then the government might appeal to the country on that, and, if sustained, they would be perfectly justified in going on with the measure. That to my mind would be the proper constitutional procedure. But I am thoroughly convinced, as thoroughly convinced as I have ever been in regard to anything in my life, that there is an emergency at the present time. I believe Germany means mischief to the British empire. Hon. gentlemen opposite have seen fit to belittle our anxiety in this matter. They have quoted statements of British statesmen uttered in the heat of an election, when they were trying to placate the electors of Great Britain and to keep them quiet until the elections were over. We on this side of the House in turn have quoted the utterances of these very same men, uttered a few months previous, when there was no election on, and when they would be much more likely to express their real opinions. Now, we know that there has been a great deal of talk back and forth with regard to the attitude of Germany; but out of all the fog and mist of words, there is one outstanding reality, terrible in its reality, towering up above like the peaks of the Rockies, something that cannot be gainsaid; that is, the fact of the terrible anxiety of the German people to outbuild Great Britain in naval construction. There is no man who has been able to gainsay that, and no member of this House has been able to give any reasonable explanation of this attitude on the part of Germany unless it means a purpose to go to war with Great Britain. We have had various explanations given in this House. One ingenious gentleman tells us that it is to overawe the United States into abrogating the Monroe doctrine in order that Germany may establish a colony in Brazil. In regard to that, I want to point to this fact, that if that is the end Germany has in view, she already has a navy sufficient for the purpose. So that there is no necessity for Germany enlarging her navy for any of the purposes that have been mentioned in this House, except that of going to war with Great Britain. I would point, too, to the fact that Great Britain approached Germany not very long ago with a proposition aimed at stopping this mad waste of public money in the race for naval supremacy; but Germany, I will not say contemptuously, but at any rate very abruptly, turned that proposition down with the statement that Germany was able to mind her own business. There is no shadow of doubt that we can escape war by only one method, that is by Great Britain maintaining her supremacy in naval construction. If that is true —and I believe from the bottom of my heart that it is true—what is the duty of Canada in the premises? Is it to commence building a little navy, which will take ten or fifteen years to attain sufficient importance to be of any effect, even in protecting our own commerce? Have the government gone thoroughly into the question of what it means to build a navy—of all the machinery that is requisite, of all the time that it will take to build and equip and man the ships, to put the guns

and everything else that appertains to a navy in such order as to be of any practical use? In my humble judgment it will take twenty years at least to do that, and by that time it will be a matter of indifference to Great Britain whether Canada has a navy or not. If we are to view this question only from the standpoint of Canada, with the evident intention of cutting the tie that binds us to the motherland, then of what use will this navy be to Canada? If we sever our connection with the motherland, what would we do in attempting to protect Canada from any first class nation, such as the United States or Germany? We could not for a moment hope to compete with people of that kind. We might just as well be without a navy if we are going to rely upon our own resources. If I felt that we could build a navy in the next two or three years that would be of practical benefit and assistance to the British navy I would hold up both hands in favour of doing so. But I do not believe we can, nor do I think that hon. gentlemen in this House believe that is possible.

I would point out further that Germany, in her position, has no need of a navy. She has the strongest army in the world to-day, she is almost entirely inland, perfectly immune from attack from the sea, so that all the navies of the earth could not attack her with any success. The navy which she is building, therefore, since it is not required for defence, must be for the purpose of aggression. I would further point out that Great Britain is absolutely dependent upon her navy for her very existence. She is dependent upon it for the food supplies of her people, as, in case of war, those supplies could be cut off, if by any chance her naval power suffered a reverse. That being the case we have this condition of things. We have Germany strong enough to protect her own country against attack from any power in the world, and Great Britain all powerful by sea to protect her own coasts and her own people. In my judgment that is an admirable condition of affairs. That gives a counterpoise in the world power which makes for peace; but the moment you see the greatest strength of both the army and navy in one power, I care not what power, that nation will become arrogant and try to dictate to other nations, and thus inevitably bring on war. Looking at the question from every standpoint, it seems to me that there is only one way in which we can preserve peace, and that is by maintaining the supremacy of the British navy. But whatever step may be taken by Canada, none should be taken which would divest the King and his representatives of the full control of the navy. But what position would we be in under the policy of this government? The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told us that when England was at war Canada was at war, and in the next breath he said that when England was at war Canada might not be at war. Let me point out that the late wars of Great Britain, such as the South African war, were entirely upon land. In the South African war, the British navy took no part and we were consequently immune from attack. But on account of the British navy not being called into play, the opinion prevails among some people in Canada that we are entirely immune, and that it is a matter of indifference to us whether Great Britain goes to war or not. But should Great Britain go to war with Germany, and should Germany send over one of her great battleships to attack Halifax, how would we meet that attack? Would we nail a copy of 'Hansard' to the coast line and order the German vessels back to sea on the ground that we had nothing to do with Great Britain's wars? Or would the right hon. the Prime Minister go down there, and bring into play that great eloquence of his in order to induce the German commander to sail away because Canada was no part of the British empire? I can safely say that such a proceeding would be highly ludicrous. When Great Britain is at war Canada is at war in the real sense and subject to attack by any foe of Great Britain; and no fine strung theories of the government can alter that fact.

We find some people apparently assuming that we are under no obligation to the motherland. Let me point out that for hundreds of years Great Britain had been laying the foundations for the peace of Canada, as well as other parts of her empire. There is not a privilege which the Canadian people enjoy to-day which has not been secured to us by the expenditure of the blood and treasure of the motherland, and we would be ingrate, indeed, to refuse to-day to give practical assistance to the parent state, and her other oversea dominions. In my opinion we ought to come to her assistance in some practical way. Hon. gentlemen opposite have asked of what practical use would two Dreadnoughts be to the empire. But will any man say that they might not save the situation in the case of war between Germany and Britain? We are told that there is no danger, that Great Britain has a larger number of boats afloat than Germany, that she has a larger tonnage in her navy; but these things count for very little when we consider the fact that a great amount of the tonnage is absolutely obsolete for war purposes to-day, and that we can only depend on such vessels as are up to date when we consider the question of our supremacy as a world-power. I think it would be cheaper for the people of Can-

ada, considered from every standpoint, to do our duty as a people in the existing crisis. If we want to bring about peace, we could do nothing better than give a notification to any possible enemy of Britain that all of her colonies, without exception, stand on all fours in their desire to go to her assistance. We have had no practical answer from the government as to what could be possibly accomplished by the navy they propose to build. As regards the protection of our trade and commerce, it would be absolutely valueless against attack. Such being the case, does it not look like an absolute waste of money to launch an enterprise of this kind?

If, as I have said, there is no emergency, what would be wrong in consulting the people of this Dominion? I want to point out that when this resolution was discussed in this House in March, 1909, the people of Canada had no opportunity of making themselves heard in regard to the matter. And even the people's representatives here in Canada had very little opportunity to consider the question in all its bearings. And I say again that if the government intend to go on with the construction of a navy, two or three years would not be too much time to allow for the thorough discussion of the question, with a view to preparing a well digested scheme in keeping with our needs and capabilities. If it is going to cost Canada two dollars to build here what would cost one dollar if built in the motherland, it seems to me it would be better to order our battleships. If this expenditure upon a navy is going to help our merchant marine, if the government have some scheme by which these vessels would carry our commerce throughout the world, yet be so constructed that they could be speedily converted into war vessels, something might be done in that direction. But, apparently, the government have not the slightest idea of what they are going to do in regard to that matter. They have very little idea of the cost. They make a guess, but it is a mere guess—and we have had some experience in the past as to the accuracy of forecasts that these hon. gentlemen make of the cost of enterprises they launch in this House. Thus, we are absolutely at sea in regard to the cost of the navy we are to construct. That being the case, it seems to me it would be no harm to take a little more time, to go into the matter more thoroughly and make sure that our plan is in accordance with public opinion.

Now, I have taken up the time I had set for myself. There were some other phases of the question I thought I might well discuss, but I feel that it would be unpardonable to do so, therefore I close my remarks. It seems to be the motto of the government to have one suzerain, as they call it, to have one or two flags (two seems to be the favourite idea) to float over the navy, and a divided people. We on this side of the House stand for one King, one country, one navy, one people—united we stand, divided we fall.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to offer an apology for dealing with this important subject even at this stage of the debate. I have no sympathy with the attempt made by members opposite and also by the Liberal press to cut short the discussion of this most important question. The government delayed the introduction of the Bill for more than two months after the opening of the session, and practically no information as to details in connection with the Bill was given for yet another month. As this discussion proceeds, it becomes more and more apparent that the whole question is fraught with consequences of the greatest moment to the whole future of Canada and the empire. This House will not be doing its duty if it attempts to stifle full discussion of the question. Nearly every day's speeches have brought valuable suggestions or have thrown some light upon the sentiment of the country, and everything points to the correctness of the stand which the opposition have taken, that more time should be given to the country to study the question, and no permanent policy developed until the people thoroughly understand it. Meantime, to save Canadian honour, an emergency contribution should be offered to the British government for the immediate construction of ships. I am rising to support this amendment for the following reasons:

1. The essential features of the Bill provide for an independent Canadian navy which shall take no part in, nor rally to, the defence of other parts of the empire, unless specially authorized to do so by the government of the day.

2. That, even if authorized to fight by the government in power, it can render no assistance to the empire in a fleet engagement, and would have to confine its energy to protecting commerce, close to Canadian shores and then only when no superior ship of the enemy was in the neighbourhood.

3. It provides for defence from a thoroughly local standpoint which Lord Selborne, when First Lord of the Admiralty, declared to be a policy which simply invited disaster.

4. That the power given to the government of the day to remain neutral in case of Great Britain being engaged in a naval war includes necessarily the power to haul down the flag and declare the independence of Canada without giving parliament the chance to pronounce upon the subject.

As I do not wish to appear as simply condemning these proposals, poor as they are, to take a step in the direction of naval defence without having an alternative policy to propose, let me say that what I would suggest by way of permanent policy is that negotiations should at once be entered into with the mother country and other parts of the empire looking to the establishment of an imperial council, having under its control foreign policy and imperial defence, in which the various parts of the empire should have representation according to their means and contributions towards imperial defence and diplomacy.

I need say little in regard to my first proposition. The government have made it thoroughly clear that the navy is to be independent of the imperial authorities and absolutely at the disposal of the Dominion government who may or may not, in their discretion, place it on duty during war or invasion. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told us it shall go to no war unless sent by the Governor in Council, but the Bill seems to provide that it shall not even defend itself unless authorized by that body. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean) tried to explain it the other day. Perhaps he is right as to the intention of the Bill. This is what he said:

> We should keep Canada in this position, that if ever Great Britain should engage in a war of which we did not approve, the justice and righteousness of which we were not convinced of, this country should stand aloof as we have done on other occasions, and act the part of a looker-on.

I will not waste time in asking what kind of inquiry will be made by the government into the justice of the war—whether evidence will be taken, or whether they will decide without knowing all the facts. What I will point out is the responsibility of the position in which they will be placed. Some parallels have been drawn with regard to the militia and the navy. There is no real parallel.

Mr. NESBITT. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) is reading his speech, and that is against the rules.

Mr. FIELDING. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) will not press the point, because many members on both sides have done the same.

Mr. NESBITT. If the leader of the House does not wish the point pressed, I have no desire to press it. At the same time, it is against the rules.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman evidently does not want the discussion cut dwon. I am willing to speak from notes, but if I do so I shall probably take double the time I otherwise would in putting my case before the House. Nearly every hon. member I have seen speaking on the other side, has practically read his speech, and in that way he has contributed to a certain extent to the curtailment of the debate. However, I am under the rules of the House.

If Great Britain is at war then, and the government, under the Militia Act, decides not to send troops, they simply do nothing, conditions remain as they were, except, of course, in the case of an invasion of Canadian soil. On the other hand, if the government decides that the navy shall not participate in a war, they cannot sit still and do nothing, because the navy is on the high seas and flying the British flag, and liable to attack by an enemy wherever it is found. They must take action. What action can they possibly take? Shall they haul up the ships and disband the crews? That will not save them. There can be only one possible way of evading war, and that would be to haul down the British flag and substitute a neutral one. That is the only way to evade participation in war with a naval power. Our great commercial marine, too, would have to haul down the Union Jack and fly a neutral flag. There is this essential difference between the two cases. If the cabinet decides not to participate in hostilities outside Canada, under the Militia Act, they do nothing; if they make the decision under the Naval Bill, they have to do something, they have to take action, they have to haul down the flag. But curiously enough this latter action is not subject to the summoning of parliament. On the other hand, if, under the Naval Bill, they decide to leave things as they are and automatically to adopt the theory that if Britain is at war we are at war, then they have to summon parliament to endorse their action, even for allowing the naval forces of the Dominion to defend the country from invasion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in this cold blooded idea of holding an inquiry into the justice of Britain's action. Great Britain has treated us far differently. Let me read a few words spoken by Lord Tweedmouth in 1907, as to the attitude of Great Britain towards her colonies.

> We want you to give us all the assistance that you can, but we do not come to you as beggars; we gladly take all that you can give us, but at the same time if you are not inclined to give us the help that we hope to have from you, we acknowledge our absolute obligation to defend the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

Let me quote also from some remarks of the Duke of Newcastle on the 10th of December, 1862:

> The fact known to all the world that war with Canada means war with England—not

in Canada only, but upon every sea and upon the shores wherever situated, of the aggressive power itself.

Those are very generous words, Mr. Speaker. Can we afford to be less generous to the mother country than the mother country has been to us? If we will not help the empire will the empire help us? We have received the assistance of the empire on many occasions, the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) mentioned a few, and there would have been many more when we should have been in trouble but for the fact known to the world that the Britsh fleet was behind us. I believe in the policy announced by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) in the House on the 28th of February, when he said:

My policy as a British subject is to jump into the breach and go to the aid of my fellow British subject wherever on this earth he is, and discuss the righteousness of his cause afterwards.

That is an honest and manly policy, which I believe will appeal to the great mass of the people of this country. When it ceases to be the policy of the British empire, then the empire will shortly cease to exist.

Let me now deal for a few moments with my second point, that is, the adequacy of the government's programme. What do they propose to do? To provide for the completion in five years' time of four unarmoured cruisers and six torpedo boat destroyers, and in the meantime to commence the education of officers and men in training ships to be purchased from the admiralty, and in a naval college which is to be erected in the future. In support of these proposals the government pretend that they are acting in accordance with the wishes of the admiralty, and along the lines suggested at the last imperial conference. This is true in neither case, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately, we now have the report of the defence conference, which was withheld from us in November last when the Prime Minister was so anxious to discuss this question, and we can demonstrate from that report that the wishes of the admiralty were far from being followed, while from previous blue-books we know that a system of purely local defence has always been condemned by them. The views of the admiralty are set forth in a carefully prepared memo dated the 20th July, 1909. In that memo it was stated in the most explicit manner that a direct contribution to the British navy would be the most effectual aid to the problem of naval defence, and that the best results would be obtained by all parts of the empire contributing according to their needs and resources to the maintenance of a single navy, with unity of command and unity of training. Recognizing that this might not be acceptable to all the dominions, they suggested that the next best measure to be taken was that any dominion government desirous of creating a navy should form a distinct fleet unit which, while under local control in time of peace, would be capable of being used in its component parts in time of war. The admiralty then set forth in detail what the unit should consist of, and what its subsidiary services were to be, and they made no other suggestion at all except in regard to matters of detail. This fleet unit was to be headed by an armoured cruiser of the Indomitable class and of the Dreadnought type. They further positively stated that the Dreadnought cruiser was the essential part of a fleet unit, and should be the first vessel to be built. But the Canadian representatives positively refused to meet the wishes of the admiralty in regard to either of these suggestions. Subsequently, on the Canadians stating that they were only prepared to spend a sum of money less than that required to build a fleet unit, the admiralty were good enough to advise them as to how they could spend the money to the best advantage, and that was the only proposal of the admiralty which the government has carried out. This is what has been christened the tin-pot navy, a term which has become widely known throughout Canada. The government have already departed from the advice of the admiralty even with regard to this tin-pot navy—I call it so to distinguish it from that proposed by the admiralty—they have departed even from the policy which they agreed to adopt in connection with it, and have purchased a 13-year old cruiser instead of building a new one of the Boadicea class, and in making this announcement to the House they proudly told us that they had effected a saving of $475,000. If they begin with savings of this nature how are they likely to go on and build the rest even of the fleet they have proposed? The situation then stands thus: The admiralty made two alternative proposals, the acceptance of either of which would have given a substantial addition to the fighting strength of the empire within two years, and our government has refused both proposals, and propose to construct in five years time a small group of ships designed only for commerce protection, should Great Britain retain command of the sea, and of no value whatever to the fighting strength of the empire, and valueless to Canada if the command of the sea passes from British hands. This is quite clear from the utterances of successive lords of the admiralty since 1902. We are proposing to do the very thing they have specifically warned us against as likely to entail disastrous consequences, treating naval defence as a local question.

I believe it to be one of the first principles of war, both on sea and land, to seek out the main force of the enemy wherever it is to be found and beat it. Once this is done, the rest is merely a matter of time; one by one the smaller squadrons and ships will fall into your hands. The advent of the Dreadnought type of warship has made it practically certain that the naval supremacy of the future will be determined by superiority in these ships. Canada is to have none of them. The government proposals still leave her dependent for her protection upon the bounty of the mother country, the bounty of Australia and New Zealand. Is this an enviable position, and can it be acceptable to a self-respecting people like the Canadians? I repeat the navy to be created under this Bill will be of no effective service to the empire and of no use to Canada without the backing of the imperial fleet. To meet our immediate obligations in regard to some contribution to the fleet upon which we in common with all other parts of the empire rely for the protection of our commerce, the safety of our country from invasion, and the peaceful development of the country, the leader of the opposition proposed that we should place at the disposal of the imperial authorities a sum nearly equal to the cost of the fleet unit and its first year's maintenance, to be used by them in the purchase of Dreadnought cruisers, or in such a way as would add most to the efficiency of the impeial navy. That proposition has been rejected by this House, and I earnestly trust now that the provinces may take the matter up and individually offer contributions. I believe they would if this Bill is out of the way.

There is no question whatever as to the reality of the nervousness of the British government in regard to the present situation. Acts speak louder than words. As pointed out in a 'Times' article, read the other day by the Minister of Militia, the British fleet during the last four years has been drawn in from all quarters of the world and concentrated in home waters. And now that the elections are over and the government returned, they are laying down the contingent Dreadnoughts sanctioned last year and asking for a large increase in the navy estimates. I noticed in to-day's paper that the naval estimates brought down in the British House of Commons are $27,000,000 more than they were last year, and the estimates last year were higher than they had ever been before. Even the papers which support the government in the old country, even the 'Morning Chronicle,' the strongest Liberal paper in the old country, predicts that next year's estimates will be even larger as the inevitable price of British freedom. Sir, we see that the mother country is being absolutely ruined by the necessary preparations for the maintenance of the freedom of the British empire. Are we to sit down and do absolutely nothing in this country for the next five years? It is a disgrace to this Dominion if we do so. I do not wish to disparage in the least the magnificent array of warships in the British navy or the splendid men who man them, and I believe the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis) is wrong in saying they are short of men. I believe that there is no difficulty in getting men, but that it is ships that they are short of. The building of Dreadnoughts has revolutionized naval warfare, and times are changing. Not much more than a year ago the premier of Great Britain declared that his naval programme would make Britain ten per cent more powerful than any two other naval powers combined. Within six months, he was compelled to own that it would be all she could do to keep ahead of Germany alone, while within two or three years, she will be inferior to more than one possible combination of powers against her.

Mr. Speaker, if the British empire is true to itself there is no danger. If the dependencies of the empire will contribute to naval defence proportionately to their wealth, or as they would have to do if they were independent states, we should be invincible and could pursue our progress and development in peace and security. I believe this is an insurance we must and should take in the interest of Canadian producers and Canadian commerce.

And now, let me take up the essential features of the Bill that provide for an independent Canadian navy—a navy which is to take part in no war unless the government of the day allow it to do so by order in council. It is these features that I am unalterably opposed to and on account of which I propose to vote against the second reading on the ground that they are ill-advised and dangerous, and that any permanent policy of this nature should first be submitted to the people for their approval or otherwise. As has been said over and over again during this debate the refusal of the government to allow our navy to take part in any naval war in which the empire was engaged would be tantamount to a declaration of independence. The flag would have to be hauled down and neutrality declared, the empire deserted.

It means that this Act is to give the government which happens to be in power at the moment the right to declare the independence of Canada and the people would have no power through their representatives to prevent them. For while power is given and indeed the obligation imposed by the Bill that if the navy is

allowed to take part in the war parliament must be summoned. There is no provision on the other hand for the summoning of parliament, if the government of the day declares the neutrality of the fleet. I have already pointed out that government speakers have drawn a parallel between the provisions of the Militia Act and this Bill in regard to the power of the Governor in Council to place the militia on active service either in Canada or out of Canada—and the similar power of the Governor in Council over the fleet. Of course the status of a militia force and a navy are absolutely and entirely different from each other. But, I would like to point out in addition that the fine hand of the premier is to be seen in this provision of the Militia Act just the same as it is in the Navy Act. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) stated this provision had been in the statute-book for 40 years and was placed there by the Conservatives. I am surprised that an hon. member who thought it necessary to keep assuring the House how accurate he always is, should have made such a misstatement.

If he had looked up the Acts he would have seen that in the old Militia Acts of 1868 and 1883 this power was absolutely vested in Her Majesty. It was only when this government amended the Act in 1904 that they took the power away from the King and usurped it themselves, just as they now propose to do with the navy which is an infinitely more dangerous matter.

Let me quote the two Acts so as to make it absolutely certain. Militia Act 1904, clause 70:

> The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Clause 72:

> In time of war, when the militia is called out for active service to serve conjointly with His Majesty's regular forces, His Majesty may place in command thereof a senior general officer of his regular army.

Then let us take the Militia Acts of 1868 and 1883. They are practically the same word for word. I think one insignificant word only is altered. Clause 61:

> Her Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof for active service either within or without the Dominion, at any time, when it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

That Act did not even say that it was to be done for the defence of Canada. These words were inserted in 1904. The clause goes on:

> And the militiamen when so called out for actual service, shall continue to serve for at least one year from the date of their being called out for actual service, if required to do so, or for any longer period which Her Majesty may appoint.

Again:

> Whenever the militia or any part thereof are called out for actual service by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, Her Majesty may place them under the orders of the commander of her regular forces in Canada.

So, while there is very little difference between this Bill and the Milita Act of 1904 in this regard, it should be remembered that it was this government who set the precedent and interfered with the prerogative, as far as they were able to do so, of His Majesty in 1904. I may mention also that, by some gentlemen who spoke upon the other side of the House, this very fact was actually pointed to as a considerable step towards separation from the empire. Now, Sir, I am prepared to hold the Prime Minister responsible for the difficulty in getting the approval of the people in so many quarters to a proposal to grant assistance to the empire. If the right hon. gentleman has an affection for the empire he has taken a very curious way of showing it. He has never repudiated his advocacy of separation from the empire which he preached in and out of Canada, he has always tried to convey the impression that he is engaged in a constant struggle to maintain our autonomy, and he has never ceased to criticise and vilify most unjustly British diplomacy. I was much struck by the remarks of the member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) as to the Prime Minister's connection with the Alaskan Boundary Commission, and that hon. member pointed out that the Prime Minister, acting for the governmnet, actually himself nominated all the members of that tribunal; but he did not say, which is a fact, that the Prime Minister nominated these members against the positive advice of the British foreign office, who advised him that he ought to nominate another class of representatives, and not jurists of repute, as these gentlemen were supposed to be. under the treaty. So that the Prime Minister himself was responsible for the finding of that commission, because there is no doubt whatever that the tribunal would not have made any finding if the right hon. gentleman had followed the advice which was given to him by the British foreign office. Therefore I feel that it is —I do not know that I can use a strong enough word and be within the rules of this House—I was going to say it is con-

temptible on the part of any man who is responsible for such a condition as that to come back afterwards and throw the whole blame upon the British government. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister's teaching in regard to imperialism has made it most difficult to get some of his compatriots to provide for any naval defence at all. He has told them that imperialism would involve us in the vortex of European militarism. Now, what is the meaning of imperialism. I think, the Prime Minister himself, in moving the resolution on the 29th of March last, gave about as good a definition of imperialism as you could find anywhere, when he used these words:

The Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and the honour of the empire.

That, Sir, is my idea of imperialism. The member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) expressed the same idea a few days ago, when he said:

The imperialist is a man who while doing all his duty to his own country always remembers that his country is part of an empire into which it was born and in which he desires it to remain.

I have consulted a number of authorities in regard to imperialism, and I find that all of them come down to pretty well the same idea as to what imperialism means. Now, why, after moving such a resolution, does the Prime Minister say that he does not intend to be an imperialist, nor does he pretend to be an anti-imperialist. Has he gone back upon that part of the resolution as he has gone back upon all the amendments which he agreed to incorporate in that resolution when he got the members of the opposition to agree to it on the 29th of March last? That is what he has done. That part of the resolution is all so many vain words so far as he is concerned. It is always difficult to understand what the Prime Minister's real intentions are, because he makes so many contradictory statements as to his actual position. Can this mean that after all his protests, he takes no interest whatever in the British empire? It seems to me that is the only meaning that can be attached to his words. Many years ago in this House, the right hon. gentleman condemned the idea, to use his own words, 'of welding together a gigantic British empire on the face of the earth,' and on that occasion he stated that he thought the conception of individual British communities was a grander idea. Is this still his idea, and is he still at the bottom of his heart in favour of separation from the British empire and of independence as he was in 1892? I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that the difficulties which exist to-day in doing anything effective for the common defence of Canada and the empire is due mainly to the influence of the Prime Minister in the province of Quebec. The right hon. gentleman has lately gone a step further in his independence ideas, and he has tried to propagate the gospel even in Ontario. Some attention has been given to his speech in Toronto on the 5th of January last, and I propose to put on 'Hansard' his own version of what he said, and which will be found in answer to a question on the 24th of January last ('Hansard,' page 2357).

We are under the suzerainty of the King of England. We are his loyal subjects. We bow the knee to him, but the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our Canadian parliament.

I do not intend to discuss the statement that the King has no more power in Canada than the parliament chooses to give him, because that point was most effectually dealt with by the member for West Elgin. I do intend, however, to refer for a moment to the use of the word 'suzerain,' because I believe the Prime Minister used it advisedly and deliberately and with an ulterior motive. It is, of course, in its original meaning a word signifying the relation of a fedual lord to his vassals, and we constantly come across it in books which deal with the old fedual system. It is a word, however, that since the year 1891 has had a special significance in English ears. It was used by Mr. Gladstone to describe the special relationship for which he was responsible between the Queen of England and the Transvaal when peace was concluded after the Boer victory at Majuba Hill. I can well remember the discussion which took place in the English newspapers as to the meaning of the new relationship under which the Transvaal republic recognized the suzerainty of the Queen. Mr. Gladstone explained it on the 25th of July, 1881, as follows:

After all that had occurred it became necessary that there should be some plan fixed and agreed upon between us, so that they (the Transvaal) should know what obligations they were under to us, and that we should have no powers except such as were well understood by them. That is the plan which we have actually adopted. I apprehend that the term which has been adopted, 'suzerainty of the Queen,' is intended to signify that certain portions of sovereignty are reserved, and are expressly reserved; but that all that is not reserved is given up. That is the meaning which, I think, we ourselves should attach to the term. What are those portions of sovereignty? The portions of sovereignty that we desire to reserve are, first, those which relate to the relations between the Transvaal community and foreign countries—the whole care of the foreign relations of the

Boers. Those foreign relations are not altogether unknown to the Boers in their brief independent existence. They had communications with various countries of Europe, with various considerable countries of Europe; but the whole of these relations in the future will remain in the hands of the Queen. But what was still more important was that we should reserve sufficient power to make provision for the interests of the natives, and this reservation of foreign relations was a most important one as regards the interests of the natives, because a very large portion of the native interests of the country involve the natives beyond the frontier of the Transvaal, &c.

Those are the only two reservations of sovereignty which Mr. Gladstone declared were retained in the condition of suzerainty which the Transvaal agreed to, so that there having been a considerable discussion on the subject I am surprised that the Prime Minister—a man who takes an interest in everything that is going on in the empire—did not remember that discussion when he used the word 'suzerainty.' It will be remembered that under these conditions which I have just quoted in Mr. Gladstone's words, the Transvaal was an independent republic, flew an independent flag, and British subjects within its borders were aliens. The Prime Minister, on the 3rd of February in this House made an explanation of his use of the word 'suzerainty,' and he said:

I do not pretend to be a master of the English language, but I think I know something of it, and I have always understood that if there is any difference between 'sovereignty' and 'suzerainty' it is merely a shadow, and that it is used by men of great eminence indifferently as applying to the same condition of things.

The Prime Minister is much too modest. I should imagine that there are few men in the House who are such masters of the English language as he is; there are few men more careful to use the exact word to convey the idea than the Prime Minister. According to his statement on the 3rd of February, after the matter had been discussed and the word criticised the Prime Minister still professed and believed that there is only a shade of difference between the two words. He might have satisfied himself by looking up the interpretation of the term by legal authorities, or even by looking at the ordinary dictionaries. I have a suspicion that he did look at the dictionaries for I find in the Century Dictionary the reference to the lady in Quentin Durward. Would it not have been more candid if he had given us the definition which immediately preceded the quotation which gave the meaning as 'Sovereign but not supreme.'

But would you be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to learn that the Prime Minister once discussed in this very House the question of 'suzerainty,' as applied to the Transvaal republic? Let me quote what he said on the 31st of July, 1899, 'Hansard,' page 8992:—

The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I beg to interrupt the regular course of the business, in order to offer certain resolutions which I believe the state of things now existing in a distant country under the suzerainty of Her Majesty seems to render appropriate. Every one will agree with me that the development of the British empire has now reached such a condition and degree of consolidation that no part of it can affect to be indifferent to anything that may be going on in any other part, and, assuredly, we cannot be indifferent to the condition of things existing in the Transvaal state, which, it must be remembered, though an independent and self-governing country, is under the suzerainty of Her Majesty. Some 80,000 of Her Majesty's subjects have been allowed to become residents of that country, to purchase lands there, to open mines, to develop trade, to establish industries and to build up cities, yet are denied almost every kind of participation in its administration. They are subjected to discriminating and heavy taxation, and yet are denied any kind of representation, and although forced to bear their full share of citizenship, are denied the rights and privileges and liberties of citizens.

Later on, he said:—

It must not be forgotten either, when we come to deal with this question, that Her Majesty is the suzerain of the Transvaal republic, and became so with the full consent of the people of the Transvaal. It must not be forgotten that, at a time when the Dutch population of the Transvaal was in dire distress, when they were threatened almost with annihilation by their neighbours, when they were threatened with something like civil war among themselves, they appealed for British interference, and, after a series of events, which there is no use going into at this moment, a treaty of peace was concluded between the people of the Transvaal and Her Majesty, by which, on the one hand, while the independence of the Transvaal was recognized, on the other hand the suzerain power of Her Majesty was fully recognized and admitted. The least, then, that can be expected is that the subject of the suzerain power should not only be not subjected to any kind of oppression, but be given also rights equal to those enjoyed by the citizens of the Transvaal republic.

I desire you to note the distinction between His Majesty's subjects and the citizens of the republic. I might perhaps also quote the resolution moved by the right hon. gentleman, as follows:—

1. Resolved, that this House has viewed with regret the complications which have arisen in the Transvaal republic, of which Her Majesty is suzerain, from the refusal to accord to Her Majesty's subjects now settled in that region any adequate participation in its government.

2. Resolved, that this House has learned with still greater regret that the conditions of things there existing has resulted in intolerable oppression, and has produced great and dangerous excitement among several classes of Her Majesty's subjects in her South African possessions.

3. Resolved, that this House, representing a people which has largely succeeded, by the adoption of the principle of conceding equal political rights to every portion of the population, in harmonizing estrangements and in producing general content with the existing system of government, desires to express its sympathy with the efforts of Her Majesty's imperial authorities to obtain for the subjects of Her Majesty who have taken up their abode in the Transvaal, such measure of justice and political recognization as may be found necessary to secure them in the full possession of equal rights and liberties.

And yet the Prime Minister told us the other day that: 'I have always understood that if there is any difference between sovereignty and suzerainty, it is merely a shadow. I leave it to the House to decide between the two statements, and to say whether the Prime Minister used the word suzerainty designedly or not. There is this further point to be remembered: that the Transvaal was independent, and had its own flag. If we are under the suzerainty rather than the sovereignty of the King, we would have to have our own flag. I believe this was in the mind of the Prime Minister. It is the logical sequence of the position taken in regard to the proposed navy. The Prime Minister says it is to remain neutral until the government decide whether it is to take part in any war in which Great Britain is engaged. How can any ships on the high seas, flying the Union Jack remain neutral in the presence of a power at war with His Britannic Majesty? It is impossible. The next proposal we shall undoubtedly have from the Prime Minister is that to carry out the intention of this Bill it is necessary that some other flag than the Union Jack should fly over the proposed navy. I have already seen the proposal in a paper supporting the government naval policy. It says:

This is another stride forward in the development of our nationality. A Canadian army, a Canadian navy, a Canadian gold coinage. This is an admirable trio. Shortly we will have a real Canadian flag, which will be more suitable than the plain Union Jack and more acceptable to the much-speaking people.

I wonder whether the new Canadian flag will have the same talismanic influence in Europe to which the Prime Minister referred as the Union Jack! I fear not! The first war in which the empire is engaged in which the Canadian navy refuses to take a part in, inevitably means the hauling down of the Union Jack from our ships, and the declaration of our neutrality, or independence. It means the same thing. But let me say to the Prime Minister, you may legislate a man out of his civil rights, you may legislate him out of his personal liberty, but you cannot by Act of parliament deprive him of his allegiance. You cannot take his flag from him. That is a personal matter, a matter of his conscience. If you try to take that from him by force, he will fight, and he has a right to fight.

In the earlier part of the debate the opinion, expressed on this side of the House, that the Prime Minister still desired ultimate separation from the empire, and the independence of Canada, and that his naval proposals were based on this desire, caused much excitement among his supporters. They expressed great indignation because his speeches on the subject were quoted and commented on. The continuation of the debate, however, has proved that he has a considerable following of Liberals in this House who advocate candidly separation. Most of the references to the subject have been more or less veiled, but there have been some very frank expressions of opinion. The member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte) was the chief spokesman, and I shall endeavour to offer a somewhat free translation of the words used by him last week:

It ill-becomes politicians of many years' experience, who have seen unfold before them the great events and the political changes which are now relegated to the history of our country, who have seen the nation grow, and who know its vigour and its immense resources, it is neither patriotic nor loyal on the part of these men to clog the full development of our political organization, and to pretend that we should always remain under the protection of the English flag. But, thank God, I am convinced it will not be thus, and the creation of a military fleet is, in my humble opinion, the last step towards independence.

It is this point of view especially, and I should say exclusively, that I take in giving my adhesion to the Liberal policy of the moment. I speak from the Canadian point of view, and I think that this manner of regarding (facing) the question is also that of the voters in my county, and I do not think I exaggerate in saying that it is that of the great majority in the province of Quebec.

Later on, he said:

In concluding, I wish to clearly declare the motives which urge me to vote in favour of the present measure; they are, first of all, the great confidence which I have in the policy so surely directed by my right honourable chief; secondly, the constitutional conditions in which our country is placed in regard to England; and thirdly, and above all, the interest which I bear to my country, and my conviction that the establishment of a war-navy will be the last step towards a political state more perfect and more in conformity with our national aspirations—independence. But I desire this independence only inasmuch as we could attain it with the good-will and

'entente cordiale' of England, to whom, I am happy to acknowledge, we owe that which we are to-day, and in whose favour I am proud to proclaim myself a loyal and devoted subject.

I call special attention to the statement made that he believed the majority of the people of Quebec were in accord with his point of view, and also that he gave as his reason for supporting the Bill that he considered it the final step towards independence. I presume from what has been said in the House that the doctrine of separation from the empire and independence for Canada is being widely preached. Moreover, the fact that perhaps the best known and ablest advocate of separation, Mr. J. S. Ewart, is employed in a most prominent position in the conduct of our fisheries case before the Hague tribunal gives him the endorsation of the Liberal party, and gives weight to his propaganda. I propose, therefore, to offer a few comments on the probable effects of independence, following the lines taken in the earliest part of this debate by the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General, the other evening, gave a list of independent countries with a population of less than 10,000,000, who have navies of their own. It was headed by the Argentine Republic—a country much the same size as the organized portion of Canada, but with a slightly smaller population. There they have a naval programme calling for an expenditure—I am using the Postmaster General's figures—of $35,000,000, with three Dreadnoughts under construction and universal military service imposed on the population. In every one of the countries in that list, with the exception of the Negro republics of Hayti and St. Domingo, and possibly Peru, they have universal military service or conscription. Roughly speaking, it may be said that it is only in the British empire and the United States that universal military service or conscrpition has not to be enforced as the price of independence. If Canada were to become independent to-morrow, the only possible guarantee of its liberties would be the immediate enforcement of universal military service upon our population. Independence would undoubtedly carry militarism with it. That is the experience of all other states—why not with us?

Let me mention another price that would have to be paid for independence. During the South African war, it will be remembered that Canadian securities were placed on the trustee list in England. In moving for the requisite legislation in this House the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made the statement that the enhanced value of Canadian securities that would accrue thereby would more than cover the whole cost to Canada of that war. I would like to impress that fact on the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McLean), who said that Great Britain had done nothing for Canada for which she had not received full value. If, instead of being an integral portion of the British empire, Canada was to become a republic, her securities would undoubtedly at once have to be removed from the British trustee list, and as a weak and struggling republic, her credit would undoubtedly drop, and I do not think I should be far astray in saying the annual cost to this country on that score alone would amount to four or five millions a year. But the Postmaster General did not confine himself to a comparison of independent countries, he devoted some time to an argument against dependence on the Monroe doctrine and its inevitable result—absorption into the United States. I don't think any one can doubt but that union with the United States would mean for Quebec just what the Postmaster General suggested—the loss of their language, their laws, their schools, their usages and customs. It would also mean that Canada would have to contribute its share to the naval and military and pension expenditure of the union. In 1908 that share would have amounted to $37,000,000. In 1909, a large reduction was made in the vote, but even then our contribution, according to population, would have amounted to about $29,000,000. Surely it would be better if only from this point of view alone, to do our share towards the maintenance of an imperial navy? It would not cost us one-third as much as absorption into the union.

I have already spoken at far greater length than I had intended, but I wish to say one thing more in support of my contention for an imperial council. In my opinion the time has come when some definite action should be taken for the closer knitting together in a political union of the different parts of the empire. The policy of each over-sea dominion providing their own navies and keeping them, even in peace time, under their own control, is unsatisfactory, while in war time, if such provisions as those in this Bill are enacted, it becomes dangerous. If we had one imperial council upon which all the dependencies of the empire had a due share of representation, and which controlled the two subjects of foreign policy and defence, it would be possible for all the dominions to contribute to one imperial navy without in any way infringing upon any rights of self-government. This is no new matter. It was put in definite form by Mr. Chamberlain at the imperial conference of 1902, as follows:

His Majesty's government while they could welcome any approval which might be made to a more definite and a closer union, feel that it is not for them to press this upon

you. The demand if it comes and when it comes, must come from the colonies. If it comes, it will be enthusiastically received in this country. . . .

I would refer to an expression in an eloquent speech of—the Premier of the Dominion of Canada—an expression which has called forth much appreciation in this country, although I believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has himself explained that it was not quite correctly understood. But the expression was 'If you want our aid call us to your councils.'

'We do want your aid,' 'whenever you make the request to us be assured we shall gladly call you to our councils. If you are prepared at any time to take any share, any proportionate share in the burdens of the empire, we are prepared to meet you with any proposal for giving to you a corresponding voice in the policy of the empire.'

Three years ago an article appeared in the London 'Standard,' at the time of the imperial conference, which I would like to quote. It is as follows:

We, of the old country, to put the matter quite plainly, have not the smallest desire to keep the distant shires of the empire in leading strings; we do not wish to hinder—we would rather help—their advance to nationhood. But we will not attempt to force them to take their places as fully-grown members of the family until they demonstrate, of their own free-will, their desire to do so. We wish to see an Imperial Witan created; we wish to see an imperial navy ride the seas; but, until the five nations offer willingly, we will bear cheerfully the burden of their defence and the exacting task of endeavouring to adjust foreign relations with regard at once to the interests of the imperial whole and the susceptibilities of its component parts.

And let me also point to the fact that when the United States brought in their dependencies they gave them representation in congress. There are representatives sitting in the congress of the United States to-day from Porto Rico, the Philippines and Hawaii. Why should it not be possible for our statesmen to devise some similar arrangement for the component parts of the British empire? These difficulties about the Navy Bill convince me that the time has come when we should make a step forward and act on Mr. Chamberlain's suggestion. And Canada, the premier colony of the empire, should lead the way.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying which, I presume, you have heard. 'Whom to know is to love.' If there is any man in this House who awakens that feeling in the hearts of hon. members on either side it is our good friend the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare). He is frail in body at present, but he is in this House the lone German representing a Canadian constituency, and loyal to the core. When he was speaking last night, I know, your sympathies were with him as were those of all his other fellow-members. You could see, Sir, that he was labouring against the frailities of his body, labouring to voice in this House his opinions against the policy brought forward by this government, and also, in some measure, against the policy of his party and voiced by his political leader. You could not help, no hon. member of this House could help, but feel strong sympathy for him. Frail in body, great in courage, he stood here declaring his opinions. And you could not but feel, as every member felt, when an hon. member of this House got up and offered factious interruption, that he was doing something that was not right for any member of this House to do. For the first time in my life I felt ashamed of the fact that Scotch blood runs in my veins when I heard that 2 x 4 Scotch proposition get up and abuse my hon. friend from South Waterloo. It reminded me of the fact that some of the Scotch are the descendants of sheep stealers and cattle lifters. But when I heard the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. M. Y. McLean) I could not help but think that even at that he was a degenerate son of the race.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that expression is beyond the limits of debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no man in this House who is so ready and willing to abide by your decision as I am, and I will at once absolutely take back the word, if you will permit me the pleasure of the reminiscence of having said it.

To come to the subject that is before the House. I am afraid that, to some extent, I shall have to infringe on the rules, the infraction of which was so strongly objected to by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) for the reason that I have not taken the time to properly get my views on this subject into shape to present to the House. In saying that, I want to say, further, that if there is any hon. gentlemen in this House who ought to speak by the book and read his speeches to do his common sense justice, it is the hon. member for North Oxford. In offering a few remarks on the subject before the House, I shall have to do what many Liberals in this House have not done—take the same stand to-night that I took this time last year. To emphasize that, I ask your permission to refer to what I said in this House on April 26 last, as reported in 'Hansard':

I listened to the splendid logical argument laid before this House on the matter of imperial defence or aid to imperial defence delivered by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It was found fault with by the hon. gentleman who leads the House.

Why? Because it was not concrete. That is the fault he found with it and what did he give us? He gave us verbiage, which means nothing. Why, Sir, it is time for this House to realize that the whole world is looking to Canada in this particular matter. I say the whole world and I mean it. Why these little Japanese, with their civilization 4,000 years older than ours in some matters of esthetics and the arts, have come to realize in the last few years that painting and ornamental work of that kind does not bring them anything, they have become ambitious to take a position in the world, and have taken a position by defeating great Russia. The fact that they defeated Russia has stimulated them to further aspirations, there is no doubt about that, they are looking around for fresh worlds to conquer, they are watching to see what Canada is going to do, when the motherland is calling. Then there is Russia, she is watching as we all know, to see if anything will befall the navy of Great Britain. If anything occurs to the navy of Great Britain, I am of the opinion that the next day Russia will be marching across the borders into northern India. Germany is watching to see what Canada will do. Why? Because she has an idea that if she can only beat England on the sea she has the supremacy of the world. She is watching to see if Great Britain has her colonies at her back, she is watching to see whether the Germans, who have come out here by thousands, are ready to support loyally the country of their choice and their adoption.

France is watching for the same reason that all the minor powers in Europe are watching, watching on account of her commerce for one reason, because she knows that the naval power of Great Britain has stood for the safe commerce of the world, has stood for the safe commerce of all the smaller countries, knows that the navy of Great Britain has not been maintained and brought to its present standard because Great Britain desired to go out to conquer new worlds, but simply because Great Britain believed that as long as she held the supremacy of the seas, the commerce of all kinds from the smallest nation to the greatest nation was safe. France is looking to this colony to see what it will do. France does not forget that on this side of the Atlantic are the descendants of Frenchmen in their thousands, she looks to them to see whether the old French chivalry, the loyalty to the flag which protects them, is dead in the descendants of the men who came over from beauteous France. She is looking to see if chivalry died in this country when fell Montcalm.

I think further that we ought to remember that in Great Britain there are hundreds of thousands, nay millions of people, who for all those decades have been paying 'with a smile' for the protection of Canada as well as other colonies, they have been paying their taxes, and it has been hard to pay them, with a smile, because they know it is Great Britain's colony, it was the daughter of the great mother, whom they were helping to protect. Those people are looking to us to see whether we are going to respond to the call, if we are not going to show that we were ready to help our brothers across the seas in bearing the burden they have to bear on our account. All through Canada, the people have been looking to see if anything definite is going to be done. Every board of trade from the Atlantic to the Pacific has been passing resolutions to that end, to have Canada show herself, show her hand, show her willingness to come out in the open and say: We are with the mother country. Send the message to Great Britain, 'you can call on us for what you want and we are behind you.'

I was more than surprised to hear the hon. gentleman from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith)—

But I wont say here what I said of him then, because he has made two somersaults since then. I referred also to the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Congdon), and went on to say:

Knowing the people of the north country as I do, I declare that his sentiments as expressed in this House are not the sentiments of the men who have gone into that north country and taken their lives in their hands from day to day. I hope the First Minister will reconsider his reply of two or three days ago with regard to aid in the matter of Dreadnoughts. I hope he will consider that even although he cannot trust me to back him up in many of the things he does, there is one thing in which I and every Conservative would support him, loyally and enthusiastically, that is, if he would come to this House and give us a part in saying what we will do for the mother country and for the empire. Had he been here, I would have taken pleasure in telling him that it is my opinion that this is the hour and he is the man, and all Canada is looking to him.

Those were my sentiments expressed in this House last year, and I regret exceedingly that I must take back the last sentence in which I stated that this was the hour and he was the man. The hour is here, but the man is not. While I am only a humble member of the Conservative party and a follower of the hon. the leader of the opposition, I feel now as I felt then, that I was voicing the opinion of the Conservatives in this House. They would have been glad Sir, to have a part in doing something substantial for the empire at that time. If the First Minister would bring forward a policy now that would be in the slightest degree an available help to the empire, he would not have a stauncher supporter in this House than myself. But last night, when the exigencies of the occasion demanded that I should vote with him, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that never in my life did I do anything that so grated against my feelings as to support him in any respect whatever, pertaining to his naval policy. He has brought down a little old naval scheme, and an abortion at that, and not only an abortion, but an abortion tainted, to my mind, with disloyalty and

separation from the empire. I never will support it in any manner, shape or form; and if I knew my efforts would avail anything, I would stay here till Christmas fighting that Bill. The Bill is absolutely inadequate in every way, it is absolutely useless in case an emergency should arise, it is not a fighting force in any shape or form. In saying this, I am not saying anything original by any means, because I have only to refer to the way it has been characterized by some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, beginning with the First Minister himself. Let me quote a few of their expressions: 'Built to elude pursuit'. That is a nice kind of fighting force. 'For policing our own waters and patrolling our trade routes'. That is another one of the arguments they bring forward. Now the First Minister is not present, and I regret it, because there are one or two questions I would like to ask him. What ships have been policing our grain routes and taking care of our trade for the last 150 years? None at all, Sir. What ships are going to protect our trade routes and our commerce and look after our ports for the next five or six years until his little navy is built? None. I will tell him the answer to those questions, I will tell him what has protected our trade routes: The great, old, grand, old, Union Jack, the flag that has been flying over all our towns and our cities, over our commerce, over our merchant service boats. But, Mr. Speaker, there is something behind it. That flag in itself could not protect anything were it not for the fact that it represents the supremacy of the great British empire's fleet in the North sea and the English channel. Our protection has been something invisible, but none the less has it been absolutely equal to all occasions. They talk about a little dinky tin-pot navy that is going to patrol our shores and protect our trade routes. Why, Sir, I am surprised to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk that way. They have lots of sense in other things. These are things they know as well as I do. They know them, because I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite saying these things last year, and all through the session. Until this year they were the most independent bunch I ever heard speak in my life, until they came in here and were up against it.

The supremacy of the sea, when held by Great Britain, is what protects our trade, our commerce and the commerce of the world. It stands for the safety of all the world. The flag is emblematic of that supremacy. Break that supremacy and what will happen? Our grand old Union Jack will only be a reminiscence of past glory, it will not be able to protect anything, not even itself, and the nations that wrest from the great British empire that supremacy that she now holds for the welfare of the world, will be our masters and we will have to dance to their tune. You cannot get over that. I have heard a great many eminently selfish speeches on this question, but if the hon. gentlemen who made these selfish speeches would go one little step further, or open their minds one little tiny bit, they would realize the selfishness of their position, and they would agree with me when I tell them that it is up to them to do something to help the mother country to hold the supremacy that protect them, even from the point of selfish self interest. We hear from the other side of the House various opinions—independence, building up Canada, separation—every kind of opinion you can think of, but at the same time every hon. gentleman who speaks on the other side of the House congratulates himself and throws a stone at us on this side because we are not in the same box as they are in, in that they are a united party and we are not. For sure they are a united party! I like that kind of union! They are united—I admit it—on one point and I will tell hon. gentlemen what that point is, and it is the only point of union amongst them; it is because Sir Wilfrid Laurier says so. That is why they are united, and there is no other reason. Last year half the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, as well as the 'Globe,' which is the accredited official organ of the government, were in favour of doing something at once. The 'Globe' wrote editorials, and some of these editorials I have to believe—I do not believe them all but I am, perforce, compelled to believe some, because I understand they were written by a gentleman who wears, or used to wear, the clerical garb—and these editorials advocated giving at once to the old country at least three Dreadnoughts. I need not weary the House by reading those editorials because they have already been introduced by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers). I, myself, heard half of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, or perhaps not quite that per cent, after the resolution was passed in March last, telling their whip from Quebec that they would not vote for anything that would help the old country—no contribution, no Dreadnoughts, nothing—but they are all ready now, behind the right hon. First Minister, to jump when he calls. They all hurrah for Laurier, a united party and navy—tin pot at that. I do not believe that there is more than five per cent of them who are not ashamed of themselves for having to take this stand. I will tell you another reason why they are going to vote for this Bill. No vote means no patronage.

Mr. E. ROY. You know your side of the House better than our side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will speak to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roy), who has just spoken.

Mr. E. ROY. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have no patronage at all in my constituency.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I presume the hon. gentleman is representing a constituency up where the 'Arctic' went among the Esquimaux.

Mr. E. ROY. My constituency has been represented here for twelve years by a Conservative.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No public buildings, and no barrel to carry them through the next elections, because without a barrel, none of them would come back here on such policies as Lumsden charges of over-classification, saw-dust piles that are called wharfs, Newmarket canals without any water in them, pot-boy palaces at Kingston, an expenditure of $112,000 for eight little cottages for the bung-starters who are to occupy them. And yet, they call upon this House to support a naval policy like that, a naval policy that they do not dare to submit to the people. If it is possible to say 'and worse still,' I will say it; and, worse still, they propose to put this navy under the management of a department of this government that under a very superficial investigation at the hands of Judge Cassels, not very long ago, was adjudged to be reeking with graft, crookedness and lack of conscience. That is where they are going to put this navy. It is scandalous. I am surprised that even a Liberal would stand for it—a department that has been in charge of the buoys that were set out at various places along our coast. After a buoy broke loose at the Old Proprietor reef on the Bay of Fundy it took this department that you are going to give your navy to, ten months to get that buoy back in place, and during that time, owing to their absolute criminal negligence—and it was nothing else—forty valuable lives were lost, as was so realistically depicted in this House by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) last year. Shame on your department. What will a department do with a navy that cannot manage a little old buoy? You have heard the slogan on the other side of the line. 'Remember the "Maine."' You know what that text meant on the other side of the line. But, Sir, I would say to the decent Liberals, and there are lots of them——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. They are not here tonight.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, they are; they are warped politically, but they are decent if you can ever get at their consciences. There is the trouble. I want the decent Liberals in this House when they are asked to vote for this navy to remember that it is going to cost millions and millions of dollars, not only to them, but to their children and their grand children, for all time and eternity. There is not get away from that. And, I will give them a slogan to remember it by—instead of 'Remember the "Maine"', let the cry be: 'Remember the "Minnie M."' with its stories of ballot boxes, and debauchery, and blackguardism; 'remember the "Arctic"', another of your fleet with its stores of booze, drugs of all kinds unmentionable, and ladies spring hats for the Esquimo four hundred. Remember these things boys. Remember the 'Montcalm' with its stores of cut glass and silverware bought from party friends at prices, three and four and five and six times more than they were worth. Remember these things when you go to vote, and remembering them beware of the navy. It seems to give gentlemen on the other side of the House a kind of nightmare when any one says 'emergency'. And I do not wonder at that because the First Minister for example, and the Minister of Militia and Defence must remember when they hear that word the emergency rations that they sent to our boys in South Africa, and that is a sore spot with them. The hon. member for Pictou in his speech the other day gave to this House the sentiments of a South African veteran, and I do not think I can do better than quote from a friend of mine who was right at the front in South Africa, and who knows what he was talking about. He says:

I think the arrangement with the Dominion was, but I am not sure that they supplied the rations and clothing that went with the men and horses, and the imperial government was to pay the Dominion the amount they charged, but you can find out, for sure, yourself.

The 2nd, 3rd 4th, 5th and 6th Regiments C. M. Rifles, and 10th Field Hospital were organized, paid, equipped and maintained throughout at the sole expense of the imperial government. It did not cost Canada one iota, not even the price of a bottle of ink for the orderly room. Wickwire was Sir Frederick Borden's purchasing agent at Halifax for these, charging the whole to the imperial government, and Oh, my, poor imperial government, they ought to give her four Dreadnoughts, and they would still owe her money.

Now in the case of the 1st C.M.R., we were to receive three shillings a day for a private soldier (and pay went up according to rank), but deducted from that was one shilling and two pence we received from the imperial purse, making a private get the handsome allowance of one shilling and ten pence a day from Canada. In comparison our comrades,

the New Zealanders and Australians, received for a private five shillings a day from their respective colonies, to which was added the one and two pence from the imperial government. Our clothing was the merest shoddy, just about as poor as is made, it wearing out in the matter of a few weeks. Our underclothing was so poor that General Hutton had to buy us some out of his own pocket, the issue being considered an imperial issue. The clothes were so frightfully poor he managed to get us some imperial clothes to wear. In contrast, the New Zealanders and Australians had the very best of underclothes, including real Bedford cord riding breeches, and serges made of as good a material as our officers.

Our rations.—First, the emergency ration. You must know this is a ration which a soldier can only use in case of being cut off from the supply column to keep body and soul together. Now, the ration we got, on being analyzed was found to be made of pure Indian corn. Laurier and Sir Frederick Borden must have thought of the pure food law in this case, as it was the only pure food we got. The size of the tin, as near as my memory carries me, was about the size of a two-ounce tin of Capstain tobacco, with about enough corn to keep a hen alive about five minutes, and an ordinarily healthy man about five seconds. We were paraded at Bloomfontein just before we started on Roberts's advance and had the ration taken away from every officer and man, and an English emergency given us in its place. Can you imagine our feelings, just arriving in a strange land, standing there before all the imperial troops, subjected to such an indignity, and the blessings we asked to be showered down on Laurier and Sir Frederick. It was said, and I have every reason to believe it was true, that the English officers who made the exchange said that the men who sent us out with that ration ought to be hung, and that they would like to pull the rope. There were about fifteen hundred of us in South Africa then, and this ration of pure Indian corn cost the Dominion, for which the imperial government cheerfully paid, I think, $50,000, but you can find out for sure. These are the same men who begrudge giving money to England for a navy. This philanthropic Laurier and this patriotic Borden just sent us out there to die like rabbits, should circumstances have necessitated the use of this ration; for you must understand that so much was thought of it that we were liable to a field general court martial (which has the power of awarding a death sentence) if we used it except to save starvation. In Laurier and Borden's case I wonder how fat they would get if, already in a half-starved condition, they had about an ounce of this pure food to live on. You can quite realize the indignation of the English officers when they had a ration themselves taking up very little more room that would make a pail of first class soup and a jug of the finest chocolate. Laurier and Borden, why their names were spoken of in the merest contempt, and there were many true Christian men who wished them both in a hotter place than South Africa, to which place they sent us out to starve. Their canned meats—you should have seen them, or rather smelt them. Why, they smelt nearly as bad as that box would if they lifted the lid where they hide their colossal steals. Their jam—put it all in a row, peach, marmalade, apricots, plum, apple and strawberry, and open the lot up, and you will find the same thing in all—one blue glucose, all the same colour but with different names. Their hay, musty and dusty, and so rotten that it could not be used for bedding. Oats, same quality. Why, I saw where that righteous Laurier denied they were pulling it out and throwing it into the ocean, but it is a fact, as we all saw it, to our shame. The only mistake the Boers made was not to buy this stuff up, because even after the best of this was sorted out all one had to do was to tell the 'Tommies' there was an issue of 'Canadian' rations coming along and they would run like old Harry (oh, the odour). In contrast to this, the Australian and New Zealand colonies, who had the same distance and transportation (practically) sent to the imperial government the very finest beef and mutton, better in fact I am sure than you have tasted in the best restaurant in Ottawa. Jam, hay and oats of the finest that money could buy; and arrived in South Africa in the very best condition; so much so in fact that our quartermaster was only telling me the other day that in drawing supplies from the Army Service Corps, he always tried to get fodder and meat that our sister colonies had supplied. Think what this must have been to a Canadian; and what do you think of our thoughts for that pious Laurier? When talking to an Australian (who had had a draught of seven years in their country) we would say to him, why don't you come to Canada, that is the best country in the world? He would say, oh, it must be, but not for us old boys, for if its anything like your meat, hay, oats, jam or the pay you receive, it must be a peach of a place. The only pure, sweet thing in the food line we have seen from your country is the emergency ration, which we might poison rabbits with except that it would take six tins to find enough corn to mix the poison with to kill one rabbit. Now, this is true, and no fiction about it, and you can imagine our feelings towards that Laurier-Borden combination, and what great colonists these brother colonials of ours would make in our western country, and how if it had not been for the rotten supplies that was sent out from here we could have got a thousand or more of them to come back to the west with us where they would have made ideal citizens, for they are about as fine a race of men as you ever saw.

After discussing the field hospitals, he goes on to say:

Now, imagine such men as Laurier and Borden talking of equipping a navy of our own. Why there is not a man living who was out in South Africa who does not shudder at the idea. It will be a navy so rotten in its structure and its interior economy that the world would shudder if it could see the inside. Just imagine these old contractor friends of Laurier of South African fame, how much rejected jam and clothes and fodder they must have on hand by now to outfit the navy with, and no imperial govern-

ment to throw them into the sea and pay for fresh supplies out of their own pockets. Talk about the German swindle in armour plate; how much old useless iron Laurier and Borden's friends must have on hand to be made into armour plate? Why, I bet they are figuring it out now, for if this pair have done it once they will do it again. The lives of the men who vote for them (as shown in the South African war, for the officers were good supporters of theirs) were as nought to them, how much more the lives of the men who do not believe in their unscrupulous dealings. No, the people have a right and demand that they go to the country for a vote and have an opportunity to show the imperial government that they appreciate what they have done in shielding the disgraceful ordnance and stores we supplied and that they paid for willingly and threw into the sea. How she praised a small handful of men who fought for her. Why take Diamond Hills, there were only I think 110 Canadians there, out of 72,000 men engaged, who did no more than their share, yet like a mother she would smother her children with praise when they had robbed the parent right and left. How realistic of human life, the worst the child the more the mother loves and cares for him, not but in this case the children as a whole loves the mother and would not rob her, but would give her half they have. It is the black one of the family who tries to misrepresent the rest. Let us, the whole of the children, have a vote and we will show that black one how generous we can be to the mother who fed and educated us without costing us a cent.

So much of my friend's opinion of the emergency rations, and this new naval scheme. Following the example of my hon. friend from Pictou, I will read another letter, even on the off-chance of boring you. This is from a farmer, one of the best farmers in Manitoba, a man who perhaps has not had the chance of getting as much education as some of us, but who has sound common sense, and is in touch with the pulse of the people. I wrote to him last fall asking for his opinion, and in his reply he says:

You ask what my opinion of a Canadian navy is. I cannot tell you all I think about it in this letter; but here are some of the views that occur to my mind over the prospect. It appears to me that the mother country would be pleased to have any assistance that Canada could give along the line of defence; but I cannot see how a Canadian navy would be of any assistance at all in that line. It would only be a source of anxiety and care on the hands of the British imperial navy. You know we, who are older shudder sometimes when we see our little kids floundering around in water that is too deep for them. Of course, we have always had a pretty good idea of the policy that the leaders of our present government would like to adopt in regard to the relations of our country and the motherland. Let me say that as a British subject, there are none more willing that Canada contribute to the defence of our empire than myself; but I would want that contribution to be a real help and not an hindrance. If the government is really taking the matter seriously, and a navy is their solution of the matter, for heaven's sake urge the necessity of placing the little fellow on some of our inland waters where we will have better facilities for looking after it and keeping it out of harms' way. I believe I express the sentiment of nine-tenths of our western people.

I might ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who is at present leading the House, if this Bill gets through, as I hope it will not, to see that my friend's wishes are carried out with regard to placing this little navy on our inland waters. However, Sir, we have a comfort, or what should be a comfort in this matter. Last year, in speaking in this House, the right hon. the First Minister said that in the event, which at that time seemed to him quite possible, of an emergency suddenly arising, he was prepared to get a move on, and to go into Quebec, and stump the country. That is a great way to meet an emergency, is it not, Mr. Speaker? The only trouble with the right hon. gentleman on that occasion, so far as I could see, was this, that he did not tell us what he would say in stumping the country. All his life he has been too fond of stumping, and too careless of what he says when on the stump. If he were, I will not say an ordinary member, but an ordinary citizen, and expressed the views he has expressed, it would be his own business, and it would not be right to criticise him. But, unfortunately for this country, he is in a position in which we have to criticise his words, because these words do not emanate from him as a private citizen, but as the leader of the great Liberal party. That is why we on this side criticise the speeches he made in Boston where he absolutely declared against Great Britain, and British diplomacy. And in other speeches, even in this House, he put forward, as the goal of his ambition, the independence of Canada. In his speech on the Champs de Mars, Montreal, he declared, speaking of the rebellion in Saskatchewan in 1885, that had he been there he would have shouldered a musket along with those poor unfortunate misguided rebels. Only the right hon. gentleman did not call them misguided rebels. Those were my words. Every Liberal feels sore that we can get up, and make the statements we do without fear of contradiction, because the language, and the sentiments uttered by the Prime Minister he has never repudiated. If he would repudiate to-day the sentiments he voiced in former times, many of us on this side would feel more disposed to support his naval policy. But he has not repudiated them, and I can have no confidence in any

Canadian, and especially in the leader of a party, who made such statements. 'Let Laurier finish his work,' was the cry all over Canada at the last elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was his work? Are hon. gentlemen crying 'hear, hear', because the right hon. gentleman said that the goal of his ambition was the independence of Canada? If that is his work, I will have none of it, but am against him first, last and all the time. But even if you could confine those idiosyncrasies, as our hon. friends opposite are pleased to term them, to the Prime Minister that would not be quite so bad because you could get rid of him, but the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has a similar record. In 1886 that hon. gentleman stumped his own province of Nova Scotia with the war cry of separation from the Dominion. When premier of that province he moved a resolution on the 5th May, 1886, declaring for separation, yet hon. gentlemen opposite will get up and say that it is shameful the way in which we decry their ministers. Sir, that is not where the shame belongs. It belongs to the ministers who have said those things which give us an opportunity to show them in their true light, and sorry we are to have such an opportunity. We are ashamed for Canada that we can throw those utterances in the teeth of these men. On that occasion to which I have referred, telegrams were read on the same platform at the Champs de Mars, where the Prime Minister made the statement I have quoted, from the worst enemies of the British empire, the Fenians, attacking the empire. And on that platform, where these telegrams were read, the right hon. gentleman, who now leads this government, and who is the wet nurse of this navy, got up and said that had he been on the plains of Saskatchewan at the time of the rebellion of 1885, he would have shouldered a musket on behalf of the rebels. I was out there with many other hon. gentlemen in this House, not because I blamed so much those poor, ignorant half-breeds, but because I realized that were the rebellion allowed to go on, it would mean that the defenceless women and children of Canada, scattered throughout the northwest, would be at the mercy of the Indians, who would have risen in all their numbers and might. I was out there in the fight for my country, taking my chances with the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington), the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie), the hon. member for Victoria (Alta.) (Mr. White), and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) and others

—fighting for what? Fighting for the solidarity of the empire, fighting for our flag, fighting for the women and children of Canada all through that country; and yet we had this hon. gentleman, who is the leader of the Liberal party, getting up among the people of Montreal and saying that had he been out in that country he would have shouldered his rifle and fought against us. The term 'United Empire Loyalist' is one to be proud of, it is one almost too great for us to aspire to, but we were united empire loyalists in heart. What was the right hon. gentleman? What would you call that kind of loyalists who would go out and fight for the rebels? I would give them a new name and call them the E, U, or entirely unique loyalists. That was not the kind of loyalty we had in our minds and hearts. Had the right hon. gentleman been out there he would have been able to carry out his aspirations and join hands with those unfortunate rebels. And if he was a better sharp shooter then than when he made a shot at the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific, he might have got myself, because I was out there taking chances and I would not now be able to give him my opinion. Or he might have got my hon. from from Victoria (Mr. White) who was there taking chances in upholding the solidarity of the empire. That is the kind of loyalty I like, but the E. U. loyalty is a brand I never will approve.

Down in the east you know the history of that rebellion from the point of view of this part of the country. You know that regiments went out there from Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, taking their lives in their hands, to fight for the unity of the empire. But there is a chapter of that rebellion which has never been written, and I would recommend the Prime Minister to get busy and write it before the men who can tell the truth about it are all dead. The chapter I refer to is this. As you know, that rebellion started in the neighbourhood of Prince Albert. Prince Albert people were poor in 1885, they had no way of getting money. The poor half breeds in that country had grievances against the government. They made demand after demand to this government and their demands were refused or neglected. The white people—some of the white people—of that district interested themselves with the half breeds, went to their meetings, incited them to rebellion, talked rebellion, talked secession. After a certain time they got up a subscription. What for? The half breeds had no money to subscribe. Some of the white settlers of that country did subscribe to send two delegates down to Milk river, Montana, and ask poor Riel, who was living down there in peace and quietness, teaching school, to come up and

agitate for them. He came up. He was a powerful speaker, a born orator, one of the greatest men to address a French audience that I ever heard. He could sway them as I move my hands. Whatever feeling or sentiment he wanted to put into them he put into them. The white people saw that the flames they had kindled were beyond their power to control, and they backed out like the cowards they were, and let the half breeds bear the brunt. There is the story of the half breed rebellion.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the object? Scrip?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Of course. These gentlemen who incited that rebellion, who sent Isbister and Lepine to Milk river, Montana, and brought Riel up, backed out like cowards, I say. And they went scot free; they were able to hide their misdeeds—evidently did hide them—from the ken of the government. But poor Riel had to suffer the brunt of it; he had to die a felon's death on the gallows, the poor tool of men who, perhaps, should have been in his place.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. A time of good government!

Mr. CAMPBELL. I appreciate what the hon. member (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) said. It helps me out. Referring to the First Minister's remarks about shouldering his musket, I want to say further that those remarks had an ulterior meaning even in the right hon. gentleman's own mind, and I will try to show it to you. Some years after he made that statement, he was running an election. He wanted to be certain of a seat—he had a seat, I presume, in Quebec, as he has now, but he wanted to run for two seats, so that he would be sure of being elected—in all the length and breadth of Canada, what seat did he pick out? The very seat I speak of, where that rebellion had been, where many of the French-speaking people were poor, illiterate half breeds, men who had never had the chance of an education, whose form of life did not call for education, for they were hunters, trappers, and engaged in other occupations of that kind. His opponent was James Mackay. He was a native of that part of the country, as I am, and he was one of the best scouts that Canada had in her service fighting for Queen and flag in 1885. He was known to every man in that riding. And he was an able man, for he has now become K. C. and is looked upon by his friends and by everybody as a very able, honest, decent fellow. When the election came on, what literature was sent to those poor people? None whatever, but Grit party heelers went through the country. They would go to a poor half-breed and say: 'Who are you going to vote for, Jim?' The answer naturally was: 'For Jim Mackay.' Then the heeler would say: 'You can't vote for him; he was fighting you; he was killing your people like rabbits in 1885. You can't vote for him. Vote for Laurier, he was the leader of the Liberal party who was not afraid to say in Montreal that he would have come to help you to fight if he could have got there.' And Laurier was elected. United Empire loyalty again, I say. It did not die out even with that in the western country. I have mixed up in elections in that country ever since 1892, and I have never known a campaign yet where there was a French half-breed electorate but the Liberal party heelers have repeated the same thing: 'You can't vote for Campbell; he was fighting against your people; vote for the Laurier candidate, because Laurier would have helped you to fight if he could.' United Empire loyalty—I call it a bad strain of loyalty to teach the poor half-breed in my opinion. Why, the Liberal party in Manitoba even carried that E. U. entirely unique loyalty into the local politics of the province. When Mr. Roblin introduced what is called the 'flag policy,' when, in that country, having a cosmopolitan race of people, he tried to pass legislation to have the flag hung before the door of every school house of Manitoba, every Liberal in the legislature voted against it, and did everything in his power against it. Still, they say that they are loyal. Loyal? Entirely unique loyalty, to my mind.

Now, there is another matter that I will refer to very briefly. The debate is almost over—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear, Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will not detain the House very long. I regret if I am hurting the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, though this debate is almost over, we have not had any declaration from the ministry as to the kind of flag is going to fly over this tin-pot navy. I think we should have had such a declaration. I do not know whether it will come with good grace from me to make a suggestion, and I do not know that any suggestion I offer to the minister will be followed. But I suggest that they get a large white flag, with a yellow streak across it. That would signify that it was a fleet, made, as the Prime Minister suggests, to elude pursuit—ready, aye, ready, to fulfil the purpose of the construction of such a navy at all times. I do not know whether the First Minister will accept that suggestion, but I offer it to him in a free spirit.

There is just one more point I would like to mention. I am a farmer, and this question strikes me as to be best illustrated in this way: The father of a large family has an estate of a few thousand acres. He gives his son a holding of 160 acres some-

where in the middle of his property. He has a fence all around this immense property, but there is no fence visible from the son's habitation. The son goes on and improves that land, breaks it up, grows crops upon it, puts money in the bank and is successful; he has no rent and no taxes to pay. He does not assist his old father or the rest of the family in any way whatever. Finally the father gets into difficulties, and he says: 'My boy, I want a little help; what can you do for me? I want to build a seven-foot fence all around this big property.' 'Well, father,' says the son, 'I am entirely willing to help you; I will do so by building a dinky little two-rail fence all around my own lot. Now, Sir, it seems to me that that illustration is apropos of the naval situation. The supremacy of the British navy is this great big fence that has been protecting little Canada. It has not been visible to us, but it has been there, and it has been efficacious. What good is our little tin-pot navy going to do in the defence of the empire? Would it not be a great deal better for that son to say: 'Yes, father, I will do something for you. There are a lot of strange cattle marauding around the farm; there is danger of them jumping over the fence, and if they do jump over the fence, anything I can build around my farm will be no good to me, therefore I will help you to put two more strands upon the fence, and make it a little stronger and a little higher. I think that illustration puts the situation in a nutshell, so that any man in Canada can understand it. Sir, those are my opinions. I give them to you as the result of my careful deliberation, and the way they are received on this side of the House shows that there is a lot of united empire loyalty in us yet.

House divided on amendment. — Mr. Northrup.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	McCall,
Arthurs,	McCarthy,
Barker,	Maddin,
Barnard,	Magrath,
Best,	Marshall,
Blain,	Meighen,
Blondin,	Middlebro,
Borden (Halifax),	Monk,
Boyce,	Nantel,
Bradbury,	Northrup,
Broder,	Paquet,
Burrell,	Perley,
Campbell,	Porter,
Chisholm (Huron),	Price,
Clare,	Reid (Grenville),
Cowan,	Rhodes,
Crocket,	Roche,
Crothers,	Russell,
Currie (Simcoe),	Schaffner,
Daniel,	Sexsmith,
Doherty,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Donnelly,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Edwards,	Smyth,
Elson,	Sproule,
Forget,	Stanfield,
Fraser,	Staples,
Goodeve,	Stewart,
Haggart (Lanark),	Taylor (Leeds),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Taylor (New Westminster),
Henderson,	Thoburn,
Herron,	Thornton,
Hughes,	Verville,
Jameson,	Wallace,
Kidd,	White (Renfrew),
Lake,	Wilcox (Essex),
Lalor,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Lancaster,	Worthington,
Lennox,	Wright.—78.
Lortie,	
Macdonell,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	MacNutt,
Aylesworth,	McAllister,
Beauparlant,	McColl,
Béland,	McCraney,
Bickerdike,	McKenzie,
Black,	McLean (Huron),
Boyer,	McLean (Sunbury),
Brown,	McMillan,
Bureau,	Major,
Carrier,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carvell,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Cash,	Martin (Regina),
Champagne,	Martin (Wellington),
Chew,	Mayrand,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Meigs,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Michaud,
Clark (Red Deer),	Miller,
Clarke (Essex),	Molloy,
Congdon,	Murphy,
Conmee,	Nesbitt,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Neely,
Delisle,	Oliver,
Demers,	Papineau,
Devlin,	Pardee,
Douglas,	Parent,
Dubeau,	Pickup,
Ecrément,	Proulx,
Emmerson,	Prowse,
Ethier,	Pugsley,
Fielding,	Rankin,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Richards,
Fowke,	Rivet,
Gauvreau,	Robb,
Geoffrion,	Ross (Middlesex),
Gervais,	Ross (Rimouski),
Girard,	Roy (Dorchester),
Gladu,	Roy (Montmagny),
Graham,	Rutan,
Guthrie,	Savoie,
Harty,	Schell,
Hodgins,	Sealey,
Hunt,	Seguin,
King,	Sinclair,
Knowles,	Smith (Middlesex),
Kyte,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Lachance,	Smith (Stormont),
Lafortune,	Sperry,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Templeman,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Tobin,
Lapointe,	Todd,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tolmie,
	Turcotte (Nicolet),

Lavergne,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Low,
Macdonald,
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Warburton,
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson (Laval).—119.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Borden (Sir F.),	Foster (Hon. G. E.),
Paterson (Hon. W.),	Crosby,
Brodeur (Hon. L. P.),	Ames,
Harris,	Beattie,
Gordon (Kent),	Osler,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
McCoig,	Bristol,
Talbot,	Owens,
McIntyre,	Lewis.

Amendment (Mr. Northrup) negatived.

House divided on motion.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Boyer,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Ecrément,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
King,
Knowles,
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McColl,
McCraney,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Robb,
Ross (Middlesex),
Ross (Rimouski),
Roy (Dorchester),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sinclair,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Low,
Macdonald,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Sperry,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Todd,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Warburton,
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson (Laval).—118.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Barker,
Barnard,
Best
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden (Halifax),
Boyce,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Cowan,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elson,
Forget,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Lanark),
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lortie,
Macdonell,
McCall,
McCarthy,
Maddin,
Magrath,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Monk,
Nantel,
Northrup,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Price,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Verville,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Worthington,
Wright.—78.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Borden (Sir F.),	Foster,
Paterson,	Crosby,
Brodeur,	Ames,
Harris,	Beattie,
Gordon (Kent),	Osler,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
McCoig,	Bristol.
Talbot,	Owens,
McIntyre,	Lewis.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Committee of Supply on the Estimates of the Minister of Railways.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 11, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into committee on Monday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient, in connection with Bill No. 95, now under consideration by this House, respecting the naval service of Canada, to provide for the establishment, under regulations in that behalf, to be made by the Governor General in Council, of pensions and gratuities for the permanent naval service; such pensions or gratuities not to be larger in amount or granted upon more favourable terms than the pensions and gratuities authorized under the Militia Act.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON. Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. In the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday, while my name appears as having voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup), it is omitted in the record of the vote on the main motion. This omission occurs both in the Votes and Proceedings and 'Hansard.' It is obvious that some error has been made, because it will be remembered distinctly that the vote on the main motion was exactly as was the vote on the amendment, but the total in the main motion, as recorded in the Votes and Proceedings and 'Hansard,' is put down at 118, whereas it was announced by the clerk of the House as 119. I think all hon. members will recollect the fact that I was present at both divisions, that I voted against the amendment to the main motion and in favour of the main motion, and I would ask that both 'Hansard' and Votes and Proceedings be corrected in that regard, so as to conform with what actually took place.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

THE LUMSDEN INVESTIGATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to an extraordinary mistake which seems to have been made by the chairman of the committee now engaged in making an investigation into the charges preferred by Mr. Lumsden. On looking at the proceedings of the committee, it will be seen, at page 3, that the following resolution was passed:

Mr. Lennox moved that the committee recommend that the proceedings and evidence taken by them be printed and reported to the House from day to day.

This was agreed to, but for some reason which I cannot understand, the chairman of the committee, in reporting that to the House, left out the very important words and reported to the House so that the committee is represented to have recommended only that the proceedings and evidence taken by them should be printed. That seems to be an extraordinary step for the chairman of the committee to have taken, and I think we should have an explanation from him why such an omission was made, and have that omission immediately rectified.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The report was prepared by the clerk of the committee and submitted to the committee, and nobody objected. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by saying that the chairman omitted any words at all. I submitted the report which was prepared by the clerk, according to the order of the House, which says that the committee shall report to the House from time to time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I regret that either I seem to have a very imperfect realization of what took place, or else the hon. gentleman has. I am not talking about the order of the House, but about the recommendation of the committee, which it was the duty of the hon. gentleman to report to this House in the terms in which it passed the committee. The motion which passed the committee was as follows:

Mr. Lennox moved that the committee recommend that their proceedings and the evidence taken by them be printed and reported to the House from day to day, which was agreed to.

That is plain, is it not? But here is the way in which the chairman of the committee reported that resolution:

Your committee recommends that their proceedings and any evidence taken by them be printed from day to day.

Carefully leaving out the important words 'and reported to the House.' What has the order of this House to do with the matter? The hon. gentleman had nothing

to do with the order of this House, but only with the recommendation of the committee, words which were essential to it, omit from the recommendation of the commitee, words which were essential to it, and he has given no explanation for that omission which can be regarded as satisfactory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Has my hon. friend taken the trouble to compare the printed report with the printed record of the motion?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have taken the trouble to ask members of the committee who were present when that motion passed. I asked the hon. gentleman who moved that motion, and moved it in writing, and he tells me that the printed report is exactly in the terms in which he put his motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not the slightest wish to reflect on my hon. friend, but errors sometimes do occur in the printing. He may recollect that some days ago the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) put a question on the paper containing an extract from a speech delivered by me in Toronto. It happened that the printed extract was not a correct printing of the hon. gentleman's question, and I thought that possibly a similar error might have taken place in this instance. The chairman of the committee, taken by surprise, does not know that there was a discrepancy, but his attention being drawn to it, he will see that it is rectified

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. the leader of the opposition knows very well that the chairman of a committee usually presents to the House the report prepared by the clerk of that committee and does not himself draft that report. I would suggest that the supporters of my hon. friend, who were appointed to that committee, should go there and settle these matters before hand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not a matter to be dealt with in the committee at all, but in this House, which has the right to have the recommendation of a committee reported to it in the terms in which the motion passed that committee.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend's remarks are out of order because they relate to a proceeding before a committee which that committee has not reported to this House. He has not taken the trouble to ascertain whether the printed record agrees with his version.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have done so. I have gone to the hon. gentleman who moved the motion and he says the printed document is exactly as he moved it. He is as certain of that as any one can be of any fact. The hon. member for Pictou has a very extraordinary idea of what we should do. First, he suggests that when the recommendation of a committee is brought before this House in terms other than those in which they passed, the matter cannot be raised in this House. In other words when a committee recommends that its proceedings shall be reported to the House from day to day, and when that recommendation has been omitted from the report without a word of explanation, we cannot raise the question in this House because the committee has not reported, and it has not so reported because that recommendation has been omitted for some mysterious reason. Is that my hon. friend's argument? If so, I do not think it would commend itself to any one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is too hasty in presuming that there is something mysterious in this. What is much more likely is that an error has occurred, as often happens. There is a disparity between the report as moved in the House and the resolution of the committee. But, my hon. friend knows that the chairman does not draw the report. That is drawn by the clerk, and it is very likely that the chairman signed it without looking at it carefully. Now that his attention is drawn to the matter, he will look into it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The proceedings of the committee, as recommeneded by the committee should have been reported to the House day by day. But the fact that that recommendation has been altered by some person—I do not say who is responsible—before being brought to the House, and that the report has been confirmed by this House should prove that any explanation of that alteration—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No person noticed the alteration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I was about to remark. The House had no explanation; the House was misled. The matter should have been corrected at once, and, for the reason suggested by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), the fact of these proceedings not having been reported day by day, prevented hon. members from making reference to the proceedings of the committee. One might think there was a certain connection between the alteration and the result of the alteration as argued by my hon. friend from Pictou. That hon. gentleman took the point at once: there is no report of the proceedings of this committee, and, therefore, the matter cannot be referred to. Why is there no report of the proceedings of the committee? Because the recommen-

dation of the committee was altered. The hon. member for Pictou is very quick to take the point, and gives us a clue, perhaps as to why the alteration was made. It is a very astute point, but rather an obvious one; I think it must have occurred to almost every member of the House before my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) had the remarkable candour and frankness to raise it.

Mr. MACDONALD. May I permitted, though perhaps out of order—

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter cannot be discussed—

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. member (Mr. R. L. Borden) has made reference to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has made three speeches—

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that there is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. MACDONALD. I agree with that; but Mr. Speaker, if you will hear me—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has taken a very bad precedent—

Mr. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order—

Mr. SPEAKER. The custom of the House here and in England is, when the Speaker rises, for the member who claims the floor to be seated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. This remark applies to both sides. The same thing occurred yesterday. I say, there is nothing before the Chair. I cannot allow this discussion to go on.

Mr. MACDONALD. When the discussion is wholly out of order, as it admittedly is and was, and when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) spoke three times out of order, and made a personal reference to myself, I submit that it is quite in order for me to reply to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) cannot raise a discussion on that.

Mr. MACDONALD. It seems hardly fair for—

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that a point of order was to be raised—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood that a point of order was to be raised.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes. When, in a debate is admittedly out of order, the hon. gentleman discussing the matter makes a personal reference to another hon. member, I think that other hon. member should have a right to reply. That is the point of order I make. But if you rule that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition Mr. R. L. Borden) can make three speeches out of order and I cannot make one, I accept the ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. Government orders.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are entered upon, I ask the permission of the House to say a few words on a question of privilege.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder. Come forward.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. If it is not out of order, I would say that the acoustic properties of this chamber are so defective that it is impossible for any one at the back of the chamber to hear what is going on at the front, and for any one at the front to know what is said at the back. However, as I said, I wish to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I say a word on a question of privilege. I received from a friend this morning a clipping from a newspaper, a report of a special Ottawa correspondent, and I may say that a similar statement has appeared in several other Conservative papers. Before proceeding to read the statement itself, I may say that the statement is headed with a large scare head as follows:

An M.P. Rebuked by his own Party—M. Y. McLean (S. Huron) stirs up an unpleasant scene by interrupting Geo. Clare and declining to be shut up.

The despatch proceeds:

George A. Clare, the German-Canadian representative of South Waterloo, was interrupted by Mr. McLean while in the course of an amiable speech, which was being listened to by the largest attendance seen during the naval debate, since the premier and Mr. Borden addressed the House.

Mr. Clare, who has been in bad health for some time, was obviously speaking under difficulties, and the Conservatives resented the sneer with which Mr. McLean accompanied his interjected question, 'Would you favour sending $25,000,000 to England for Dreadnoughts?'

They shouted 'Oh, oh' and 'Sit down.' Mr. McLean refused to sit down, and the hubbub grew boisterous. The Speaker intimated that Mr. McLean couldn't break into the debate without Mr. Clare's permission, but McLean refused to take the hint. He said something which was inaudible, owing to shouts of 'Order, order,' and 'Put him down.'

The premier nodded to the Speaker and gave McLean a warning look. Mr. Fielding

also turned round and signed with his hand to McLean to sit down, but the member for South Huron wouldn't.

The Speaker: I have already told the hon. member to sit down. The hon. member for South Waterloo has the floor and cannot be interrupted.

Mr. McLean still endeavoured to proceed, and, amid cries of 'Name him,' the Speaker formally ordered him to sit down.

Mr. Clare then remarked that never in his years in the House had he interrupted any one, and when a gentleman was in poor health, he had always endeavoured to assist him. General applause, in which Mr. Fielding joined, greeted this, and the incident closed.

I am not in the habit of taking very seriously to heart any statements that the Conservative papers or the Conservative politicians may make about or against me, because I know that if I did not say something that was worth while and something that hit hard, they would not pay attention to me. And, Sir, I have been fighting them nearly all my life and I have learned to take hard knocks as well as soft knocks with the greatest equanimity and to return them with interest when I could. But this statement goes beyond what is fair. It accuses me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. If you will wait for a moment—that is one of the things that creates difficulties. I say that, if not by direct statement, at least by insinuation, this accuses me of taking advantage of the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare) in order to interrupt and annoy him. Now, I have to say this: that, although the hon. member for South Waterloo represents my native constituency, I have not the pleasure of his acquaintance. I really did not know who he was until he got up to continue the discussion, nor had I the least idea that he was suffering from ill health. Had I known that it is quite possible that I should not have interrupted him, because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. friend himself, that no one could have more sympathy with a gentleman under such circumstances than I would have. But while he was suffering from ill health he was not so ill but that he could pay his attentions to myself as he went along, and not do it in a very becoming or generous manner. However, I will allow that to pass. As the hon. gentleman was proceeding with his argument, an argument which I thought very involved and difficult to understand, I desired, for my own information, to find out just where he was at. I got up, as I think I had a right to do, at least to do what has been done a hundred times in this House, I got up and asked the hon. gentleman if he would permit me to ask him a question, and he replied: Yes, certainly. I submitted that question, but instead of answering it he proceeded with his argument, entirely ignoring the question. Under these circumstances I again asked him the question, and still he did not reply. My statement of the case is borne out by the official report of the debates which I have on my desk. Now, I think that under the circumstances, if there was any discourtesy it was not on my part, but on the part of the hon. gentleman who, having permitted me to ask him a question, saw fit to ignore it and would not answer either, yes or no. If there was any discourtesy it was on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposite who, when I was exercising my right in this House, endeavoured to howl me down; and, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to your decision on that occasion, I must say that I think I was perfectly in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss a ruling of the Speaker.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. All right, Sir, there is no person more desious of obeying the rules of this House than I am. Although I have no personal acquaintance with the hon. member for South Waterloo, I have heard of him frequently, being as he is the representative of my native county. I have nothing but the greatest respect for that gentleman, and nothing would be further from my desire than to annoy him, or injure him in any way whatever. I have only to say in conclusion that I think I cannot be accused of unduly interrupting hon. members in this House, because, although I have been here for the greater part of three sessions. I think this is only the second time that I have had occasion to do anything of the kind. I may also add this, that if hon. gentlemen opposite have left the hon. member for South Waterloo and myself alone, any difference that had arisen between us would have been settled very amicably.

SUPPLY—RECIPROCAL USE OF CANALS.

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

Mr. G. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). On the 24th of February last I asked this question:

Have Canadian vessels carrying freight the right to use the canals of the state of New York? If so, what statute authorizes it? If not, what statute or regulation prevents it?

The Minister of Justice replied:

By the treaty of Washington the government of the United States engaged to urge upon the state governments to secure to British subjects the use of the several state canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by, or contiguous to

the boundary line, on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, but this government is not aware that such urgency has, up to the present time, been productive of any practical result. The matter is, of course, not governed by Canadian legislation, and the government is not in a position to answer as to the legislation on the subject (if any) there may be in the state of New York.

I judge from this reply that the Department of Justice does not think that at the present time Canadians have a right to use the canals in the state of New York on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, and up to a short time ago that was my own idea on the subject. My reason for bringing this matter up at the present time is that there has been a feeling in this part of Canada, at all events, for a great many years, that the United States did not give us fair play under the treaty of Washington in relation to the canals in the state of New York. It has been generally understood here for many years that we have no right to send a vessel of Canadian register from here to New York city. I remember years ago when I first started business here everybody said that we could not send a vessel of Canadian register through to New York, and I have felt that way about it ever since. However, within the last few months, I have had some talk with the American Consul General here, the Hon. J. G. Foster, on this subject, and he assured me that we were mistaken in our idea, and that a boat of Canadian register could go through all right. I have a letter written by Mr. Denis Murphy, of the city of Ottawa, a gentleman who has been in the transportation business all his life; it is written to the United States Consul General, under date of March 1, 1909:

Dear Sir,—In reference to our conversation of Friday last, I now have much pleasure in giving you what information I have in regard to the stopping of Canadian barges at the Champlain canal.

About the year 1870 or 1871, the late firm of J. W. McRae & Company built six small barges called the A., B., C., D., E. and F., with the intention of running them through to New York with lumber and having them return with cargoes of coal. The first trip they were stopped at Whitehall and after considerable correspondence and much delay to the barges, they were allowed to proceed with the understanding that in future they would not be allowed further than Whitehall. These barges loaded coal in New York and came back to Ottawa and were kept in the trade here.

About this time the forwarders here found this class of barge too small for the trade, and the larger barges then were built. These barges were too large to go through the Champlain canal, so that there was never any further trouble from that source. I might state that this one occasion is the only time I know of Canadian vessels being stopped at any of the American canals.

Trusting this information will be satisfactory,

I am, yours truly,
D. MURPHY.

My impression is that the reason why it was supposed all these years that Canadian vessels could not use the New York state canals on an equality with the inhabitants of the United States, was because of this incident away back in the '70's. I have been unable to find any case of late years where a Canadian boat has been stopped from using the New York canals. The American Consul General in a letter which I received from him a few days ago says:

The present constitution of the state of New York was adopted November 6, 1894, and went into force January 1, 1895. Since the adoption of this constitution it is my understanding that the canals have been absolutely free to vessels of all nations.

I took the opinion of a gentleman from New York who is conversant with the statutes of that state, and he says that he is unable to find any provision of law or Act of the legislature which discriminates against the free use of the state canals by Canadian vessels. That is his very positive statement. It seems that under this constitution of the state of New York which came into force in 1895 it is provided by article 97:

No tolls shall hereafter be imposed on persons or property transported on the canals, but all boats navigating the canals and the owners and masters thereof shall be subject to such laws and regulations as have been, or may hereafter be enacted, concerning the navigation of canals.

This clause in the constitution seems to be a perfectly clear one, and it explicitly abolishes all tolls on persons and property transported on the canals. It seems evident that at least from the adoption of the constitution of 1895 the canals of the state of New York have been free to all comers, including Canadians. The constitution of the state places the management of the canals, and their control and operation as well as their maintenance and repair in the hands of the superintendent of public works in the state of New York.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are all the canals in question the property of the state or are any of them under private ownership?

Mr. PERLEY. All these canals are the property of the state. Article 100 of the constitution of the state of New York provides as follows:

The legislature shall not sell, lease or otherwise dispose of the Erie canal, the Oswego canal the Champlain canal the Cayuga and Seneca canals or the Black River canal, but they shall remain the property of the state and under its management for ever.

Mr. A. BRODER. There are some private owned canals as well?

Mr. PERLEY. There may be; I am referring only to those owned by the state. I may say that I am not going to find any fault with the government on this subject, I am not asking an answer, I am simply putting on record what I understand to be the exact state of affairs today. It has been my impression for the last thirty-five years that we could not send a Canadian boat through to New York and evidently the Minister of Justice thinks that that is at present the state of affairs, because in his answer of February 24, he says, speaking of the efforts of the United States:

The government is not aware that such urgency has up to the present time been productive of any practical result.

That is in the way of the state of New York agreeing that we should use their canals.

As the superintendent of public works of the state of New York has this matter entirely in charge, and must be cognizant of all the facts concerning it, I wrote him last month, and this is his reply:

State of New York,
Superintendent of Public Works, Albany.
February 16, 1910.

Subject: Discrimination as to boats.

Mr. George H. Perley,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—Answering your letter of the 9th instant, addressed to the superintendent of Public Works, I beg to say that there has never been any discrimination either by the rules for the management of the canals, or by statute, against Canadian owned boats, nor is there at the present time.

Section 172 of chapter 13, laws of 1909, known as the Canal Law, prescribes rules for the registration of canal boats. This section, after providing that the owner of boats navigating the canals shall deliver to properly designated officials a certificate of registry, containing the name of the owner, his residence, name of the boat and the hailing point, provides that such registry shall be signed by the owner, if a resident of this state; if not, by the master of the boat as the owner thereof.

Yours very truly,
WINSLOW M. MEAD,
Deputy Supt. Public Works.

My object in rising is that I think it is only fair that this evidence and correspondence should be made public in this way, because I believe that if the impression which every one in this section of Canada has had for a great many years that the state of New York does not allow Canadian boats to use the New York canal is a wrong impression, we should disabuse the public mind of it. As I read this correspondence and evidence particularly this letter from the deputy superintendent of public works, unless there is some other evidence to be found of which I know nothing, it seems to me absolutely that the state of New York allows us to use the canals of that state on an equality with the inhabitants of the United States if we wish to do so. If the Minister of Justice finds anything to be said on the other side, and his department thinks that we have not the right to use these canals, I wish he would inform the House of that fact.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). If I say anything with regard to this subject it is not that I think that I can enlighten the hon. gentleman or this House with reference to the very important question he has brought up. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) who is a keen and acute business man, with the investigation he has made into this subject knows more about it than I do, probably more than any Canadian lawyer, and I have no idea that I can add to his knowledge by anything I can say. I should explain that the circumstance that I made the answer to the question which my hon. friend put upon the order paper some days ago, was merely an accident. Some one had to answer it, and the First Minister asked me to do so. The subject is one not depending in any way upon Canadian legislation, it is not a question of the interpretation of any Canadian statute or Canadian regulations. So far as I am aware, so far as I have ever heard, there is no treaty existing between the United States and Great Britain which would cover this matter except the treaty of Washington, and in making the answer the other day to the question propounded I simply referred to that treaty and stated the substance of its provisions with regard to this matter. I take it that the only way in which the question can be practically determined would be by diplomatic representations to the United States government, and through the federal government to that of the state of New York; or possibly by proceedings before the courts of that state if the right to use the canals on the part of a Canadian vessel was challenged or refused. It would necessarily be a matter in regard to which the only person competent to give advice which would be of any value would be some one acquainted thoroughly with the statutes of the state of New York on the subject, some local practitioner whose opinion would be of value in regard to their legislation, and the regulations under which their canals may be used. No one in this country would I think be competent to do so. I can only say with reference to the whole subject, and especially to the points which my hon. friend has called attention to, that I shall examine with great interest what

he has said when it appears in 'Hansard,' and that if there is anything which can be accomplished toward the end which no doubt he desires, by correspondence, diplomatically or otherwise, I am sure that I should be only too happy, and that any other member of the government would be only too well pleased to facilitate the objects which the hon. gentleman has in view.

Mr. BRODER. As a matter of fact, I believe it is without dispute that for the last forty years no Canadian vessel has any privilege of going and coming through these canals. When the Washington treaty was negotiated in 1871 the United States federal government went only so far as to agree to urge the state to give the Canadians that privilege, but they did not succeed, so that we are just in the position we were in before we made a treaty at all. There are not only state owned canals in the state of New York, but there are privately owned canals, and even if they had acceded to the wishes of the federal government under the treaty, they would still have control of these private canals. I believe that as a matter of fact for forty years Canadian vessels have not frequented these canals. What can you do now? The federal authorities cannot oblige the state of New York to give the use of these canals, all they can do is to urge the state to do it and it will end just where it ended before. It is a very awkward position to be in, but if you look up the protocols of the Washington treaty you will see that all they agreed to do was simply to urge on the state the wisdom of giving us the use of these canals, and the state refused to do it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) is right in saying that according to the treaty of Washington the United States authorities undertook to urge upon the state of New York to give to Canadians the use of their canals just as by that treaty the use of the canals of the St. Lawrence was given to American citizens. It is a long time since I have looked into the matter, but I have a distinct recollection of what took place in this House when my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) and I were young members, and I believe in that discussion it was assumed that the state of New York had actually passed legislation to give to Canadians the use of these canals, but by subsequent regulations applying to the canals, the object of this legislation was practically defeated. There was discrimination against Canadians, and while the legislature of the state of New York gave the use of the canals, it was made nugatory by subsequent regulations. My recollection is, however, vague as to that, but I have sent to the library, and I think in a few days I will be able to give exact information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may have been brought about by some arrangement of the tolls, but it would seem from the official communication to the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) from the deputy Superintendent of Public Works of the state of New York, that all tolls have been abolished, that no tolls whatever are charged now, and that the canals are as open to the citizens of Canada as to the citizens of the United States. It would be extremely desirable that the matter should be cleared up officially, as it appears to have been pretty well cleared up in the statement received by the hon. member (Mr. Perley) to whom I think a great deal of credit is due in the matter. The official in charge of these canals has informed him in the most unqualified terms that the canals of the state of New York are as open to the citizens of Canada as they are to the citizens of the United States. It is quite true that a contrary impression has prevailed for a long time, but I presume that is due to the fact that thirty-five years ago when we wanted to use these canals we could not use them by reason of the discrimination which undoubtedly did exist, and having got out of the way of using them, and not being aware of the change in the regulations, no one has attempted to use them in recent years. For that reason the real condition of affairs has not been disclosed to the public. I may be entirely wrong in that conjecture, but surely if we can trust official assurances at all it is perfectly plain that the citizens of Canada can use these canals.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. I remember the circumstance perfectly well, and the right hon. gentleman, and the hon. member (Mr. Broder) are perfectly correct in what they say. The treaty of Washington gave us the right to use canals belonging to the United States, and the United States promised they would use their influence to get us the use of the state canals on the same terms as the federal canals. There was a correspondence between this government and the government of the United States in reference to the Sault Ste. Marie canal, which at that time belonged to the state of Michigan, and I think the state of Michigan refused us the right to use that canal on the same terms as citizens of the United States. That difficulty was gotten over by the United States government obtaining possession of the Sault Ste. Marie canal, and it became a federal work. I do not think, however, that the United States federal government used their influence except in reference to the Sault Ste. Marie canal which at that time was the only canal in the United States owned by a state government that we were inter-

ested in the navigation of, except it be the New York canal system on which lumber was carried from Ottawa to New York. After the effort was made by Mr. Murphy and his friends, McRae & Co., to get their barges down to New York, there was no other effort made to obtain the use of the New York canals.

TRENT VALLEY—CLAIMS FOR FLOODING.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). On the 17th of February last I obtained information from the Minister of Railways in reference to lands that are alleged to be flooded in connection with the Trent waterways system, and particularly in reference to payments near the village of Hastings. I asked the minister as to payments to certain people, I asked who acted as valuator for the government, and the minister answered James Dickson. I also asked who acted as solicitor for the government in each case, and what amount the solicitor was paid for his services in each case, and the answer is:

L. F. Clarry. Nothing has yet been paid, but his accounts have been approved by the Department of Justice, and will be paid as soon as the money is available, April 1, 1910.

I may refer to Return No. 83 brought down on the 15th of March, 1909, showing the amount paid property owners for damages caused by holding the water in the Otonabee river between Hastings and Peterborough.' These payments amount to some $24,000. The amounts paid out altogether by the government are very considerable, and if I am instructed correctly the conditions under which they are paid are very unfavourable to the interests of the public. In other words, there is reason to believe that the person who is acting on behalf of the government is also, in some instances, and perhaps in many instances, acting in the interests of the persons who are obtaining payments and upon terms that he will receive compensation in proportion to the amount he obtains from the government, which, of course, is not likely to stimulate him to try and get the best possible bargain on behalf of the government. Now, in this return which has been brought down the names are set forth, and in every case not only is the name of the owner mentioned, but the name of the lawyer as well. The persons to whom the cheques are issued are not the owners of the land alone, but the owner and the government agent, that is the government lawyer. And when I tell you, Mr. Speaker—and refer to some documents that I will read—when I tell you that not only is the lawyer paid by the government, but that he is paid a commission by the owner of the land, you can realize why it is arranged that the cheque is not made payable to the owner alone, but is made jointly payable to the owner and to the solicitor. I have read what the government says in reference to Mr. Clarry in their answer: That Mr. Dickson is the valuator and that Mr. Clarry is the solicitor acting on behalf of the government, that his accounts have been passed and that he will be paid by the first of April. I might also add the further information that Mr. Clarry is a defeated Reform candidate in the last Ontario elections, and I add, so that the government may be on the alert in order to right this matter if possible, that it is reported that Mr. Clarry has sold out his practice and is about to move away within a short time. I will read to the House the method by which Mr. Clarry seeks to advance the public interest on behalf of the government. I have here a copy of a letter—I have also the original here, fortunately—and this letter shows the methods by which he seeks to obtain business for himself and to forward the public interest, I presume. This is a sample of the letter which he sends out:

Hastings, Ont., February 9, 1909.

Mr. Graham, Westwood, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Enclosed you will find retainer which I will ask you to kindly have your brother fill in and sign in your presence. Please then return it with Mr. Dickson.

Mr. Dickson is the valuator:

Please then return it with Mr. Dickson and I will have your brother's claim forwarded to Ottawa without delay. I am glad to advise you that I am having good settlements with nearly all my claims, and I think your brother will be dealt with all right. Have him hang out for 12 or 15 acres, and show where the water flows in the spring, and make the settlement with Mr. Dickson and I will be perfectly satisfied.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) L. F. CLARRY.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman who is acting on behalf of the government. Then, the retainer is made out in this way:

I, , of the township of Asphodel, in the county of Peterborough, farmer, do hereby request and authorize L. F. Clarry, Esq., solicitor, of Hastings, Ontario, to make claim on my behalf against the government of Canada for damages to my lands in the township of Asphodel, caused by the flooding of the waters of Rice lake, and I agree to pay the said L. F. Clarry a commission of 20 per cent of all moneys awarded to me as damages aforesaid for his fees and compensation in the matter.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The usual rake off.

Mr. LENNOX. It goes on to say:

In case no damages are awarded to me, I am to pay nothing.

Dated the 9th day of January, A.D. 1909.

It does not require any great stretch of imagination to know that Mr. Clarry would be reasonably zealous on behalf of the parties claiming damages, and reasonably anxious to make out as large a claim as possible, seeing that his compensation is dependent upon whether he shall get anything and upon how much he shall get.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. LENNOX. The retainer is dated the 9th January, 1909, and the letter is dated the 9th February, 1909. This retainer is, of course, quite in harmony with the statement of the letter: Have him hang out for 12 or 15 acres.

Mr. CROTHERS. Who is Dickson?

Mr. LENNOX. And Mr. Clarry says in this letter: You settle with Mr. Dickson and I will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. CROTHERS. Who is Dickson?

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Dickson is the valuator employed by the government. And so, Sir, we have the solicitor and the valuator going hand in hand and we have the fact—for I am told it is a fact—that although these Grahams had never approached this gentleman in any shape or form or suggested to him that they had any claim, this letter is sent out by the hand of whom? By the hand of Mr. Dickson, the government valuator, and sent from the solicitor.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a good way to work up claims.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not surprising under these circumstances that it is asserted in that neighbourhood that people are being paid who ought not to be paid, and who have no claim. This is not an isolated case. There are men in that neighbourhood who have bona fide claims and who have not been paid by the government. Mr. Humphreys, whose declaration I will read, is a wealthy farmer living a little way outside of the village of Hastings, a man of excellent reputation and high standing in the neighbourhood, a man who is 69 years of age, and who has been, I am sorry to say, a Liberal all his life. He tells me that this same Mr. Clarry demanded from him 15 per cent on his claim, and told him that unless it was put into his hands and the 15 per cent was paid to him he could not get anything. Whether that is correct or not I do not know; whether the payment of his claim depended on its passing through Mr. Clarry's hands or not I do not know; but I do know that a year ago Mr. Humphreys came down here and advised the department of the position of things, and the department promised to look into it, but no result has followed, and Mr. Humphreys' claim has not been paid, and he thinks there ought to be a general inquiry into the whole system of payment in that neighbourhood. Under these circumstances, with a lawyer, so zealous, acting on behalf of the government, a valuator acting in harmony with this lawyer in adjusting these claims, and the lawyer depending for his compensation and the amount of it on having the claims recognized, it is not surprising if we find that claims have been paid that should never have been paid at all. Now, I never saw Mr. Humphreys until I was notified that he wanted to have this matter investigated, and I state from actual knowledge that he is a gentleman that the government will not have much hesitation in believing, and I would be glad if the Minister of Railways would have an investigation in the Public Accounts Committee, and have Mr. Humphreys, Mr. Clarry and Mr. Dickson brought down here. There is no reason why the opposition should always do that sort of thing. I ask the government to institute a new departure in this respect, because the blockers will not then be in the way, and ascertain whether these allegations are true or not. This is Mr. Humphreys' declaration:

County of Northumberland.

To wit:

In the matter of lands in the township of Asphodel, in the county of Peterborough, said to be flooded by the damming of the Trent river at Hastings:—

I, Henry Humphries, of the township of Asphodel, in the county of Peterborough, yeoman, do solemnly declare that—

1. I am of the age of sixty-nine years, or thereabouts, and I have always lived in the said township of Asphodel.

2. Ever since I was a schoolboy I have been familiar with history and conditions of the River Trent as it passes through the village of Hastings, and up this river for many miles to the west, and with the history and conditions of the river or stream called the Ouse, emptying into the Trent at its mouth, and up to and beyond the land of G. A. L Humphries, hereinafter mentioned.

3. I am informed and believe that the government of Canada has paid to the following persons the sums hereinafter set forth for lands alleged to be flooded or drowned by reason of the dam maintained by the government on the River Trent, at the said village of Hastings, namely:—John Sayent, for 60 acres, $600; G. A. L. Humphries, for 50 acres, $550; C. M. Birdsall, for .. acres, $550; Charles Faux or Fox, for 80 acres, $720; M. Breckonridge, $380: James Warner, 30 acres, $330; John Breckonridge, jr., for 6 acres, $60; and Thomas Davidson, for 5 acres, $45.

4. Not one of the parties above mentioned has any land whatever drowned or flooded by reason or on account of the dam at Hastings, and I am clearly of opinion that there is no justification whatever for payment of any of the said money.

5. That of the parties above mentioned the lands of G. A. L. Humphries are furthest up stream.

Let me interject just here that the Grahams refused to have anything to do with Mr. Clarry; but they put in their claim through a government representative who was up there on the canal; and although James Warner, farther down the stream, and G. A. L. Humphries, their next neighbour, have been paid, the Grahams have not been paid, which fact lends colour to the allegation that only those who act through Clarry, and others who are on that list, are paid. Mr. Humphreys in his declaration goes on:

6. The stream called the Ouse, upon or in the neighbourhood of the said lands is largely through wooded lands, and any temporary overflow from the said stream that occurs in the spring time is occasioned solely by local conditions along the said stream obstructed by fallen timber, brush and debris, the blockage by snow and ice and the like, and wholly without reference to the condition of the River Trent.

7. The high water on and along the Ouse and affecting the said lands exists only during freshets and is of short duration, and has come and gone on all occasions long before the time of high water on the River Trent, and I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing it to be of the same force and effect as if made on oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Solemnly declared before me this 28th day of February, A.D. 1910, at the village of Hastings, in the county of Northumberland.

HENRY HUMPHRIES.

H. W. FOULDS,
A Commissioner.

This is declared to by Henry Humphries before Mr. Foulds, a commissioner. I have also a declaration which I will not take time to read, from a mill man up there, who says that he has cut green timber on some of these lands, and if you find large standing green timber on the lands there can be no more cogent evidence that it is not a case of flooding any more than a temporary flooding that may occur in the springtime. Now, what are the conditions? This valley of the Ouse is mainly timbered land, and in a case of that kind there is always more or less temporary flooding in the spring; but the point Mr. Humphries makes here is that he has known of this since his boyhood days, and that it has always occurred independently of any dam that has been erected on the river, and long before the high water on the Trent, the flooding has subsided. In order to ascertain what induced the government to settle these claims, and whether they have taken any proper step to ascertain whether these parties were entitled to payment or not, I thought the proper course was to get a return of the levels of these lands as compared with the high water level where the Ouse flows into the Trent.

You will hardly imagine that these claims would be settled without levels being taken. But, yet if I understand the meaning of a telegram submitted to me the other day—the minister furnished me a copy of it—no levels were ever taken. It is suggested now that it will cost five hundred or six hundred dollars to take them. But I said I did not want the levels now. Since no levels were taken I am not anxious to add greater injury to what the country has already suffered by insisting on levels being taken now. I have inquired of the minister, and I find that these cheques, in the cases of the several parties mentioned here and those mentioned in the answers obtained on the 17th February, were all paid jointly to the owners and Mr. Clarry, as in the case of the other return brought down. Speaking on behalf of Mr. Humphries he feels—and he says he expresses the opinion of a great many in that neighbourhood—that the government should not settle these claims in a hole and corner way, but should appoint two or three men to investigate the whole question and deal with it on a business basis. I hope that before any other moneys are paid out, the minister will bring this matter up himself in the Public Account Committee and have it investigated, and particularly will examine Mr. Clarry, Mr. Dickson and any other parties who have been acting on behalf of the government.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). If I understand my hon. friend, his chief attack is upon one of his fellow lawyers, Mr. Clarry, for some connection he may have had with some of the men who had claims. As to any connection that Mr. Clarry had with these men, this is the first intimation I have of it. My hon. friend knows well that so long as there are claims to be paid, the men who do not get all they want are convinced that other people got more than they should. They are all inclined to take that view. They think that others get too much and that they do not get enough. That is the foundation of the entire complaints, I am afraid. The department has nothing to fear in this matter. My hon. friend went so far as to say that these settlements were made in a hole and corner manner. He has no ground for any such statement, he insists that the department should have engaged engineers to take levels before making any payments, and he bases his whole argument on the word of one man who never pretended to take a level. What is the method adopted by the department?—a simple business method. A man highly recommended such as Mr. Dickson was asked to make these valu-

ations and he did so under instructions. Here is a quotation from the instructions:

It is necessary for the surveyor to ascertain, first, the area of the property actually submerged, and secondly, the area injuriously affected in consequence of the increased height of water. Claims for land over 3 feet above the level of the water cannot be considered. The valuator should submit a fair price, having regard to special conditions of each case, and he should know or ascertain, the fair value of the lands in the immediate vicinity of the property affected, this being the way that Commissioner Aylesworth always fixed his valuations. It is not of course necessary that an actual measurement and traverse should be made in every case, as any land surveyor can approximately arrive at the several areas affected.

Be pleased to inform Mr. Dickson accordingly.

And Mr. Dickson is a surveyor, although my hon. friend would lead us to believe that he was just an ordinary individual who would not make a fair valuation but would be governed by party proclivities. It was according to these instructions that Mr. Dickson went and made his valuations. Mr. Henry Humphries, an old and respected resident, I understand, and Mr. Dickson did not get along harmoniously. Mr. Dickson, as I am informed, contended that he was asked by Mr. Humphries to put a valuation on some property, which did not belong to him at all. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) can easily understand how this might affect the valuation; but after Mr. Humphries had cast some reflection on these valuations, another surveyor was sent out to make a valuation on the same properties, so that no injustice would be done either the public or the department. I have the valuations of most of these properties in the various townships made by Mr. Fitzgerald, and in nearly every case his valuation was higher than Mr. Dickson's, showing that Mr. Dickson's valuation was within the mark. Mr. Fitzgerald did not know Mr. Dickson's valuations on these properties. The valuations of Mr. Fitzgerald were not taken but the claims were settled on the valuations of Mr. Dickson. As a rule members of parliament come to me to urge that we do not pay enough, but my hon. friend urges that we have paid too much.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know anything about whether the minister has paid too much or not, but I said that, in cases I have mentioned, the minister should not pay anything because no levels were taken and they were not flooded lands.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then we must have paid them too much. But such is not the case. I have pointed out that valuations can be made without a survey. A man who is not a surveyor can go on to a property and easily tell the high water mark in order to have a fair idea of the quantity of land flooded. But a surveyor was engaged as a protection to the public, and then a second surveyor was appointed, and the second surveyor gave in every case a higher value. That this was a proper precaution will be admitted by any reasonable man, and I would not take the responsibility of casting a reflection of two members of the land surveyors association, merely because some one has complained that he did not get as much out of the government as he thought he should, he raises the question of suspicion—and this is the main body of his charge I thought—in connection with Mr. Clarry. The method adopted is that which has been followed for years and years, between the departments. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. J. Haggart) will bear me out. I think that any hon. member who is familiar with the working of the Department of Justice will bear me out. The Department of Railways gets a valuation. We do not settle a single claim until the Department of Justice authorizes the settlement of that claim. They have to look into the title to see that the man owning the land is the one who makes the claim in the first place. For that purpose, the Justice Department engaged a solicitor in the locality to do the work. In this case, Mr. Clarry—though my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) was careful not to explain that—was the agent of the Department of Justice, and not of the Department of Railways and Canals. When we get the valuation of the lands, that valuation is handed over to the department for them to make a thorough investigation as to the titles, and to see that we are paying the proper parties. I am informed by the Justice Department that the cheques being made out to two parties is the custom between legal firms doing a large business. That is, when a legal firm, say in Toronto, has an agent acting for it in a case on all fours with this, that legal firm invariably makes out its cheque payable to its own agent, and the other party.

Mr. CARVELL. And an insurance company in the case of a mortgage the same.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, I understand insurance companies do the same thing. It is a matter of business; it is done every day; my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) knows that as a lawyer. There is no suspicion attached to such a transaction; it is a clear matter of business, and has been done by this government ever since there was a government. These two names on the cheque make it necessary, in order to have the cheque cashed, that both signatures shall appear upon it, the agent of the depart-

ment and the person to whom the money is to be paid. It is a safeguard, as I have said, used by large legal firms in dealing with their agents, and which the Department of Justice has adopted for many years, and a proper safeguard in the interests of the public. When both parties must sign the cheque, there is no possibility of the money being paid to other than the proper party. The hon. member says that Mr. Clarry was acting as the agent of other parties. That is a matter between Mr. Clarry and the other parties. I have not heard of it, but it ought not to exist if it does exist. I trust the hon. member will see to it, that Mr. Clarry, if he has been guilty of unprofessional conduct shall be chastised by that other great organization of monopolists, the bar association. There is another law under which you could get at him, I should think. Under the new statute, he has been guilty of taking secret commissions, if what is stated of him be true. I am not sure, but it strikes me as a layman that he would be liable under that statute.

The department is not afraid of investigation, it courts investigation of this or any other transaction, to make clear to all how it manages its business. This matter having been brought to my attention, I will see what there is in the charge that Mr. Clarry has been acting in the double capacity. As to other matters, they are above board, perfectly fair business transactions, that can be defended on business principles.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The explanation of the Minister of Railways is the most extraordinary I have ever heard in answer to such charges as have been made by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). What are the facts? The agent of the government goes to value lands alleged to have been overflowed by reason of the existence of a government dam. As the minister (Mr. Graham) properly said, his department is, to a certain extent, not liable, because, in the first instance, before they pay out a cent, they get the report of the Justice Department as to the title and the valuation. But, in this case, the agent of the Minister of Justice becomes also agent for the claimant against the government. And the government valuator assists the agent of the Minister of Justice by bringing a request from him to the claimant and saying, in effect: Give me twenty per cent of what you get for your claims and I will see that you are properly looked after. And the minister says there is no harm in that. No harm in the agent of the Minister of Justice looking after the business also of the claimant against the Crown for damages? No harm in the agent of the department taking these documents down to the claimant against the Crown and urging upon him to make the attorney of the Minister of Justice, acting for the Railway Department also, the attorney of the claimant?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not understand the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to say that Mr. Dickson urged anybody to engage Mr. Clarry.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. He carried a letter——

Mr. GRAHAM. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) wants to be right with me. I did not understand the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to say that it was charged that Mr. Dickson himself requested that this man appoint Mr. Clarry agent. That would be serious.

Mr. LENNOX. I said that Mr. Clarry is your agent, as you admit——

Mr. GRAHAM. No, agent of the Department of Justice.

Mr. LENNOX. You can separate the departments if you like. He sends a letter and a blank retainer, and sends it with your agent, Mr. Dickson, and says: Settle with Mr. Dickson, and it will be perfectly satisfactory; but put in a good stiff claim.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was, as I understood it, said about Mr. Dickson, not about Mr. Clarry.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. He carries the document; takes it to the party who has the claim—that is, the party whom you appoint for the purpose of settling takes the document to the claimant and makes an arrangement——

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. That is the statement. I am taking the statement of the hon. member for South Simcoe.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understand it, he did not make that charge. It would be very serious if he did make that charge, but I do not understand him to say that Mr. Dickson made an arrangement with this man. He carried a letter. If he were a party to that, it would be very serious. I will investigate and find out what there is in that. But that is not the charge that has been made. He carried the letter——

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. But what are the contents of the letter? The minister has heard it read. It says: That this solicitor advises the party to make an arrangement with Mr. Dickson and to ask a large price. Mr. Dickson knew what was in the letter.

Mr. EMMERSON. How does that appear?

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. By the affidavit and letters read by the hon. member for South Simcoe. Now, these are very serious charges. An officer who would do anything

of the kind ought to be dismissed at once; more than that, he is guilty of a crime against the community, and such an action should be punished as criminal. Of course, the hon. gentleman may say that the administration of the law rests with the provincial authorities, and that their attention ought to be directed to it. If this transaction means anything in the world, it means connivance between officers of the government and the parties they are dealing with, in order to defraud the people of this country; it means nothing more or less than that. When the attention of the minister is drawn to it he says: Inquire into it before the Public Accounts Committee, summons Mr. Humphries and these agents, and if these charges are proved to be true, let them all be punished. No one accuses the minister of being a party to anything of that kind. I suppose this is the first he has heard of it. Of course, he thinks his department is well administered, he takes the report of his officers in reference to these matters. But when the case is so plain as this, when the documents are brought to his attention, with the affidavit, as my hon. friend says, of one of the most respectable farmers in the county, it matters not whether he is a Conservative or not, I suppose he is a good, honest Canadian, and his word is to be taken until it is contradicted—I say that under these circumstances the minister should take prompt action in this matter. We know there are cases in the past where offenders have gone unwhipped of justice; in this case, if the charges are proved, let the offenders be punished as they deserve.

Mr. BOYCE. I must confess to being a little disappointed at the minister's reply to the very serious charges that have been made by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I would prefer to believe that the minister has not sufficiently grasped the gravity of the situation, rather than to believe that, having grasped it, he is disposed to make light of it. Let us see what the facts are. In connection with the valuation of lands which were supposed to have been injured by flooding, a gentleman was appointed by the department in the capacity of valuator, Mr. James Dickson. As I understand it, there was no dispute as to what his duties were; they were quasi-judicial, he was to ascertain judicially, in a fair, and proper manner, first, as to whether there had been any flooding of certain land; and, secondly, if there had been a flooding, for which the government ought to pay what would be a fair compensation for the government of Canada to pay to the owner for the damage caused. In conjunction with that a gentleman was employed by the government, a solicitor by the name of L. F. Clarry, whose duties, the minister says, were to ascertain the state of the titles and report upon the question of damage.

Mr. GRAHAM. The solicitor had nothing to do with the question of damage, or reporting the amount of damage. The valuator reported the amount of damage, and when we get those reports, the valuation is made by the surveyor. Then to complete it, we hand that over for settlement to the Department of Justice.

Mr. BOYCE. Well, we will consider that the solicitor's duties were merely those of searching the titles, and ascertaining what the conditions were as they affected that land prejudicially.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend would understand the duties of the solicitor better than I do. But it was to complete the settlement. The amount was agreed on before he touched it. Then he was to get the title of the property, and to get the relief.

Mr. BOYCE. Then necessarily the solicitor was an integral part of the machinery whereby these settlements were carried out. He was appointed for that purpose, and he was to perform his duties to the government and to the public without fear, favour, affection, or hope of reward from any one but the Department of Justice. The minister will concede that. Now, when this man, who was supposed to carry out the details of a settlement made by the valuator, went himself and solicited gentlemen to stir up claims against the government and to send those claims to that valuator, to bring back a message from that valuator to that solicitor, for the Minister of Railways to say that that is not a matter that concerns the government, is an extraordinary position to take. I say it dwarfs into insignificance many of the extraordinary statements that have been made in regard to scandals that have taken place under this government.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I had made the statement, but I did not make it.

Mr. BOYCE. The Minister of Justice said that this was a private transaction. But this man has defrauded the government. This government put him in a position of preying upon the public, and when the matter is brought to the attention of the minister in the House of Commons he says, in effect, 'Let them go on.' Practically that is the only construction to be placed on the minister's words—I do not want to do the hon. gentleman any injustice—'Let him go on,' if there is anything wrong about it, let the hon. gentleman who brings up this matter, himself a lawyer, bring the accused before the Law Society and let him be robbed of his gown. That is the position the Minister of Railways takes. He says the matter might be serious if there could be shown any connivance, any conspiracy between the

valuator and the solicitor. Well, that which must necessarily follow from their joint operations, has followed in this matter, if I understand the facts of the case correctly. I cannot get away, and the minister cannot get away, from the irresistible conclusion to be drawn from the letter of this valuator, in the handwriting of the agent of the Department of Justice. When a man acting as solicitor in the settlement of these claims, writes a letter and incloses a retainer to those adverse in interest to his clients. I am driven to the conclusion that this was the result of a conspiracy and an understanding with the valuator whose name is mentioned in it. Again let me read it to the minister, because I think he missed one of the important parts:

Mr. Graham, Westwood, Ont.
Dear Sir,—Inclosed you will find retainer which I will ask you to kindly have your brother fill in and sign in your presence. Please then return it with Mr. Dickson——

With Mr. Dickson, this letter with this retainer from the solicitor to the owner. The person having the claim is retaining privately a percentage of twenty per cent of the damages, his own brother being the owner, and it is to be returned to the solicitor through the valuator. And the minister says that that is a matter to be dealt with by the Law Society.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the minister not see now the grave complexion put on the matter?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but he is putting words in my mouth I did not utter, and has been doing it from the moment he commenced his speech.

Mr. BOYCE. I am not pretending to say that the minister says it in so many words, but I think he fully appreciates——

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. BOYCE—what I mean. We have nothing to do with that, that is a private matter, and what he says and what he did say, is that this is a matter that should be dealt with by the Law Society. He takes no responsibility whatever, he disclaims responsibility with regard to the dealings by the department with this solicitor. If that be the case, we have a curious and dangerous state of affairs. A man can be retained by this government to perform certain duties, and he can perform those duties in a manner which will result in the public being defrauded, and in injury being committed, as has been done in this case. A man is receiving double fees, and otherwise acting in almost a criminal manner, and the minister says: That is a matter that should be dealt with by the Law Society.

Mr. GRAHAM. Again my hon. friend is saying what I did not say.

Mr. BOYCE. I misunderstood my hon. friend very seriously if he did not say to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) that this is a matter that should be dealt with by the Law Society, that this man should be reported and disbarred. I shall read the rest of the letter:

Please then return it with Mr. Dickson, and I will have your brother's claim forwarded to Ottawa without delay. I am glad to advise you that I am having very good settlements with nearly all my claims, and I think your brother will be dealt with all right. Have him hang out for 12 or 15 acres, and show where the water flows in the spring, and make the settlement with Mr. Dickson and I will be perfectly satisfied.

No man claiming to possess ordinary reason can read that letter without coming to the conclusion that there was a distinct understanding between the writer of that letter, Mr. Clarry, and Mr. Dickson, valuator of the government, that whatever arrangement was made with Dickson, as valuator, for the settlement of these claims would be satisfactory to the solicitor who was advocating the settlement. The solicitor of the government is distinctly urging the owner of the land to make as large a claim against his clients as he can. Does the minister approve of that? Does he think that is not a matter that should be dealt with in the public interest, and dealt with summarily? He is also saying: Make your settlement with Mr. Dickson, the valuator, who is to return the retainer, and the settlement that you make with Mr. Dickson will be perfectly satisfactory to me, namely, that I shall get my 20 per cent on it under my retainer. Unless I am very much mistaken with regard to the ethics of the situation, that presents about as serious a case for the attention of the government as could possibly be conceived, and if this is not serious enough to invite the minister's immediate and instant action, to summarily proceed and ascertain the truth or falsity of that statement made by the gentleman himself, because he is the man on whose words we are depending, then I know of no condition of affairs which will be suffiicently strong to make the minister realize that there are conditions when even as between political friends, the interests of the public must be safeguarded and drastic action must be taken, even though it be by the prosecution of the offender. I invite the minister's careful consideration of the letter enclosing the retainer. The retainer has been read. It provides that the owner of the land, the brother of the gentleman to whom the accompanying letter was addressed,

should authorize the agent, the solicitor of the government employed in the investigation of the claims for the government, to make on his behalf as against the government of Canada, a claim for damages to his lands in the township of Asphodel, caused by the flooding of the waters of Rice lake, and agreeing to pay the agent of the government a commission of 20 per cent on all moneys awarded to him as damages, for his fees and compensation in the matter. The significant part of the retainer lies in the last line:

In case no damages are awarded to me I am to pay nothing.

Read that last line in conjunction with the last line of the accompanying letter:

Make the settlement with Mr. Dickson and I will be perfectly satisfied.

Does it look from the whole nature of the transaction as if this gentleman who showed a rapacity that is almost unequalled, wanting 20 per cent, would be satisfied with nothing? No, if nothing was to be awarded, then he was to get nothing, but he says: Make the settlement with Mr. Dickson, put the land up as high as you can, make the settlement with Dickson, send the retainer back by Dickson, and I will be perfectly satisfied. I say that it is a case in which the minister ought to interfere earnestly and promptly. He ought to get Mr. Dickson and Mr. Clarry, and all the facts before him, and ascertain whether or not that statement is correct with regard to Dickson, or clear Dickson from the very serious suspicion which rests upon him in consequence of that statement. What is the position of Dickson? Dickson is a valuator appointed by the government. He was bound to see that the correct valuation was obtained, that no more was paid by the Department of Railways, as representing the government of Canada, than should be payable for the actual damage which had been done, and for which the government ought properly to pay under its liability. How did Dickson prostitute that position if that statement be correct? He was the means of conveyance of a retainer from the owner of that land to the government solicitor, and he was the means of satisfying the government solicitor that a fee of 20 per cent of the land, upon a valuation which, according to this letter, must be made as large as possible should be paid. I commend the matter to the earnest attention of the Minister of Railways, and I hope he will change the view he expressed with regard to this not being a grave matter. The minister said that if Dickson was a party it would be serious; have I read this letter in vain, that the minister shakes his head and says that if Dickson is not a party, it is not serious?

Mr. BOYCE.

Mr. GRAHAM. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I did not make any such remark, and when he hears my statement, which I will make in a few minutes later I think he will be convinced that he is endeavouring to express thoughts for me which I certainly have not in my mind.

Mr. BOYCE. The inference from the minister's statement was that if Dickson was not a party it would not be serious, but, this letter plainly shows that there was an unquestionable conspiracy to defraud the government, and whether the valuator shared in the ill-gotten gains or not I leave to the minister to inquire into. He should find out how far the valuator was implicated, and in the interest of the people of Canada he should see that every cent that the solicitor has collected from the owners of the land is wrested from him by the most drastic operation of the law, and is restored with interest, and with costs to the owners.

Mr. GRAHAM. The matter brought to my attention by the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) is of course new to me. He had the advantage that he had copies of my documents, and I of course had no copies of his. It is the first I have heard of this letter, and what I was trying to elicit was the connection of Dickson with this letter. If the agent of the Department of Justice has been charging a commission at that end, he has been acting improperly, and all the money he has got in that way ought to be handed back to the people from whom he took it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no question about that. I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) that I never led any one to think that such was not my view, and I was surprised at my hon. friend getting excited as if he thought I was endeavouring to screen somebody.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman says that if Dickson was a party it would be serious.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not dealt with Dickson yet; I was dealing with Mr. Clarry his fellow legal luminary. As to Mr. Dickson, I was trying to elicit the information from the letter, which is all the information I have ever had about this. If it be true that Mr. Dickson was a party in some way in getting a commission or trying to have the amount of a just claim raised, Mr. Dickson can no longer, so far as I am concerned, ever think of acting on behalf of my department for anything.

Mr. LENNOX. When the minister says that this is all he knew about it, I may mention that Mr. Humphries came down here last Easter time, and went to the de-

partment, and made his demand, and said that this man Clarry was holding him up and demanding fifteen per cent, and the department then promised they would see about it, but nothing has been done.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the first I have heard about that either. There is a possibility he may have said to some one, but I never heard of it before.

Mr. LENNOX. He said it to Mr. Butler.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to say again that the department will immediately investigate this matter.

Mr. LENNOX. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. Neither the Department of Railways nor the Department of Justice desires to screen anybody. If men have acted dishonestly with us we will get rid of them as quickly as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. One important feature of this case the Minister of Railways seems to treat with great unconcern, and that is as to the determination of what was, and what was not submerged land. I understood the minister to say that it was not necessary to get an engineer to determine what was high water mark.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said that it was not considered by the chief engineer necessary that a survey should be made in every case. It was quite evident what was high water mark in most cases, and as a matter of fact this valuator was a surveyor himself.

Mr. LENNOX. He took no evidence, and these lands were three miles away.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot understand how you could divide the land which was not submerged from the land which was submerged without first determining what was high water mark. I remember once hearing a case tried in court with reference to submerged land, and the court demanded that evidence should extend over twenty-one years, and when they did conclude, after a great deal of evidence, as to what was high water mark they were able to decide the case, and not before. We have here a statutory declaration made by Mr. Humphries who has lived there for sixty-nine years, and who must be familiar with the condition of the lands in the spring, and in the fall, and he declares that considerable amounts have been paid in respect of land that is not submerged at all. That evidence of Mr. Humphries is not contradicted, and yet the minister treats it with levity. We have here the charge that this government agent is doing exactly what was done by one of their agents in the Yukon, a man paid $4,000 or $5,000 a year to advise the Yukon council in legal matters, and who then took $700 from a man who was brought before the authorities for violating the customs law. When that was brought to the attention of the government they treated it with levity as the Minister of Railways has done in this case, and made no inquiry. If that is the moral standard that the Minister of Railways is going to set up for his officials, then it is no wonder that we have so many cases of graft, and dishonesty, and improper conduct to ventilate in this parliament. We are getting to a very low ebb in the moral status of our people when the officials know that when wrong-doing is brought to the notice of the government the government will pay no attention to it. I do not think the country will regard the hon. minister having done his duty when he treats this matter with levity, and says that it is not our duty to prosecute a lawyer for taking a double commission, that belongs to the province of Ontario, or that we should bring the case before the bar association, and have his gown taken from him; but he is quite unconcerned whether the lawyer has done the right thing or not. Well, let the country judge. If that is the moral standard set up by any department of this government, then it seems to me that it has got to a very low ebb.

Mr. SMYTH. Looking at the matter from a layman's standpoint, I would like to ask the minister if he intends to pay this man the amount that has been passed, as stated in the question of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox)? I would also like to know what services the minister thinks this man has rendered. It seems to me that he has been paid at one end, and that the department should not pay him at the other end.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. A good deal has been said during this discussion about a gentleman who has been referred to as the agent of the Department of Justice. I would like to prevent, if I can, any misapprehension on the part of any hon. gentleman as to the meaning of that expression. The Department of Justice, at the present time at any rate, has no standing agent anywhere in this country. When I took charge of the department four years ago, I found that, in some parts of the country at any rate, there were legal gentlemen who considered themselves, and who were possibly entitled to consider themselves, as standing agents of the Department of Justice in their respective localities. I did not think that was a desirable condition of things, and I put an end to it as soon as I could. In the province of Ontario there was nobody in that position at that time, and there has been nobody in that position since. I had the advantage, or disadvantage, of having been

in active legal practice in the province of Ontario for some thirty years, and I was personally acquainted with the great majority of the legal practitioners in that province, and the course I adopted, not only in that province, but all over the Dominion, was the course which I think any ordinary business man, or any lawyer, who has business to be done in another part of the country, or in a foreign country, would adopt. It was simply to select for the particular piece of business in hand the man who I thought would be best qualified to do that business satisfactorily; and that particular piece of business being ended, there was an end to that man's employment, unless he were instructed to do some other piece of business at some future time. Of course, the ordinary business man who has any considerable amount of legal business commits each piece of it to the same solicitor, and thus in a sense has a standing solicitor. So long as he has confidence in him, the solicitor does practically all his legal business; and I am quite free to say that at a place where we have, in connection with the Department of Justice, a considerable amount of legal business going on, perhaps practically all through the year, unless there seems to be some reason for making a change, or sending some new piece of business to a different practitioner, the one in whom we have confidence, and who has given satisfaction, gets each new piece of business that goes to that locality. But the usual practice in seeking agents for a particular work is that which I have described. With reference to the particular gentleman whose name has been mentioned in connection with the matter under discussion, I have no personal acquaintance with him, and I do not know that I have ever met him; but I have known him by name and reputation for ten or fifteen, possibly twenty, years. I have never heard his professional honour, or his honesty questioned, until I have been told what has been said to-day. I cannot at the moment recall how it came that this particular piece of work was sent to him. My best recollection is that his name was recommended to me for the work by the late deputy of the Department of Railways and Canals, who, if my recollection is correct, said he had personal acquaintance with him. But the selection of Mr. Clarry to pay over these amounts to the different men whose lands have been damaged in his locality, and to satisfy himself and certify to the department that these men were the legal owners of the land damaged, and the right men to pay, was simply the ordinary piece of business which every lawyer in the carrying on of his office business might have at any time to do. If a client of any practising lawyer has a piece of business at the other end of the country, and tells his lawyer to get it done for him, the lawyer can but go to the law list, if he is not personally acquainted with the legal practitioners in a distant place. He assumes, in the absence of any reason to think the contrary, that a man who appears to be practising in good repute, is a man of ordinary honesty who will do the work with which he is entrusted, and will report the result of whatever he may do. It was precisely in that sense, and in no other that Mr. Clarry was instructed by the Department of Justice to take up these various claims, to look into the titles of each piece of property, and satisfy himself and certify to us that the claimant had the right to be paid for the damage to the particular land which was in question, and then to pay the amount which had been agreed upon as between the owner, and the department interested. The check, as a matter of ordinary business precaution, was made payable to both the land owner and the legal agent, for the very purpose that neither could cash it without the concurrence of the other—in order that the agent could not do it without the land owner getting the money, and in order that the land owner could not do it until the agent was satisfied that the man was entitled to the money.

That was a simple, ordinary business precaution. It is now charged that this legal gentleman was guilty of impropriety by taking money from the land owner with whom he was dealing. If that be so, he not only did something for which he would be liable to discipline by the law society, but something which, if it were in the shape of any secret commission, would render him liable to criminal prosecution. For my part, although I do not know the man, I give him, from the mere circumstance that he is a legal practitioner at the bar of Ontario, apparently in reputable standing, the simple justice of believing that the charge is not true until I see some evidence to the contrary. Let me just mention as an illustration an incident which occurred some time ago. A complaint was made to me regarding a legal practitioner in a different part of the country, who had been entrusted by the Justice Department with the work of searching a title to a piece of land taken for right of way and with the paying over of the money after the title was established. The owner of the property made the very serious charge against this gentleman that he had taken from the cheque, endorsed by both of them and cashed by him, some fifteen or twenty dollars. I inquired at once and the explanation was perfectly clear and simple. The title of the owner of the land was very defective. It required the preparation of several deeds from men who had outstanding claims

against it and from women who were the wives of predecessors in title and had never signed to bar their dower, and defects of different characters had to be made right, before the owner was in a position to receive the money. That legal work was an obligation on the land owner. He had to get it done by somebody, and he had it done by our agent. There was no impropriety in our agent doing it and the owner paid our agent the proper legal fees. There was no reason in the world why the man, who was acting as our agent and certifying to the correctness of the title and handing over the money, should not be paid by the owner for making that title right. I merely mention this as an instance where, upon inquiry and explanation, there turned out to have been no irregularity whatever, although a serious charge had been made. With regard to the gentleman whose conduct has been under discussion, I can merely say that what has taken place is quite sufficient to warrant my calling on him for explanation. If he has been guilty of any misfeasance or wrong-doing, or betrayal of confidence, I shall make it my business to see, not merely that no more work is entrusted to him, but that such a course is taken as will likely prevent a repetition of it on the part of any one else.

Mr. SMYTH. Have the fees been paid to Mr. Clarry by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. SMYTH. Do you intend to pay him after what you have heard?

Mr. GRAHAM. He is an agent of the Justice Department, to be dealt with by that department. The other man is in my department, and I will look after the investigation in his case.

Mr. LENNOX. Ask the Minister of Justice not to pay until the matter is investigated.

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Justice does not pay.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is paid by the Department of Railways on an order from the Justice Department.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister see that the money is not paid until a proper investigation has been had.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will start the investigation to-morrow, so far as I am concerned.

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

Surveys and construction, National Transcontinental railway, $27,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister made a statement showing the cost in 1908. His answer is contained in two memoranda from the Transcontinental Railway Commission that are to be found on pages 12238 to 12242 of the 'Hansard' of 1908. The information given as to cost and estimated cost was pretty full up to that time and was followed by a debate. I would like to have the hon. minister bring that information down to date. Certain matters, which were only estimated then, are matters of actual expenditure at present. Also with respect to matters which were then estimated and still must be estimated, the minister no doubt has fuller information now. If he would give that information, it would be an advantage to the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. That would take up all the tenders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not mean necessarily all the tenders. My hon. friend brought down information in a very simple form then, in the form of a statement, carefully prepared, which gave the cost up to date and the estimated future cost of the eastern division. He also gave us estimates as to the length and cost of the western division, distinguishing in that regard the Prairie from the Mountain section. What I would like is to have that information brought down to date.

Mr. GRAHAM. The information with reference to the western section, I have brought down. It will all be found in a memo by Mr. Schreiber which I brought down some time ago. Possibly I referred to it in my remarks, but I am not sure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I looked at the minister's remarks on February 1, but could not find anything about it. I may have overlooked it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Take the eastern division. The total expenditure up to December 31, 1909, was $67,890,697.59. The estimate made by Mr. Lumsden was about $63,500 a mile, and no change has been made in that estimate since. The total grading done to December 31, 1909, was 1,062·1 miles. The total track laying was 727·118 miles, of which 621·003 miles was on the main line and 106·115 on the sidings. The total contracts for steel superstructure in bridges and viaducts awarded to December 31, 1909, amounted to 34,030 tons, of which completed bridges represented 11,800 tons and erected bridges 15,350. I could give a memo showing the total amount on the western section. If I remember the figures, the prairie section as given in the returns is about $33,000 a mile. One hundred miles east of Prince Rupert is under contract and

the track is being laid for a portion west of Wolf creek and supplies being taken in. The track is laid from Winnipeg to Wolf creek and trains are running. As to this western section, I cannot now give any nearer figures than I gave some time ago. As I stated, this estimate of $63,500 a mile for the eastern section does not include the terminals at the city of Quebec, the approaches to the terminals or the terminals or shops at Winnipeg.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Nor the Quebec bridge.

Mr. GRAHAM. Nor the Quebec bridge which, as I have always contended, is a separate undertaking.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Will the hon. minister give us the figures showing a comparison of the estimated quantities with the quantities as actually returned?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a statement here which I think it would be well to put on 'Hansard.'

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Before the minister reads that, can he tell us whether the total quantities are exactly the same as the estimates, the differences being only in the kind of classification within that figure, or do the totals of the returns show a difference as compared with the total quantities estimated?

Mr. GRAHAM. The figures will show that?

Mr. LENNOX. For what contract is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have here the figures with relation to each contract. There are twenty-one contracts in all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the minister read the classification, so far as returned, on each of the 21 contracts, giving the estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give the estimates on each contract and what the result has been up to December 31, on each contract:

Engineers' Estimated Quantities of Solid Rock, Loose Rock and Common Excavation, and actual quantities of each returned to December 31, 1909.

Contract No.	Solid Rock.		Loose Rock.		Common Excavation.	
	Estimated quantity.	Returned to December 31, 1909.	Estimated quantity.	Returned to December 31, 1909.	Estimated quantity.	Returned to December 31, 1909.
1	Nil.	42,219	129,379	938,728	1,841,152	520,728
2	Nil.	43,556	58,473	87,728	529,452	47,695
3	22,112	83,434	492,589	483,960	494,036	232,506
4	315,315	510,948	1,030,121	812,745	1,016,720	301,602
5	252,893	801,189	971,224	548,817	1,224,284	163,828
6	172,709	251,602	64,765	913,188	1,676,175	810,671
7	633,900	533,668	196,300	280,962	407,000	366,280
8	918,381	1,365,625	395,645	1,382,705	3,091,120	869,306
9	392,989	484,005	38,248	81,396	1,795,202	495,256
10	776,161	2,849,832	278,552	1,351,519	4,508,480	1,552,331
11	220,200	847,949	180,200	449,313	1,966,458	631,199
12	990,600	188,710	633,700	130,100	2,259,000	68,000
13	462,000	No returns.	470,600	No returns.	1,920,000	No returns.
14	203,144	20,679	21,646	767,136	3,956,566	990,894
15	243,400	12,727	51,900	622,259	1,127,200	555,651
16	104,700	No returns.	45,200	No returns.	1,618,600	No returns.
17	16,000	"	8,000	"	1,677,000	"
18	225,845	237,441	25,900	107,410	1,046,000	620,085
19	2,602,000	658,182	89,000	242,178	1,489,000	228,703
20	493,400	344,377	71,900	331,802	374,000	129,057
21	3,696,336	6,415,869	733,454	2,056,297	11,233,247	2,215,876

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the minister state what percentage of the work on each of the 21 contracts has been accomplished?

Mr. GRAHAM (reading):

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

STATEMENT Showing Districts, Mileages, &c., and Amount of Sundry Items of Work Done to December 31, 1909.

District.	Contract No.	Contractor.	Through Mileage of Contract.	Boundaries Between Districts.	Percent of contract completed.	Miles of grading completed in district.	Miles of Track laid in District.	Miles of telegraph completed in district.	Steel bridges completed in district.	Ballasting miles.	Remarks.
									p. c.		
	1	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co.	0· - ·50	Moncton, N.B.	94·3						
	2	J. W. McManus & Co., Ltd.	50. - ·58		62·6		Sidings 24·9				
A	3	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co.	58· - 96·42	(256·61 Miles.)	85·0	243	Main 133·1	86	·54	109·2	
	4	" "	96·42- 163·80		68 3						
	5	W. Kitchen Co., Ltd.	163·8 - 195·58		73·6		158·0				
	6	Lyons & White	195·58 256·61		85·9						
				New Brunswick and Quebec Boundary.							
	7	M. P. & J. T. Davis	256·61- 310·22		46·7						
	8	" " " (East Que. Bridge)..	310·22- 460·45		67·9		Sidings 14·5				
B	9	" " " (West Que. Bridge)	460·45- 510·31		75 3		Main 174·1				
	10	Macdonell & O'Brien	510·31- 610·41	(507·22 Miles.)	87·7	355·8		83	63·9	93·8	
	11	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co	610 41- 656·83		60·5		188·6				
	12	Macdonell & O'Brien	656·83- 763·83		8·8						c. b. 107 m. transferred from C. to B.
				107 M. west of Weymontachene, Que.							
C	13	Macdonell & O'Brien	763·83- 878·80								
	14	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co.	878·80- 956·74	(192·91 Miles.)	Nil.	8·5	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	
				Que. and Ont. Boundary.	28·2						
	14	Grand Trunk Pacific Con. Co.	956·74-1028·80				Sidings 9·9				d. c. 31·6 miles transferred from D to C.
D	15	E. F. & G. E. Fauquier	1028·80-1128·77	(216·11 Miles.)	33	108·5	Main 57·9	Nil.	16·7	23·5	
	16	M. P. & J. T. Davis	1128·77-1172·85				67·8				
				144 M. west of Cochrane, Ont.	Nil.						
	16	M. P. & J. T. Davis	1172·85-1232·85								
E	17	" " "	1232·85-1332·85		Nil.						
	18	E. F. & G. E. Fauquier	1332·85-1407·85	(255·19 Miles.)	45·3	36·0	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	
	19	O'Brien, Fowler & McDougall Bros.	1407·85-1428·04	339 M. west of Cochrane or 125 M. east of present Lake Superior Junction.	21 5						
	19	O'Brien, Fowler & McDougall Bros.	1428·04-1534·04				Sidings 56·8				
F	20	" " " "	1534·04-1557·80	(376·80 Miles.)	75·0	310·3	Main 255·9	217	40·9	213·3	
	21	J. D. McArthur	1557·80-1804·84		93·7		312·7				
				Winnipeg, Man.							
						1062·1	728.1	386	....	439·8	

Total percentage of work done on all 21 contracts, 57·2 p.c.

Ottawa, February 26, 1910.

H. MACPHERSON,
Asst. Chief Engineer.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The estimated cost to complete that will not exceed Mr. Lumsden's last estimate?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could not say that. The last estimate we had on the whole of it was $63,437 per mile.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

KINGSTON, SMITHS FALLS AND OTTAWA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. NESBITT moved:

That the order for the consideration in Committee of the Whole House of Bill (No. 146), respecting the Kingston, Smiths Falls and Ottawa Railway Company be discharged, and that the said Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What reason is there for that?

Mr. NESBITT. Deputations from Kingston want to be heard on the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

NELSON RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company—Mr. Rutan.

Mr. LENNOX. This Bill has been allowed to stand over in order that it may be considered with another similar Bill containing water-powers which is not yet reported.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are some Bills in respect to which the water is international, but they are not similar to this. The Minister of the Interior has full control of the rates for power on a river such as is referred to in this Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. My point is that we should have some policy by which we can protect the public interest in these waterways, and by which some revenue will be secured either to the Dominion or to the province, and some provision made by which we will not conflict with the rights of the provinces. I do not think we ought to take up any time over this to-night, as the Bill can very well stand, and when the policy of the government is declared it will go through swimmingly, I presume.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no objection to it standing over, because if you are going to talk it out we had better take up some other Bill. So far as this Bill is concerned the government has a policy, because for a year past the Minister of the Interior can issue licenses for a fee which goes to the revenue of the Dominion.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have here the regulations of the Minister of the Interior and there is nothing to indicate in them what that fee is. The fixing of it is entirely in the hands of the minister, and my contention is that there should be some well defined policy, and that the fee should be fixed.

Mr. GRAHAM. You cannot have a fixed fee.

Mr. BRADBURY. No minister should have absolute control in these matters. For instance, if I am a personal friend of the minister I may be able to get a water-power on more favourable terms than could another person, unless there is some well defined policy. The statement of the Minister of the Interior the other night that the regulations cover these two water-powers is not correct because they are situated in the territories, and not in the provinces, and there is no regulation covering the territories. This is a very important question. The Minister of Railways may not know it, but the fact is that the Nelson river contains a number of great water-powers. I do not believe that on any river in all Canada there are more water-powers than on the Nelson river. The Sea Falls alone 250,000 horse-power can be developed. There is a whole series of falls right down to the bay, and I do not think any company ought to be allowed to interfere with them. The government should keep control over them.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know my hon. friend will agree with me when I say that it would be impossible to provide for fixed fees, because a water-power in one place may be worth only $1 per horse-power, while in another place, owing to its proximity to a populous locality, it may be worth $20 per horse-power. Some department must handle the matter, and take into consideration all the circumstances, and grant a lease by order in council after a fair rate has been fixed after full investigation.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The contention of my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) is that the power with reference to these matters should not be in the hands of a minister, but should be statutory. You can put these rights up to competition if you like, and in that way you would get over any difficulty as to fixing the fees.

Mr. BARNARD. I think the Minister of Railways is sufficiently broad minded to not being adverse to taking a hint from what has been done in connection with these powers in the province of British Columbia. We have a large number of very

valuable water-powers there belonging to the Crown in the right of the province, and we have a very comprehensive code dealing with them and the obtaining of rights by companies to use these water-powers. To a very large extent that province is undeveloped, and no doubt as the minister says, some water-powers are much more valuable than others. But they have, after some years of experience, deemed it wise to provide a scale of fees by order in council according to the number of cubic inches of water taken. The result is that if the power is valuable it is developed; if there is no market for it, it is not developed; but it lies there available to anybody who comes along and complies with the Act; and all are treated equally. Surely it is undesirable that it should be left to the arbitrary decision of any minister, however willing or anxious he may be to do what is right, to say what revenue should be paid by a company for the use of power. We have found the other system to work very satisfactorily, and the province derives considerable revenue from a regular tariff which anybody can ascertain without going to the minister of any department; and I should think that the same system might very profitably be adopted in connection with water-powers belonging to the Dominion.

Mr. RUTAN. I hope that this Bill will not be held up again to-night. The powers asked for are no more than have been granted by the Railway Committee and this House to other companies, not only in past sessions, but even in the present session. The power of expropriation has been omitted from this Bill. The Bill to which the hon. gentleman referred, the Rainy River Company's Bill, is of an entirely different character, because it relates to the province of Ontario, where the province owns all the lands and water-powers. This Bill relates to the Northwest Territories, which belong to the Dominion, and to a portion of those territories which is undeveloped; and the people who live in that part of the country are anxious to see it developed as well as other parts of the Dominion, as they believe that it will prove to be very valuable.

Mr. BRADBURY. Will the hon. gentleman tell me where there any people living within a hundred miles of the proposed railway and water-power?

Mr. RUTAN. The people who live nearest to that country are in my own constituency. My hon. friend seems to be talking of Winnipeg and its vicinity. I ask him if there have been any petitions or communications from the city of Winnipeg against this undertaking? We might say that it is a Winnipeg undertaking. It is for the purpose of giving Winnipeg the cheapest and most direct connection with the Hudson Bay railway. Both the clause in the Bill giving the right of expropriation, and clause 15, with reference to a tramway, have been cut out in the Railway Committee, and it seems to me very unfair now to hold up this Bill when it asks for no more than has been granted with practically no opposition to many other companies. In the Bill that passed the Railway Committee to-day, the power given by clause 11 is practically the same as the power asked for in this Bill, and it passed the committee without any objection.

Mr. BRADBURY. What Bill is that?

Mr. RUTAN. The Bill incorporating the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company. If capital is willing to go into these undeveloped territories and develop them, I do not see why we should not allow it to go there. We who live in that northern country know, from what we have heard from people who have gone into these territories and prospected, that there is untold wealth in them. It seems to me that the hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill are only talking against their own interests. People who live in the Northwest and who know what the development of a new country is, should be ready to receive that kindly assistance that other people are willing to give. Though the Bill is in my name, the only interest I have in it is the interest of having the country developed. I do not believe it would be possible for the Minister of the Interior, whether a Liberal or a Conservative, to grant any right or privilege to an individual or a company, that could not bear criticism. I would ask hon. gentlemen to grant this Bill fair play and give this company the same privilege as others. We are not asking for any special privileges; we are not trying to gobble up any water-powers. Neither these or any other powers which are in our rivers, whether provincial or Dominion, are of any good until they are utilized. This company asks the right to acquire water-powers and make whatever arrangement it can, either with the Department of the Interior or with the province, as the case may be.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The hon. gentleman mistakes altogether the opposition to this Bill. The Bill is a very simple one. It is only intended to give to a corporation the powers which an individual would have. The hon. gentleman says that they struck out the expropriation clause. They might well do that because you cannot expropriate against the Crown. I am not opposed to the Bill. I would like to see it go through, and I think it will because it is a very simple Bill giving a corporation the same powers as an individual. But

what we want is a declaration of policy from the government as to the manner in which they intend disposing of these valuable privileges, either to individuals or to corporations.

Mr. BRADBURY. If this Bill is going to stand over, I have no intention of trying to block it, but I would point out that the matter is a very serious one. These water-powers are nearly 350 miles from Winnipeg, and there is not a white man living within one hundred and fifty or sixty miles of where this company is asking for these water-powers. The power they propose generating would be simply for the piece of railway they intend to build. They do not say where this railway is going to start. It is to start either at the mouth of the Nelson, or at the mouth of the Saskatchewan, which are 150 miles apart. The whole scheme is immature. And outside of all that is the fact that we have no regulations governing these water-powers. They are at the present outside the province, and the regulations provided by the Interior Department affect only water-powers within the different provinces. My hon. friend says that we have been giving these powers to other companies. That may be true, but that is no reason for continuing that policy. What I urge is to stay proceedings until the government investigates this matter thoroughly and brings down some policy regarding the distribution of these great water-powers. There is no question in my mind that this is simply a power scheme. The hon. gentleman talks about reduced rates between Winnipeg and Hudson bay, but every man who knows anything about Lake Winnipeg, knows that it is frozen up six months in the year, and in the other six months we have the water route. This is simply a scheme to control the great water-powers. If the rights of the people are protected, I have no objection to this Bill, but I do want to see their rights safeguarded. Another question is this. Within a very short time these great powers will likely come within the territory of Manitoba. The argument is used that Manitoba has no rights in her waterways; but I hope the day is not far distant when all that will be remedied. Our province should have control of our great water-powers. I believe the time is coming when Manitoba will have the control of its fisheries. That control is essential to her development and the proper protection of our fisheries. That is one of the reasons why this government should stay its hand. I do not think we should give away rights, or any thing that may affect the future of any province. There can be no question that the province of Manitoba will have those rights in years to come, and nothing should be done here to make it impossible or difficult for the province to legislate with regard to her water-powers. I am not holding up the Bill, or objecting to it on personal grounds, but I realize my position, representing a constituency more directly affected than any other, as these powers are at the head of Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. I see in the Ottawa 'Free Press' to-night that an impassable muskeg on the Hudson Bay railway route, extending many miles, has stopped the survey work. Last year I explained, in a speech I made on the twelfth of March in this House, about this muskeg. I explained that there were miles of that Hudson Bay railway route composed of frozen muskeg, covered with a kind of moss two feet, or three feet thick. This acts like sawdust in an ice house, and keeps the muskeg frozen all the year round. So long as the ground remains frozen underneath, the muskeg is passable, but as soon as it is broken up as it must be in building a railway the heat gets in, and the ground thaws out, and the whole road-bed sinks into the muskeg. If the route of the Hudson Bay railway is to be changed, it would be well to let the Bill before us stand because, the company it proposes to incorporate is to connect with the Hudson Bay road. I think it would be as well, therefore, to let it stand over until the hon. minister gets more particulars.

A trial line should be run at once between Prince Albert city and Hudson bay to see if a better route cannot be obtained for the Hudson Bay railway. The lakes in the Pas country are so nearly on a level with the land that the water backs up, and soaks over an immense territory, and that is what causes the muskeg. I was told in Prince Albert last year that a million muskrat skins had been taken out of that country during last winter, which would indicate that there must be a considerable extent of low land there. If that be the case, I am afraid that any attempt to build a road through that section of country will be a failure, and as the road mentioned in this Bill is to connect with the Hudson Bay railway, it would be well to hold it over for reconsideration. A trial line from Prince Albert should be run at once because there are no high hills, impassable muskegs, big rivers, or other serious obstacles to be met with between northern Prince Albert and Hudson bay.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. I must urge that this matter stand over. It seems to me as if there were some concerted action to monopolize this territory. We had a Bill the other day, a canal Bill, but it was really a water-power Bill, to build a canal upon the streams reaching all the way between Lake Superior and Lake Winnipeg. This Bill is a railway Bill in name, but it is really a water-power Bill, as has been set forth by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). I would call the atten-

tion of the House to the part of it which defines the line of railway. Under section 7 the railway is to start at Grand Rapids (at the mouth of the Saskatchewan) or at the outlet of Lake Winnipeg (that is, the Nelson river) or at any point between. One of these points is in the north east of Lake Winnipeg and the other is in the northwest. And there is at least 100 miles, perhaps 150 miles, between them. Does the railway run north, south, east or west? The Bill does not say. It runs to intersect the Hudson Bay railway, wherever it may be located by the government. That road is not located yet. So, as the hon. member for Selkirk has said, it has no starting point and it ends nowhere. That is the railway part of the Bill. It is just possible by giving that a liberal construction that the road may run all the way down the banks of the Nelson river to somewhere near York factory. And, with the powers in the original Bill—I have forgotten just how far the Bill was amended—to build tramways around the rapids—

Mr. GRAHAM. That is cut out.

Mr. A. HAGGART. That is cut out. Well, it can run all along the Nelson river for hundreds of miles. The province of Manitoba looks forward to the time when this territory will be included within its boundaries, and we would like, when this territory comes to Manitoba, that it should come unencumbered by legislation of this kind. We find that already a good deal of the public domain has been alienated. We would not like to acquire this new territory and find a practical, grafting politician—well, that is too strong a word; I will take that back—sitting upon every waterfall that is among the few assets we have left. If there were any immediate necessity for the construction of this road, we should be the last to oppose it. As the hon. member for Selkirk has said, there are not fifty white men between Lake Winnipeg and the proposed terminus of this road at York factory or any other part of that territory. If the gentleman is ready with his friends and their capital to go ahead and develop that territory he will find not only the people of Winnipeg but the people of Manitoba behind him. But they would like to have some more definite scheme than this.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to ask him a question? Does he understand the law at present to be such that, if this territory were added to Manitoba under the present conditions, the province of Manitoba would control the water-powers?

Mr. LENNOX. We have the minister—

Mr. CARVELL. I am asking the hon. member for Winnipeg (A. Haggart). If he does not wish to answer, all right.

Mr. A. HAGGART. The law is by no means clear on that point. There are few water-powers in Manitoba as the province exists. It is a 'prairie province,' a level province. The only water-powers of any importance are those on the Winnipeg river in the eastern part of the province. They have been administered in this way: Parties have applied to this government for a license or a lease of the falls, or the right to develop the water-powers upon that river. But what the authority of this government is, I am not very clear.

Mr. CARVELL. One more question, if I may be permitted. In the case of the Winnipeg river, has the province of Manitoba exercised any jurisdiction over these water-powers?

Mr. A. HAGGART. They have to this extent, that they have granted charters to people to develop these powers, and the city of Winnipeg—

Mr. CARVELL. That is the incorporating of a company, but have they exercised any powers or rights of ownership over the water-powers themselves?

Mr. A. HAGGART. I am not aware that they have. A water-power is a peculiar kind of property.

Mr. CARVELL. It is very simple.

Mr. A. HAGGART. With reference to Winnipeg river, if the Dominion owned the land all along that river no doubt the Dominion would own the lands under the river, and would have a sufficient grip upon that water-power to control it.

Mr. CARVELL. It would seem so.

Mr. A. HAGGART. But, if the Dominion had alienated these lands along the river—and they have alienated a lot of them, for some of these lands are what are known as swamp lands and have been conveyed to Manitoba and are Crown lands in the right of the province of Manitoba—or if they had been patented either to the province of Manitoba or to individuals who are now riparian owners, and if these held and own sufficient of the fee simple on both sides of the river, I have no doubt that, as riparian owners, they would have the right, perhaps, to develop that power in so far as that development did not interfere with navigation. But, with reference to navigation, while there are stretches in that river that are navigable for ten or twenty miles, it is not valuable as a navigable river. We do not want to do anything to prevent development, but I would urge upon the government to have this

Bill stand over until we know a little more about it.

Mr. RUTAN. It seems to me that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. A. Haggart) has shown a good deal of feeling in this matter. He speaks of grafting along the river—

Mr. A. HAGGART. I took that back.

Mr. RUTAN. The hon. gentleman makes a point of the fact that Lake Winnipeg is open only part of the year, and infers from that fact that this must be a water-power Bill entirely. But there are many things in this country not operated all the year and that yet pay dividends. Lake Superior is not open all the year. If we go back to our farmers, we find that many of them own binders, costing them up to $200, which they use for only ten days in the year. And one individual, or a number of individuals clubbing together, will buy a threshing machine at a cost of several thousand dollars, for use only about sixty days a year, and still the use of these articles are the foundation of our wealth. There is nothing in this Bill that can authorize any man to state that it is only a power Bill. This is an undertaking to build the railway, and, in connection therewith, making an arrangement to build steamers to ply in connection with it, to acquire power for the undertaking and to dispose of the surplus power. This is a concession which is given to other companies—has been given to other companies since this Bill started through the Railway Committee. I cannot see what will be gained by putting the Bill off. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) said that this was hundreds of miles away from settlement; then he turns round and says that it is so valuable that it should be given all the protection possible, and we should wait and see what arrangement can be made with the province of Manitoba. I don't think that is the right stand to take. If we do not carry on works of development in any of the provinces until they have developed all their natural resources, we shall witness continued stagnation.

Mr. BRADBURY. In answer to the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan), I would like to say that when this matter was under discussion the other evening, some question was raised about the authority of the province over these powers. The minister stated, I think, in reply to something I said myself, that even if the boundaries of the province were extended, the province would have no more rights than it has at present. We all understand that. But the point I raised was this: While I recognize the fact that we have at present no authority over our water-powers, I believe the time is coming when Manitoba will have control over its water-powers and over its lands; and in view of that fact, I think the government ought to go very slow in giving control of a power where there is absolutely no necessity. There is nothing urgent, there is no present need of developing that power. If a charter was given to it, I am satisfied that there is nothing to warrant the expenditure this Bill contemplates. By the mere fact of giving that charter we tie up that water-power, which I think is a wrong principle. Now, in the interest of Manitoba, I feel that I must urge the government to defer this Bill. I do not want to be considered as blocking the measure, but I feel that there should first be formulated some well defined policy regulating the powers on the Winnipeg river, as well as at the head of Lake Winnipeg. In answer to a question with regard to the Winnipeg river, I said that the province has some power over that river. It obtained that power largely through the fact that the swamp lands which came under its authority gave it some rights along that river. There was a charter, I think, granted by the Dominion, but although it was granted by the Dominion, they had to seek some powers in the province of Manitoba before they could do anything with that power. Now we have 15 or 16 immense powers on that river, and if the schemes that are before parliament are allowed to go through, it would be a serious matter for that western country. On the Winnipeg river, there is no canal scheme that it is possible to carry out without injuring every water-power along that route. But I do not think myself that there is anything very serious contemplated in regard to a canal scheme. The scheme is to get control of these powers, there is no question about that; and that is one of the reasons why I have taken such strong ground against granting the powers these companies are asking for. If we grant the company in the Bill that is under discussion now, the powers that are asked for, I am satisfied that for years to come nothing could be done there in the way of development.

Mr. RUTAN. That being the case, if there will be nothing done, would not the powers lapse at the end of the two years?

Mr. BRADBURY. My contention is that nothing should be done that would embarras the action of the government in future regarding these powers. That country is developing rapidly, we need all the power we can get in the city of Winnipeg, and the time may come when the power from these very falls would be most essential to the prosperity, not only of Winnipeg, but of other great towns in the west. When that time comes, the government ought to be in a position to handle that power,

which it could not do if it were tied up by the legislation that is now proposed. As I have pointed out with regard to the railway scheme, I think every hon. gentleman who has paid any attention to the proceedings of the committee, knows very well that there is no well defined scheme. If it starts south, say at a point on Lake Winnipeg, or at the mouth of the Nelson, the two points are 150 miles apart, and I do not think it is fair to ask this House to grant a railroad charter without some more definite knowledge than we have regarding where it is going to start and where it is going to end. I would, therefore, ask the minister to defer this Bill in order that the government may be in a position to bring down some well defined policy with regard to these water-powers, and especially the powers outside the province. The government at present has no scheme, the legislation they have does not in any way cover the water-powers outside the boundaries of the different provinces. There are three or four water-powers on the Nelson, perhaps as great as the first power at Sea falls, and there is not one of these powers protected by the regulations issued by the Interior Department. I think that is a matter that ought to receive the serious attention of the government before anything further is done.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Looking over the Bill I do not see any limitations within which the company shall start operations or complete them.

Mr. GRAHAM. The general Railway Act will apply.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I understand that the general Railway Act will apply, but if the company fail to commence its operation within the time limited by that Act and they should come back for a renewal of their charter, there would be no difficulty in getting the charter renewed, because the Railway Committee, since I have been in it, has adopted the policy of automatically renewing charters without any question. There has been some spasmodic opposition to the renewal of these charters, but it has practically had no effect at all. I think the time of the members of this House is too much occupied in fighting the aggressions of those private companies. These private companies introduce Bills that purport to be Railway Bills, but in reality they are water-power Bills. Not only this session, but last session, our time was occupied for days and days fighting these private companies who desired to gain control of water-powers that should be left within the jurisdiction of the various provinces. It seems to me an anomaly that matters affecting the province, for instance of British Columbia, should be decided by members from the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Burrard Inlet Bridge and Railway Company.

Mr. S. SHARPE. It seems to me an anomaly that members from Quebec can settle the terms upon which a radial railway company shall enter the city of Toronto. I think there should be some declaration of policy on the part of the government, laying down stereotyped rules and regulations upon which every company can get its charter automatically on well defined conditions. I also think that a regulation might be made that all these matters should be referred to a sub-committee from the province affected by these railway companies. For instance, if a private railway Bill is brought in affecting the province of British Columbia, that might be referred to a sub-committee of members from that province.

Mr. CARVELL. What would the hon. gentleman say if it affected the Northwest Territories? Would he refer it to the member for the Yukon? The Bill now under consideration affects the Northwest Territories alone.

Mr. S. SHARPE. In that event I would suggest that the members from the various provinces in the west be a sub-committee. They know the local conditions better than we do.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

The hour for private Bills having expired the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

National Transcontinental railway, surveys and construction, $27,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister state the character of the work done to ascertain the necessary data with respect to classification for the purpose of tendering?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be what is known as the preliminary surveys of the country. The estimates were based on the surface indications found by the engineers and some soundings or borings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am asking for information because I am in an unhappy state of ignorance in regard to all these matters. I would suppose that where advertisements were sent our for tenders, these tenders to be based on a schedule of prices for each class of work, it would be absolutely essential for the government to know the character of the country and to have some reasonable idea as to how much solid rock, how much loose rock, how much earth excavation would have to be paid for

in the final result. I am not able to understand how the government could arrive at the conclusion that one tender was higher or lower than another unless they had that information in their possession, and I cannot understand how they could come to a reasonable conclusion about the relative merits of the different tenders unless that information in their possession was reasonably accurate and reliable. The information which the minister vouchsafed to the House this afternoon shows that there are discrepancies of a most extraordinary character. Let me give you one example. On contract No. 1, the estimate was that there was no solid rock. Ninety-five per cent of that contract has been done and the final result has not yet been ascertained, but so far as 95 per cent is concerned, it shows no less than 42,219 cubic yards of solid rock. The estimate showed 129,379 cubic yards of loose rock. The result, in respect of 95 per cent of the contract shows that no less than 938,728 cubic yards have been returned. The estimates showed of common earth excavation 1,841,152 cubic yards. Ninety-five per cent of the work has been done and in that we find only 520,728 cubic yards. If the information in the possession of the government was so absolutely inaccurate as this seems to have been, how was it possible to come to a conclusion about the tenders. I do not wish to draw any conclusion that is not legitimate, but one can easily see how a tender that was really the highest of all might be accepted as the lowest if the information was no more reliable than it was in this case. What is the minister's explanation?

Mr. GRAHAM. The explanation so far as I can make it is this: I am informed that the usual practice prevailing in Canada was adopted by the engineering staff, the preliminary surveys made and the general contour of the country shown on the profile, with the approximate quantities of each kind of material in each district.

Mr. BARKER. How were the approximate quantities of loose rock and earth ascertained for these estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM. I presume they were obtained as on all railways, but not being an engineer I cannot give a professional explanation.

Mr. BARKER. Judging by the results they were never ascertained at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am inclined to think that any one could have shut his eyes, never gone near the country at all, and made as good a guess.

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineering staff followed the usual practice as I understand it. Mr. Dunn is now in the employ of the Grand Trunk Pacific in a very responsible position, and any engineers that have left us have been picked up by other railways and put in charge of the same kind of work. I believe the engineers were good men. The engineers estimated, and the tenders were based on the approximate quantities given by the engineers, and the contract was given to the lowest tender on that basis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the engineers were good men, and if they followed the practice usual in Canada, I assume it is a practice that must give satisfactory results. I am not prepared to say exactly where the fault lies, but undoubtedly if the original estimates were correct then the charges of over classification must be true. It is utterly impossible to conceive that there is not something radically wrong somewhere. Either the work was done with an incredible degree of incapacity or negligence in the first instance, or else the final classification is not a true classification. Something is inconceivably wrong in the one case or the other. I have had some little experience of this in my profession, and I know that no such absurd results as these were ever obtained where the work was properly done in both cases. It seems to be an outrageous condition of affairs. Here is an estimate of 1,841,152 yards of common earth excavation; the contract has now been completed to the extent of 95 per cent and yet we find that the classification of common earth excavation is only 520,726 yards or not quite 30 per cent of the estimate. There is something outrageously wrong in this. Does the minister pretend to tell me that is the way in which other railways are built in this country. I know a little about these contracts and I never heard of anything like this before. I shall be glad to hear what explanation the minister can give.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend's point is well taken, but of course, we cannot tell about the entire classification until the board of arbitrators give their report; and then these quantities may possibly be changed in some respects. In reading over some documents the other day it struck me that the engineers in making their preliminary surveys and estimates might not make their estimate of solid rock, or loose rock open to the same interpretation as that put upon it by the engineers making the excavation.

Mr. BARKER. The great distinction is between earth and rock.

Mr. GRAHAM. On the surface there might be no solid rock as would be indicated in the first survey.

Mr. LENNOX. The rock has to be more than a yard in size.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is an interpretation in one clause that any material that it is best to move by blasting is solid rock. Engineers classify these things differently from what we would understand, and I find that sometimes an engineer will call a thing solid rock when a layman would not so describe it. But granting all that, I admit at once that to my mind the estimated quantities are not as close to what the real returns are, as they ought to be. There is no use arguing it any other way. But a difference between the estimate and the cost often happens in other railways. For instance, I believe that the Sudbury branch of the Canadian Pacific railway cost 100 per cent higher than the estimate. I am not saying that was in the classification; I am just taking the cost of the line as a whole. Railway companies in making their estimates often go very far astray but the public do not know about it as they do in the case of a public work like this. To my mind the difficulty is not so much in there being a wrong estimate, except that that might lead parliament astray in any case as to what the cost would be, if the country is not paying for more than it is getting.

Mr. BARKER. That is not the question.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is the question I am talking about, and when the arbitrators make their final examination, I have full faith that the country will pay only for what it has got, and the classification will be properly laid down by the board.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The hon. minister must know that there is a proper way to construct a railway. First, there is a preliminary survey, then there is a location survey. The duty of the engineers in a location survey is to ascertain not only the quantity in the prisms, but the composition. How do they do that? The hon. minister says that they look at the surface. Not at all. They sink test pits on every portion of the road down to grade line, and they ought to know within ten per cent the proper classification. Fifteen per cent, as the minister stated, is an enormous allowance. What do we find on the first section of the road? No rock returned by the engineers, and as a matter of fact 40,000 yards of solid rock; an estimate of 150,000 yards of loose rock, and there is 700,000 yards; an estimate of 18,000 yards of clay or earth excavation, and there is 500,000 yards. How can you have proper tenders when such a state of affairs occurs? The estimates were in such a condition that any one who tendered on the quantities returned by the engineers would have no chance whatever. The minister says the same thing has occurred in several cases. I defy him to show a case in which such manifest errors in the location surveys have occurred in the construction of any railroad, unless there is found a pithole largely in excess of the quantity the engineers estimated. Strange to say, the prism quantities are nearly correct. The only fault is in the classification, the dividing up. If a man who takes out earth is paid for loose rock, and the man who takes out loose rock is paid for rock, it is the fault of the department or of the engineering staff who superintended the location survey. When there is 40,000 yards of rock excavation where none was estimated, and when the earth excavated is changed into loose rock excavation, the result is that the contractor is paid three or four times the amount he would have been entitled to if the location survey had been correct. There is something wrong. We have no explantion as to when or how it occurred. Everybody knows that in the construction of a railroad the original estimates of the location engineers are kept in a book, and that every week, while the work is going on, a certain portion of it is checked off. The department ought to have a similar book so that they would know at any time when anything went wrong. We have no explanation whether, when they found that these things were going wrong, the attention of the engineer in charge of the work was drawn to the improper classification or not. We should have some explanation, but we have none. It seems that this thing has gone on without any supervision whatever. The hon. minister says that a final estimate is not made, that the classification is still under consideration. I would like to know from the minister, with regard to this section of the road which we are considering, to what extent the contractor has been paid on these estimates, and whether it is not largely in excess of the original quantity as estimated by the engineers, and whether it would not be possible, even with the percentage retained by the government, and the deposit made by the contractor, to secure the government against any charges of that kind? What is the classification on which the contractor has been paid, and what is the amount reserved, over and above the usual ten per cent, for the purpose of preserving to the government any right they may have on the final classification?

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister has spoken as if the great difficulty in these matters were a distinction between loose rock and solid rock. Why, that is a trifle compared with what the real facts are. The great trouble here is the enormous difference between ordinary earth excavation and either solid rock or loose rock. If you

reduced this down to a mere question of difference between loose rock and solid rock, there would be a very important difference; but it would be nothing compared to the enormous loss to the country arising from the fact that what was represented as earth work is being paid for as either loose rock or solid rock. The minister says that he has no doubt that the thing was done as it is usually done by railway companies. I hope that it was so, and if it was, the hon. gentleman can show us, yard for yard, from one end of that road to the other, what the engineers did before these contracts were made. It is not a question of guess work. The minister has the papers in his possession; why are they not produced? Why have we not these explanations now when we are asked to vote $27,000,000 for continuing this work? Why does the minister not tell us where, and how these discrepancies occurred? It does not require an engineer to know that if these discrepancies worked against the contractors, and the government attempted to enforce the contracts the courts of the land would relieve the contractors from their obligations because of fraudulent representations made on behalf of the government. That is the case, and the hon. minister knows it.

Mr. CARVELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that if the locating engineers estimated that a certain cut contained 75 per cent of rock, and the contractor took the contract under that specification and it turned out only 25 per cent rock, he would have an action against the commissioners for breach of faith?

Mr. BARKER. I say that if you should bring before a court such manifest injustice—in this case it happens to be an injustice to the country—to the contractor, as the result of misrepresentations made, the court would relieve the contractor.

Mr. CARVELL. One other question. Is the hon. gentleman aware that in asking for tenders for this work the contractors were not given any information whatever as to what proportion was solid or loose rock or common earth excavation, in any of these different works.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is the hon. gentleman certain in his statement?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. I have had something to do with letting railway contracts. Before a company lets such a contract as this government did, its engineers go over again and again every mile of the work, and by pits and borings and preliminary surveys, they ascertain, as nearly as possible, what is the nature of the ground?

Mr. BARKER.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman know that that information was given the contractors when tendering for the work?

Mr. BARKER. If a railway company were undertaking to build a new line through a country such as this—and I have in my mind at this moment a similar work—that company would survey every mile with the utmost care, and they would have, as the government has now, if the minister's statement is correct, they would have a record of the borings and surveys of every mile of that road.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Every 100 yards.

Mr. BARKER. Every mile would be done by sections of 100 yards. They would be able to show the prism measurements, the tests, the pits and borings; and it would be such evident, downright fraud, if the differences were so enormous as they are here represented to be that no court would hold the contractor bound by his contract, because of the evident, wilful, deliberate, intentional misrepresentation and fraud. The hon. gentleman says there are differences about loose and solid rock. Why the great difference is that enormous quantities of earthwork are turned into loose or solid rock—not loose rock turned into solid, or solid into loose. That is where the cost estimated by this government has been so enormously exceeded. No one pretends for a moment that discrepancies or errors of 15 or even 20 per cent difference would be an indication of anything but carelessness on the part of the staff for which we could not hold the government or a company responsible, but to say that the directors of a railway company would not be responsible for such enormous differences as are here shown is absurd. Why, they would dismiss the whole staff if they were an honest board. They would kick every man out as incompetent unless they were afraid to do it because they were a party to the fraud. There is no business man which does not know that to be the case. I have known that in similar cases of difficult railway construction, the company has sent their staff three times over the ground. They sent them first and got their estimate, and then sent them over again, and even a third time before submitting their surveys for tenders. Then the contractors would come in and the company got all the benefit of the money they had had expended on these preliminary surveys. But what have we here? The hon. gentleman is not able to produce those preliminary surveys. He does not know that any are in existence. He can only say vaguely that the government have done what companies usually do. He ought to know whether he has

the results of those surveys. If he has, it was his duty to look into them and see who were responsible for this enormous expenditure, wholly unexpected and wholly unauthorized. That is what I complain of. It is no use for the hon. gentleman to ask for $20,000,000 and tell us he has no doubt that what is usually done was done in this case. He ought to know what was done. He ought to have the papers in his office and see whether there are still in the pay of this government men who deliberately falsified the figures or were so negligent that they were even worse than rogues and falsifiers.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not dare to follow my hon. friend in his sweeping strictures and denunciations of people as rogues and falsifiers. I am always sufficiently charitable to consider every man as honest as myself until I find out that he is not. It does not help our argument on either side to call names. My hon. friend is a good railway man perhaps, but I will venture the assertion that there is not an hon. member in this House who has heard him who would think that he has made this clear, and that is that the contractors do not base their estimates on information as to quantities or classification given them by the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the government estimate submitted them before they tender?

Mr. GRAHAM No. They know nothing about the quantities which the government engineers have figured out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The government makes certain tests and borings, and estimate as best they can what the classifications eventually will be—is that information not submitted in any form to the contractors?

Mr. GRAHAM. Partially it is and partially it is not. There is a profile given the contractors and that profile shows the probable findings in different parts of the country.

Mr. BARKER. As the result of your survey?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. But the engineers of any company are supposed to find out for themselves, they are not given the faintest inkling of what quantity there is of solid rock, no quantities are given at all, there is merely given a profile of what is in the different districts. These are not guaranteed. If the contractors are good business men, they send their own engineers over the territory, and base their tenders on their own information, and not on ours at all, and that is what they nearly always do. The government, or any company, merely gives them the general character of the country on a profile.

Mr. BEST. Is this contract let at so much per yard for solid rock, so much for loose rock, and so on?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BEST. Then what difference does it make to them how many yards there are. But it does make a difference when it turns out in so many cases that what was first classified as earth has become solid rock.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member (Mr. Best) is not going to get me away from the point though I have answered his question. I am pointing out that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) perhaps unintentionally, drew a veil over a certain part of the case in presenting it to the House. He would have left the impression upon my mind, had I not understood the matter, and I have no doubt that he left the impression on the minds of those hon. members who have not had experience, that we gave the quantities to the contractors, and that on these the contractors had made their tenders. They had no quantities, but merely a profile, and they figured out their tenders from their own information and from the profile given by the commission. The same is true in the case of contractors for a company. The company does not give its estimates of quantity made out by its own engineer. That is for its own information. The contractors have to get the information, and take the risk. As the hon. member (Mr. Best) has asked the question, our schedule prices and amounts taken out are paid for according to the quantities really found there in cuts, and in many cases these have exceeded the estimates of the engineer, not as to quantity, but on the basis of classification.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What is the difference between giving the quantities, and giving the profile, if, from so much excavation of earth, so much lose rock, and so much solid rock given on the profile——

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) shakes his head.

Mr. CARVELL. As the hon. member refers to me, I may say that it is not so. The commission never gave such information to any contractor. That is not among the papers.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman, then, differs from the minister, who says that the profile is given to the contractor, and on it is marked the classification.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. Haggart) misunderstood

me. The difference between us is only of a word. I said that on the profile the word 'probably' is the word used. That is done intentionally.

An hon. MEMBER. Probably what?

Mr. GRAHAM. For instance: 'Probably loose rock'.

Mr. J. HAGGART. That is how the government gets out in this matter. For, if they marked it specifically, they would be bound by the quantity.

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly.

Mr. J. HAGGART. And, when the contract is made, the government carefully guard themselves against guaranteeing the quantities shown in the profile, or anything else. It is on the probable quantities that the estimate of the contractor is made.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not even the probable quantity. It only appears: 'Probably loose rock', 'probably earth', and so on.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I did not say, nor had I in mind, the quantities. The quantities are never marked on the profile. But the sections are marked, 'probably rock,' 'probably loose rock', and so on. Is it not just as easy for the contractor as for the engineer of the department to estimate the quantity of loose rock, rock and earth excavation?

Mr. GRAHAM. They take the risk.

Mr. J. HAGGART. They take the risk for this reason—there is a condition imposed in the contract that the government is not responsible for the quantity set forth in the profile or otherwise. That risk the contractor has to take. But the quantities, for all practical purposes, are marked on the profile. The contractor, before he tenders, knows it. The hon. minister says that most of them go over the work. What an absurdity! Nine-tenths of the contractors before undertaking a railway contract never see the work. They find out what the character of the excavation is—earth, clay, hard pan, loose rock or rock; they rely on the profile for their estimate and they make their tender accordingly. I have never seen anything like the exposition here to-night. The hon. minister says—and said in his previous speech: What difference does it make to the country if the country receives value? What we contend is that, either those who originally surveyed and laid out and classified this work were totally incompetent—for which the government is responsible—or there has been fraud in the payment of contracts up to this time. That is what we are trying to unearth, and that is what we have a right to find out. When the government found that the quantities were being largely exceeded, they should have taken action to find out the reason, and of that action we should be informed. No information of this kind has been given to the House. Quantities so greatly in excess of the estimates should have alarmed the government, and they should have stopped the work and made an inquiry as to the competency of the engineers, and they should have been able to give to the House better reasons than they do at present for this large excess in the quantities. This enterprise was initiated by the government and the House was advised by the ministers about what the cost would be. But when they found that cost being nearly doubled, they should have had sufficient reasons to give this House for that increase. However, we are not furnished with a single bit of information in regard to the matter.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has not been as definite as I could have wished, in reference to the question of survey, as to what was done. But I dare say he has been as definite as his own information enabled him to be. I am sorry he has not ascertained just what was done in order to learn the condition of things before contracts were let. We do not require much information to realize that, if tenders are going to be properly awarded, the department, before it accepts tenders, must have a reasonably accurate estimate of the quantities of material involved in the work. If they do not do this, then what is called the moneying out is not properly based and the profession that they have ascertained which is the lower tender is absolutely false. Either the government did their duty and employed competent engineers who made regular and sufficient surveys, had the ordinary test pits sunk, the ordinary borings made, and the ordinary work of all kinds done to ascertain within reasonable limits the actual quantities of the various materials to be moved and of the various materials to enter into the construction of the work,—either that, or else the government failed in its duty, misled the country and went on with this work without having collected the proper information before proceeding. Though the minister says he had competent engineers from end to end of the 1,800 miles, yet I would still be prepared to find discrepancies in the classification. I would be prepared to find that in some cases they had over-estimated the expensive materials, and in other cases, over-estimated the cheaper materials; but I would not be prepared to find that on one continuous system for 1,804 miles the same thing would occur, that is, that solid rock increased and loose rock increased, multiplied in many cases four or five times, and that in every case without variation, common ex-

cavation decreased. But that is what we have in this case. The statement the minister gave this afternoon shows that in every case where any considerable quantity of work has been done, the solid rock has enormously increased, the loose rock has enormously increased, and common excavation has decreased. There are three or four cases where it is different. For instance, on contract No. 7, the estimated quantity of solid rock was 633,000 cubic yards, the actual quantity returned is 533,000; but in this case there is only 46 per cent of the work done. In some other cases it is the same way. For instance, in contract No. 12, the estimated quantity of solid rock was 990,000 cubic yards, the amount returned is only 188,000. Of loose rock the estimate was 633,000 cubic yards, and only 130,000 were returned, but in that case only 8·8 per cent of the work has been done. So it is all down the list. For instance, in contract No. 14, the quantity of solid rock is still below the estimated quantity, but in that case, loose rock has got up from 210,000 cubic yards to 707,000 cubic yards, and only 28 per cent of the work has been done. Now, this is the position, that from end to end of that 1,800 miles there is one invariable system, namely, that the loose rock and solid have grown enormously, while common excavation has slipped out of sight. We can understand an occasional error. It is said by competent engineers that we should allow perhaps 10 per cent for error as regards variations in classification. But you should have the total quantities correct, and there is no competent engineer who will say that you can have these enormous discrepancies and account for them on the double basis of competent engineering in the first place, and competent and honest classification in the second place. Now look at some other of these figures. Take the first two contracts. There it is said there is no solid rock at all, that there is only a small quantity, in the one case 130,000 cubic yards, and in the other case less than 60,000 cubic yards of loose rock. That makes, in the two contracts, a total of 58 miles. What does that indicate? It indicates an agricultural region, there is practically no stone at all. Yet when we come to figure that out, we have loose rock growing from 130,000 cubic yards to 938,000 cubic yards. Then take contract No. 8, a startling case. Here we had an estimated quantity of 918,000 cubic yards of solid rock, that has grown so far as returned into 1,365,625 cubic yards. We had an estimate of 395,000 cubic yards of loose rock, that has grown into 1,382,000 cubic yards. Of common excavation, we had an estimate of 3,091,000 cubic yards, and that has shrunk to 869,000, and we have only 67 per cent of the work done. Now take No. 10. There was an estimate of 776,000 cubic yards of solid rock by competent engineers, and that grows into 2,849,000 cubic yards, and there is only 87 per cent of the work yet done. We had an estimate of 278,000 cubic yards of loose rock, and that has grown into almost a million and a half, and only 87 per cent of the work is done. I have taken some of these other contracts, because they were not dealt with in the complaints of Mr. Woods. Take the last contract, the McArthur contract. There was an estimate by the engineers of 3,696,000 cubic yards of solid rock, it has grown into 6,415,869 cubic yards. There was an estimate of 733,000 cubic yards of loose rock, that has grown into 2,056,000 cubic yards. We had an estimate of 11,000,000 cubic yards of common excavation and that has dwindled away to 2,215,000 cubic yards, and there is only 93 per cent of the work done.

These are startling figures to everybody except that commission who are fighting us to-day, and the government which is backing them, and I am going to appeal to the minister, because he is not yet into it up to the shoulders as some of them are; I am going to appeal to him now and ask him what he is going to do about it? There is no use paltering about this question, there is no use in delaying. The minister has referred this evening to the fact that we have a board of expert engineers at work trying to find out how this is. How much work have they done? Practically none. There is not a syllable for the people, for the government, for the members of this House from that Board of Arbitrators yet. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) was a member of the Hodgins' Committee, and two and a half years ago he and other members of the committee on the government side fought us to prevent us from going on with the Hodgins inquiry, as we were ordered to go on by this House, and as we were ordered by the motion made by the first minister, to go on with that inquiry on all the charges contained in the various papers referred to us. They fought us and by force of numbers prevented us from going on with that inquiry. And why? Because these arbitrators were at work and it would interfere with their work, and we would have a report at once which would be satisfactory and conclusive on all these matters. Two and a half years have gone by and we are not a step closer to a determination of this question, as far as anything practical is concerned. I appeal to the minister and I say on my responsibility as a member of the House, that instead of that commission endeavouring to find out on behalf of the people what is wrong, the action of that commission from first to last, in connection with the appoint-

ment of this board, has been consistently and persistently to prevent an inquiry in this matter. In the return which has been brought down on the motion of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) every page where there is a line written by the commission is a page and a line showing a desire to prevent a full and thorough investigation of this matter. That is the action of that commission, and I say to the minister he is the one more than all others who is responsible, and that if he wants to keep his reputation up, to do justice by the people, to see that this railway does not become a perfect scandal from one end of this country to the other, and before all countries, he should take this matter in hand and take some measures by which the people will be protected and this system will not be continued. I believe every word I say in this matter. I have given a good deal of time to it and I intend to give a good deal more to it if necessary, but I do say that this is becoming one of the most iniquitous works ever carried on on this continent—and some years ago they had some pretty bad ones to the south of us. The minister has not as yet become so deeply immersed in it as some others, but I say to him that he should look at the action of this commission critically and impartially, and if he can believe that this commission is acting in the interests of the public then he should go on; but I have read the records in connection with this investigation, by these arbitrators, these experts, and I can come to no other conclusion, nor can any one who reads the evidence, than that systematically, persistently, and determinedly, the members of this commission—the chairman, perhaps, more persistently than any others—have endeavoured to block this inquiry and to confine it within the narrowest possible limits. I have talked warmly on this, let me come down to calm pleading with the minister. It is up to the minister, it is essentially his duty not to allow this matter to run on any longer, but to take some active, definite action to protect the rights of the people as regards the expenditure of money on the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall not take up the time of the House following up my hon. friend, and I hope he will not think it discourteous on my part. He said what he said before in discussing this matter and what I would say in reply would be what I said before.

Mr. LENNOX. When did I say it?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member spoke with a good deal of heat some weeks ago and I answered at some length. The situation in short is this: When this Act was being passed, the House unanimously decided on the method by which any differences as to classification would be adjusted and settled for. It was understood, of course, that in all works there would be differences of opinion, or you may call it something else if you like, that there would be differences in the classification as between the commission's engineers and the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific who had to take over the work. Parliament understood that would occur, and, without one dissenting voice, appointed a board to settle all these differences, a board of experts, not like my hon. friend or myself who has to take other peoples' word absolutely for it. They named a method by which a tribunal would be appointed.

Mr. BARKER. Meantime you want to spend $20,000,000 more?

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact there was a great deal of difficulty and a good deal of cross-firing in getting the board finally appointed. Some work has been done but a report has not been made. As soon, however, as the snow is gone this spring this board, fully equipped with authority will go out and do this work, all precautions will be taken. My hon. friend will agree with me that he would not be a good man to judge of this?

Mr. LENNOX. A good man to judge of your commission?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not a good man to judge impartially, he gets too enthusiastic, as I do myself sometimes, in trying to convince people that mine is the only view and that there is no other view that possibly could be right. But the parliament of Canada, including my hon. friend, mapped out the way in which these things should be settled and that is the way they are being settled and will be settled, I hope, to the satisfaction of the country and even of my hon. friend.

Mr. CROCKET. Are payments being made to the contractors on certificates furnished by these engineers who have made the over-classification, who have been objected to?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend asserts that there has been over-classification. Progress estimates are paid to the contractors on the certificate of the engineers.

Mr. CROCKET. The same engineers who have been objected to?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend starts out, of course, with the idea that the engineers are guilty.

Mr. CROCKET. The classification has been objected to by the Transcontinental

engineers and by the chief engineer of the commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will understand that engineers are not discharged because some person objects to their classification.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the government continuing to make payment on certificates furnished by these same engineers just as before?

Mr. GRAHAM. Progress estimates are paid to the contractors on the certificates of engineers approved by the chief engineer, and subject to revision.

Mr. BARKER. Are they the same engineers?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some are, and perhaps all. The amount of security held back from each one of these contractors is as follows: On 'A,' $1,133,583.81; on 'B,' $1,701,308.91; on 'C,' $12,942.90; on 'D,' $656,668.07; on 'E,' $193,914; on 'F,' $1,218,143.85, or in round numbers $4,915,742.69.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What form of security?

Mr. GRAHAM. Cash security.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is not the most of it the 10 per cent retained by the government on the progress estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM. Most of it is. Of course as the work goes on these amounts increase rather than decrease.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I want to know the amount paid out to the contractors, and what the amount of the contract would be on the original estimate?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will take No. 1 as a sample. The chief engineer's estimate on No. 1 was $1,017,051.43; the estimate on the basis of the lowest tender $989,895.96; gross amount of progress estimate to December 31, 1909, $1,664,410.07; less the draw back of 10 per cent.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The original contract was let for $900,000, and the lowest tender taken on the estimated quantities. Your engineer's estimate was $1,000,000, but you have already paid to the contractors $1,600,000. You say that in the revision of the contract it may be corrected, and that it may possibly be not in excess of the original tender. Where is your money to guarantee that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am frank to confess that I do not think it will ever be reduced on the original estimate.

Mr. BARKER. How much have you held back on that contract now?

Mr. GRAHAM. $166,440.

Mr. BARKER. And when you have pocketed that you are over half a million dollars short.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not pocketed anything that I ever heard of.

Mr. BARKER. I am speaking of the government, and not you. You have already paid over half a million dollars in advance of your estimate.

Mr. GRAHAM. On that contract there are no objections to the classification.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On contract No. 1 for example, is the engineer who was responsible for the estimate in the first instance the same engineer who is responsible for the classification in the final payment?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, Mr. Dunn is now with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In how many cases and on what contracts is the engineer who made the original estimate of classification the same engineer, who has certified the classification which seems to have been adopted? If that information is not at hand it would be better to produce a statement later.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will take the district engineer, he is responsible for the whole district.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know who is responsible, but the minister will understand exactly what I want. I want to know in respect to every mile from Moncton to Winnipeg, in what cases the same man is responsible for the original estimate, and for the final result which is so absolutely different from it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get that for my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There are some other things I would like to know. I do not know whether this information will be available to-night, but I want to get it some time—I want to know exactly the character of the investigation that is made upon which these estimates of classification were founded; I want to know at what distances these pits were sunk where there was need of sinking pits; I want to know at what distances borings were made; I want full and complete information as to the character of the investigation which was made before this estimate was handed into the government. Then I want to know something more about the engineers. I want to know what steps the commission have taken up to date in the way of seeking information from the engineers who made this original estimate which has been so absolutely falsified in the result. I

want that information in respect to every mile of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg. I think the minister will agree, in view of the remarkable situation that has developed that I am not asking any too much.

To put this matter in plain terms, unless there has been the most extraordinary and inconceivable incapacity and negligence in the first instance, then there has been perpetrated on the public treasury of this country one of the most gigantic steals ever heard of. This dilemma the government must face in connection with this matter: the one or the other of these two things must be true.

The minister, then, will be good enough to give us this further information with regard to contract No. 1, contract No. 2, or whichever one first developed this situation. When it became apparent to the commissioners, who, I assume, were attending to their business, either that the estimates presented to the government in the first instance were absolutely worthless, or else that some one was getting money from the government to which he was not entitled, what explanations did the commissioners ask, what investigation did they make, what steps did they take to get to the bottom of this matter? I am not disposed to blame the minister too much, except that I do not think that he has been prompt and vigilant in demanding an explanation from the commission. He has the duties of a great department to attend to outside of this. But these men were there, paid by the people of this country to look carefully into matters of this character, and I would like very much to know, when this situation first developed, what steps they took about it. I have heard some very curious statements made on the authority of reputable men as to what the action, not of all, but of some of the commissioners, was in that regard; and if I should repeat the statements here, which I do not propose to do to-night, or until I verify them a little further, I think every hon. gentleman in this House would be startled by them. But whether these statements, which have been rather free of late, be true or not, certainly this House is entitled to the fullest possible information as to what was the action of the commissioners in this connection—whether they conceived it to be their duty at all to investigate the astonishing condition of affairs which has been disclosed by the information afforded to this committee by the minister. I would like to know further what is the rate for solid rock, the rate for loose rock and the rate for common excavation on every one of these contracts, in respect to every mile of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can give that now. I will give it by the numbers of the contracts, starting at Moncton and going west:

Contract.	Solid rock.	Loose rock.	Common excavation.
No. 1...	$1 50	$0 55	$0 25
" 2...	1 50	0 50	0 21
" 3...	1 25	0 44	0 29
" 4...	1 45	0 45	0 27
" 5...	1 49	0 35	0 24
" 6...	1 60	0 50	0 23
" 7...	1 45	0 50	0 24
" 8...	1 45	0 65	0 27
" 9...	1 50	0 50	0 21
" 10...	1 50	0 50	0 21
" 11...	1 65	0 60	0 27
" 12...	1 60	0 57	0 22
" 13...	1 80	0 65	0 35
" 14...	1 75	0 65	0 34
" 15...	1 85	0 70	0 40
" 16...	1 90	0 85	0 43
" 17...	1 90	0 90	0 45
" 18...	1 80	0 60	0 38
" 19...	1 48	0 85	0 29
" 20...	1 45	0 55	0 25
" 21...	1 70	0 60	0 30

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Now, would the minister be good enough to have a statement prepared, showing the cost of the entire line from Moncton to Winnipeg, based upon the estimates of classification which were made in the first instance, for the purpose of comparison with the estimates which have been certified by the engineers in respect of the work done up to the present time?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could give my hon. friend now the estimated cost, and then I could give him exactly what has been paid up to date on each one of these contracts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The estimated cost of course, is for the whole?

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimated cost of solid rock, loose rock, and common excavation Does my hon. friend want it for the whole?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes. you have not got it by contracts I suppose? Has my hon. friend got it distributed by the several contracts, or in one lump sum?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have the different contracts:

(E) The Engineer's estimated quantity of Solid Rock, Loose Rock and Common Excavation in the section of line covered by each contract, and the estimated cost under these headings, based upon the rates of accepted tender, are as follows:—

Contract.	Solid Rock.		Loose Rock.		Common Excavation.	
	Quantity.	Cost.	Quantity.	Cost.	Quantity.	Cost.
		$ cts.		$ cts.		$ cts.
1	Nil.	Nil.	129,379	71,158 45	1,841,152	460,288 00
2	Nil.	Nil.	58,473	29,236 50	529,452	111,184 92
3	22,112	27,640 00	492,589	216,739 16	494,036	143,270 44
4	315,315	457,206 75	1,030,121	463,554 45	1,016,720	274,514 40
5	252,893	376,810 57	971,224	339,928 40	1,224,284	293,828 16
6	172,709	276,334 40	64,765	32,382 50	1,676,175	385,520 25
7	633,900	919,155 00	196,300	98,150 00	407,000	97,680 00
8	918,381	1,331,652 45	395,645	257,169 25	3,091,210	834,626 70
9	392,989	589,483 50	38,248	19,124 00	1,795,202	376,992 42
10	776,161	1,164,241 50	278,552	139,276 00	4,508,480	946,780 80
11	220,200	363,330 00	180,200	108,120 00	1,966,458	530,943 66
12	990,600	1,584,960 00	633,700	361,209 00	2,259,000	496,980 00
13	462,000	831,600 00	470,600	305,890 00	1,920,000	672,000 00
14	203,144	355,502 00	21,646	14,069 90	3,956,566	1,345,232 44
15	243,400	450,290 00	51,900	36,330 00	1,127,200	450,880 00
16	104,700	198,930 00	45,200	38,420 00	1,618,600	695,998 00
17	16,000	30,400 00	8,000	7,200 00	1,677,000	754,650 00
18	225,845	406,521 00	25,900	15,540 00	1,046,000	397,480 00
19	2,602,000	3,850,960 00	89,000	75,650 00	1,489,000	431,810 00
10	493,400	715,430 00	71,900	39,545 00	374,000	93,500 00
21	3,696,336	6,283,771 20	733,454	440,072 20	11,233,247	3,369,974 10

Mr. BARKER. Do those figures show the actual cost, including the work yet to be done?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. BARKER. It is no use unless we get that. We want to know what the whole cost will be, and the system you are going on.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been giving the estimated quantities, and the estimated cost.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of the work up to date?

Mr. GRAHAM. The original estimates. I am prepared to give the cost up to date.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Could you not add the estimated cost to finish it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I can give my hon. friend the amount estimated to finish each contract.

Mr. J. HAGGART. That will do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the minister goes into that, may I ask whether this statement he has just read covers the entire work of excavation from Moncton to Winnipeg?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, twenty-one contracts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This statement is headed, 'The engineer's estimated quantity of solid rock, loose rock and common excavation in the section of line covered by each contract, and the estimated cost under these headings, based upon the rates of accepted tender.' As I understand, that is not restricted to the work done up to the present time; it is an estimate in respect of all the work from Moncton to Winnipeg under these items.

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimate for the three classifications, solid rock, loose rock and common excavation made at the time the contracts were made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We know what has been paid up to the present time in respect of the work done under these contracts. That has been given, I understand?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I have that in the next statement. I was going to give the amount paid on each of these contracts under each heading.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister distinguish the amount paid from the amount covered by the progress estimate, because there is a certain reduction?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am going to give the amount actually paid to the contractors.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And we can add one-ninth to that to get the amount of the progress estimate.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give both the amount of the progress estimate and the amount paid to the contractor. The statement is as follows:

The actual expenditure under the headings of Solid Rock, Loose Rock and Common Excavation, as shown by progress estimates (December 31, 1909) and the amounts actually paid are as follows:—

Contract No.	—	Solid Rock.	Loose Rock.	Common Excavation.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	Progress estimate	63,328 50	516,300 40	130,182 00
	Actually paid	56,995 65	464,670 36	117,163 80
2	Progress estimate	65,334 00	43,864 00	10,015 95
	Actually paid	58,800 60	39,477 60	9,014 36
3	Progress estimate	104,292 50	212,942 40	67,426 74
	Actually paid	93,863 35	191,648 16	60,684 07
4	Progress estimate	740,875 33	365,735 25	81,432 54
	Actually paid	666,787 80	329,161 73	73,289 29
5	Progress estimate	1,193,771 61	192,085 95	39,318 72
	Actually paid	1,074,394 45	172,877 36	35,386 85
6	Progress estimate	402,563 20	456,594 00	186,454 33
	Actually paid	362,306 88	410,934 60	167,808 90
7	Progress estimate	773,818 60	140,481 00	87,907 19
	Actually paid	696,436 74	126,432 90	79,116 48
8	Progress estimate	1,980,156 25	898,758 25	234,712 62
	Actually paid	1,782,140 63	808,882 43	211,241 36
9	Progress estimate	762,495 00	41,358 00	110,736 78
	Actually paid	686,245 50	37,222 20	99,663 11
10	Progress estimate	4,274,748 00	675,759 50	325,989 49
	Actually paid	3,847,273 20	608,183 55	293,390 55
11	Progress estimate	1,399,115 85	269,587 80	170,423 73
	Actually paid	1,259,204 27	242,629 02	153,381 36
12	Progress estimate	301,936 00	74,157 00	14,960 00
	Actually paid	271,742 40	66,741 30	13,464 00
14	Progress estimate	36,188 25	498,638 40	336,903 96
	Actually paid	32,569 43	448,774 57	303,213 58
15	Progress estimate	23,544 95	435,581 30	222,260 40
	Actually paid	21,190 46	392,023 17	200,034 36
18	Progress estimate	427,393 80	64,446 00	235,632 30
	Actually paid	384,654 42	58,001 40	212,069 07
19	Progress estimate	974,109 35	205,851 30	66,323 87
	Actually paid	876,698 42	185,266 17	59,691 49
20	Progress estimate	499,346 93	182,491 10	32,264 25
	Actually paid	449,412 24	164,241 99	29,037 83
21	Progress estimate	10,906,977 30	1,233,778 20	664,762 80
	Actually paid	9,816,279 57	1,110,400 38	598,286 52

The next sheet I have here would give the amount, not for these quantities, but the amount to complete the entire contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could we get at it by a system of percentage?

Mr. GRAHAM. The note given me here is that 'the classifications have been found to be considerably different from the original estimates.' That seems to be quite agreed upon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There seems to be no fault to find with that.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, the estimate of the work to be done under these headings cannot be given until the proper borings are made and other investigations held as to the line now being built.

Mr. J. HAGGART. How could the minister get at the percentages for work done if he does not know the work to be done?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was taken on a mileage basis, I understand.

Mr. J. HAGGART. But the minister gave a percentage on the basis of quantity, stating that in a certain contract 8 per cent remained to be done, on another 95 per cent of the work had been done, and so on. If he does not know the amounts to be done, how could he get the percentage?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is taken approximately on a mileage basis—the number of miles

of track laid, the grading done, the bridges to be built, and so on.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Couldn't you give an approximation of the amount required to finish?

Mr. GRAHAM. I can give the amount required to complete each contract.

Mr. LENNOX. Last year I moved for returns asking for the original estimates of quantities of each class of material throughout the whole 103 items that enter into the construction of the railway. I asked that the engineers' estimated quantity should be set out, with the cost according to the actual accepted tender; also that I should be furnished with the quantity of work done, or the quantity of material supplied, under each of these headings, and the cost; also, the estimated amount of work of each class yet to be done, for instance, the estimated quantity of common excavation, of solid rock and of loose rock under each contract, and the cost thereof throughout the various items. The return was brought down, and in a great majority of the contracts all that information was furnished. We then had a discussion in the House, and I ventured to point out the effect of it. Now, what I am dissatisfied about is this, that I have asked for other information of the same class on other contracts that were not completed at that time—that was only brought down to December, 1908—I have asked for subsequent estimates as to the other contracts where the information had not been furnished, and the answer in every case was that no estimate had been made. I do not understand, if the department is treating me fairly, how they were able to give information as regards so many contracts before the discussion took place, and that since the discussion they have not been able to give any. Has not the department estimates, as a matter of fact, made subsequently to the contract being let, as to the balance yet to be done in every case? If they have, I think it ought to be furnished to the House. On the first return, in the majority of the contracts, the information I asked of that character was furnished, that is, they gave me not only the quantity that had been taken out, but the estimated quantity of each class that was yet to be taken out; the actual quantity of material such as lumber that had been furnished, the estimated quantity yet to be furnished, the amount of clearing that had been done, and the amount yet to be done; the amount of grubbing that had been done, and the amount yet to be done. In probably 75 per cent of the contracts that information was brought down to December, 1908. At this late date, more than a year afterwards, I ask for estimates regarding the other contracts, and they say there has never been any subsequent estimate made. I would like the minister to inquire into that and see if it is correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does seem singular that estimates should have been made in respect of those asked for up to a particular date, and none made in respect to those asked for subsequent to that date.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know what the explanation is, but no doubt there will be one. My hon. friend has had, in the returns brought down to him, all the information I have been given to-night. I think he has had all this for some time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to call attention to another matter. I do not know anything about this of my own information, it is information that has come to another member of the House, and as I understand it, it amounts to this: On division 6, station 2670 x 25, presidency 23—I am not mentioning the name of the engineer—there have been two estimates given, one to what is called the station gang and another to the contractors, I do not know whether they are the original contractors. But, at all events, the so-called station gang, I understand, are sub-contractors, of other contractors, D. W. Murray & Sons. The information I have is this, and I want to ask the minister as to its accuracy. The station gang are said to have received one estimate as follows:

815 cubic yards loose rock at 45c..	$ 366 75
1,490 cubic yards loose rock, under water, $1.25..	1,862 50
483 cubic yards solid rock at $1.25..	603 75
	$2,833 00

The other contractors obtained an estimate, which is said to have gone in and to form part of the estimates of that portion of the line, to the following effect:

210 cubic yards loose rock, under water, $1.25..	$ 262 50
553 cubic yards solid rock at $1.25..	691 25
940⁶ cubic yards loose rock at 45c..	423 27
1,709³ cubic yards excavation within coffers, $2.25..	3,845 92
	$5,222 94

The letter which accompanies it intimates that these two estimates were given in respect to the same work; one was given to what was called the station gang, and the other was given to the contractors. I do not understand it, it may be capable of explanation, but I think it requires explanation, because there is a difference of about $2,400 between the two estimates. If the minister would be good enough to ob-

tain the necessary information with regard to that, I would be glad to have it.

Mr. GRAHAM. That will have to be investigated, of course, to see what is in it. We will have to instruct the commission to look up the 'Hansard' in the morning and explain it.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister said he could not give the estimates of the amount under the various headings to complete. But I understood he could give the estimates of the total amount required to complete under each contract. I think that would be useful to us. He might put it on the 'Hansard' where we can see it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will submit the following table:

Contract No.	Amount required to complete.
1	$ 101,189 93
2	200,596 18
3	142,681 32
4	784,893 87
5	835,219 79
6	291,794 07
7	1,736,969 54
8	2,349,383 11
9	641,096 33
10	1,140,687 92
11	1,437,142 91
12	4,193,584 50
13	3,815,279 10
14	3,687,360 72
15	2,502,365 96
16	3,308,048 25
17	2,019,908 25
18	1,121,977 45
19	4,535,603 23
20	180,285 74
21	923,890 26

The above amounts stated as being required to complete are approximate, and are taken from monthly percentage reports of work done, received from district engineers, and are subject to revision; no special estimates having been made for the purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like the exact date at which these discrepancies, to which I have referred, first began to manifest themselves. The minister will see that this is important in connection with a question which I also asked, as to what action the commission have at any time taken with regard to it.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the minister tell us what has actually been done by the three engineers who have been appointed recently under the provisions of section 7 of the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is difficult off-hand to say definitely. The Board of Arbitrators began work and certain reductions have been agreed to between the chief engineer of the commission and the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Under the contract if they agree the third arbitrator is not called in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the minister referring to the McDougal contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. The McArthur contract is one.

Mr. LENNOX. I see some matters have been adjusted with reference to the McDougal contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was done by our engineer without reference to the arbitrators. Certain deductions were made by the chief engineer, and under the contract his finding is final.

Mr. LENNOX. Certain matters have been adjusted on the McDougal contract independently of the Arbitration Board. Has anything been adjusted by the arbitrators?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed about 70 per cent of the differences in reference to what is called over-break, on the McDougal Bros'. contract, have been settled.

Mr. LENNOX. Has that been reported to the commissioners or the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. They have made no report, they have just started their work, and the chief engineer has made some reductions himself. There are some differences yet before the Board of Arbitrators. They have made some progress and some adjustments have been made between the chief engineers without the third arbitrator. They were acting as members of the board under the Act.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister could give the information as to the reductions by the chief engineer of the commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. We can get that information; I think I gave a good deal of it in my remarks in the House, although there may be one adjustment since then.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much excavation remains to be done on the line between Winnipeg and Lake Superior junction?

Mr. GRAHAM. On the line from Springfield, that is the shops east of St. Boniface, there is no excavation to be done, the grading is done; but on the entrance into Winnipeg there will be some grading.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I notice a reference to three per cent or five per cent of excavation still to be performed on contract 21. I suppose that relates to the locality to which the minister alludes? Is that line being operated?

Mr. GRAHAM. The line from Winnipeg to Superior Junction is in such a position that it could be operated to a certain extent by the contractors. They have offered it to the Grand Trunk Pacific to oper-

ate a certain number of trains each week, but the Grand Trunk Pacific does not care to make the arrangement and it is not being operated except as the contractors use it themselves. I am assured by the engineers that trains can be run over the road at a moderate rate with a fair load.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will be the cost of completing that line from Winnipeg to Lake Superior junction?

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount required to complete McArthur's contract is $923,890.26.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They have the entire contract from Winnipeg to Lake Superior junction?

Mr. GRAHAM. They have the contract to the east bank of the Red river.

Mr. LENNOX. How far is Lake Superior junction from Winnipeg?

Mr. GRAHAM. 245 miles. I have a note from the engineer on 21.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then we are to accept the amount as $963,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. The approximate amount is practically $1,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there a bridge over the Red river?

Mr. GRAHAM. That does not include the bridge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the bridge completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. The sub-structure is completed, but not the superstructure. There is a question as to the entrance into St. Boniface, and I have heard the parties interested once or twice, and on account of the level crossings and the crossings of the Canadian Pacific railway there, it is possible we will have to make an overhead entrance through St. Boniface, which will increase the cost.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When is it expected that the work comprised in that contract of the MacArthurs will be taken over?

Mr. GRAHAM. The chief engineer has reported that the line already constructed —it will hardly include the northern entrance into St. Boniface—will be in condition to take over in time for the handling of next year's crop, probably early in the autumn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How does the minister account for this extraordinary statement contained in the speech from the Throne:

> The eastern division is now ready for traffic from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was ready for traffic as I have outlined, and traffic could have been carried over that line for the entire season by the contractors had the Grand Trunk Pacific desired to make such an arrangement with them. It could be carried by the Canadian Northern bridge over the Red river, connecting with that Dundee branch and running through. The Grand Trunk Pacific, as I understand it, did not care to make that arrangement with the contractors, but traffic could have been carried as contractors do carry on transportation along many lines before they hand their work over as complete.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statement of the minister is very different from the statement in the speech from the Throne. The speech from the Throne does not say there is still $1,000,000 to be expended upon it, and that by using the Canadian Northern bridge some trains could be run over it had the Grand Trunk accepted the offer of the contractors. The speech from the Throne is much more direct:

> The eastern division is now open for traffic from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction.

Why is it that so absolutely a misleading statement—not to use any harsher term—was placed in the mouth of His Excellency by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend from Marquette would say that the prairie section was open for traffic, although it is being run under the construction company yet. But, it is open for traffic and running through to Wolf creek.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But this does not even fulfil that condition. I am not concerned with what my hon. friend from Marquette would say, but I am concerned with what His Excellency the Governor General has said, and in this connection the government made him say something that is absolutely untrue. I am inclined to think that His Excellency would be perfectly justified in dismissing all his ministers.

Mr. GRAHAM. He would make a mistake.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think he would make any mistake. This section never was open for traffic, and could not have been open for traffic until the government took it over and leased it to the Grand Trunk Pacific. It never has been operated by the contractors; they offered to operate it, but the offer has not been accepted.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was open for traffic, and the traffic did not come.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Minister of Railways considers that a fair interpreta-

tion of the language of His Excellency, I will not argue any more with him. He knows perfectly well that the people of the country who read the speech from the Throne understood that the line was open for traffic in the ordinary course, and in that sense such a statement was absolutely and wholly mendacious and the Governor General has been led into a very unfortunate position. No fault is to be attributed to His Excellency, because I suppose he is obliged to place confidence in the representations of his ministers in matters of this kind. But why the trouble was taken to put these words into the mouth of His Excellency, when it must have been perfectly apparent that the truth would be discovered within a very short time, is more than I can understand.

Mr. LENNOX. When this matter comes up again, I want the minister to give us all the items of expenditure that are not included within these contracts, so that we can add the amount of the contracts together, and these other items, and see what the expenditure, so far as estimated to the present, has been on that 1,800 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I can give my hon. friend to-night all the information that he can imagine, and his imagination has been working pretty hard. I beg to give him the following information on that point:

Statement of expenditure from September, 1904, to 31st December, 1909.

Summary.

Instruments	$ 3,200 75
Supplies	425,267 58
Engineering	1,968,704 11
Camp outfit	58,749 54
General expenses	559,038 50
Freight and express	44,349 46
Medical service	3,993 77
Right of way and station grounds	1,381,433 52
Furniture	14,901 38
Grading	39,106,040 53
Clearing	856,339 87
Grubbing	302,888 21
Bridges, trestles and culverts	9,905,511 31
Ties	1,741,804 45
Rails	6,121,991 57
Crossings, cattle-guards and signs	33,042 91
Track-laying and surfacing	537,849 48
Frogs and switches	137,733 08
Interlocking or signal apparatus	19,558 89
Fencing right of way	242,432 86
Telegraph line	103,781 15
Legal expenses	2,312 92
Ballast and ballasting	642,677 04
Water stations	82,291 87
Station buildings and fixtures	53,394 48
Yards and terminals	9,292 82
Tunnels	256,639 00
Track fastenings	942,055 43
Shops, roundhouses and turntables	334,911 47
Shop, machinery and tools	588 98
Miscellaneous structures	3,972 68
	$65,896,749 61
Less contract reserve	3,247,295 63

Construction	$62,649,453 98
Location	2,947,317 36
Transport	1,028,269 22
Headquarters	1,265,657 03
Total	$67,890,697 59

Mr. LENNOX. It is well to have that statement, but that is not exactly what I wanted to know. I want to get from the minister a statement of the estimated expenditure outside of the contracts, necessary to complete the whole work; for instance, the cost of the Quebec bridge, and the terminals, and everything not embraced in the contracts.

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave the estimated cost of the Quebec bridge several weeks ago. Outside of the information I have given here. I am not clear as to what my hon. friend wants. The contracts include everything along the line except the steel rails and fastenings, and the steel bridges, and I have given all these.

Mr. LENNOX. As far as they have been constructed; but the government has an estimate of what the various items not embraced in the contracts will come to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is wanted, in short, seems to be this. We have a statement of what the contractors have already received, and an estimate of what they will receive. Outside of that, some other things are necessary to complete the road, and to put it in running order before it can be handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. What is their estimated cost, outside of the contracts?

Mr. GRAHAM. It may be a little difficult to get that information very promptly. For instance, take the Quebec terminals—my hon. friend knows that it is not decided yet where they are to be, and it is impossible to say what they will cost.

Mr. LENNOX. Give us as much as you can, and tell us what you are leaving out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, it would be idle to ask for an estimate of what is not definitely decided on; but, apart from that, the minister might give us an estimate, mentioning what is not included, but what must necessarily be provided. I would like the minister also to let us know when we meet again whether there is any change in his estimate of the cost of the Western Division.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Prairie Section is practically finished at the figures already given, and there is no change in the estimate of the cost of the Mountain Section given to me by Mr. Schreiber.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. Some Bills on the Order Paper, and then Supply, Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 14, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

GREY:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 31st March, 1910, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867. The Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 14th March, 1910.

Mr. FIELDING moved that His Excellency's message, together with the estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion was agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 154) respecting the Northern Empire Railway Company.—Mr. W. H. White.

Bill (No. 162) for the relief of Alexander Augustus Barthelmes.—Mr. W. M. Martin.

Bill (No. 160) respecting the Brockville, Ottawa and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. W. M. Martin.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIAL.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire of the Prime Minister whether or not any investigation has been made into the matter I mentioned on Friday. I brought to the attention of the right hon. gentleman, and the chairman of the committee a certain error in the report of the committee, and should like to know what has been done with the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I found that Mr. Geoffrion had left for Montreal on Friday immediately after my hon. friend brought the matter up. I expect him during the day, and will call his attention to it.

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire whether there have been any negotiations with the members of the tariff commission of the United States, and whether the government proposes to make any statement regarding the position of the matter.

Mr. FIELDING. There have been negotiations between members of the cabinet, and the gentlemen delegated to come to Ottawa by the President of the United States, but these negotiations were necessarily confidential, and I do not think they have advanced to a point which would justify my making any statement. No doubt at a later stage the importance of this matter will demand some explanation.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it we have explanations given to the world from Washington, and published in the press?

Mr. FIELDING. Both in the United States and Canada we have a very enterprising and sometimes very imaginative press.

SAULT STE. MARIE DRY-DOCKS.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether the application for a subsidy to the Sault Ste. Marie dry-docks has been passed upon yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not.

ADJUDICATION OF CLAIMS TREATY.

Mr. BOYCE. Can the right hon. gentleman give the information I asked the other day with regard to the ratification of a convention, or treaty with the United States?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has not been ratified.

TRADE REPRESENTATIVES TO GERMANY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the government appointed trade representatives to Germany, or does it intend doing so?

Mr. FIELDING. No recent appointments have been made. My recollection is that we have no representative in Germany. The matter will no doubt engage the attention of the Minister of Trade and

Commerce, under whose department that branch of the service falls.

MILITARY REVIEW AT PETAWAWA.

Mr. GERALD V. WHITE. On the 24th February last I brought to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the Ottawa 'Journal' of February 23, regarding the military review at Petawawa under Sir John French. I am glad to see the Minister of Militia in his seat to-day, and I would like to ask him if that report is correct. I would also like to draw attention to an article in the 'Journal' of March 8, as follows:

London, March 8.

In the House of Commons to-day it was announced that Sir John French would go to Canada this summer to advise on organization of militia forces.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware that there is to be any such assemblage of troops at Petawawa during the summer, but there will probably be a larger number there than last year. So far as the visit of Sir John French is concerned, I understand that it is expected he will visit Canada unofficially, or semi-officially, during the present year with the view of seeing as much as he can of the Canadian militia. And I may add that every facility will be afforded him to meet as many officers, and see as much of the militia in camp, and otherwise, as possible, as we are extremely glad to have such a distinguished officer visit this country: and I think it will be in the interests of the militia that we should give him every possible opportunity to see our Candian militia.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NELSON RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company.—Mr. Rutan.

Mr. BRADBURY. This Bill was under discussion on Friday night, and there seemed to be an understanding that it will be allowed to stand over until other Bills of a similar nature would come before the House. This Bill affects two of the great water-powers at the head of Lake Winnipeg, and is very similar to the International Waterways Bill, and the Rainy River Railway Bill, and I requested that it should stand until the government formulated some policy regarding the disposition of these great water-powers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. colleague the Minister of Railways is obliged to be absent to-day, but he desired me to say to the committee that he saw no reason whatever why this Bill should stand over. He called my attention to the fact that it gives no authority whtever to expropriate any water-powers, and gives no control whatever over any water-powers, but simply provides that the moneys of the company may be invested in the acquisition of water-powers, and the development of electricity for the purpose of operating their railways. Section 13, which deals with that subject provides:

In connection with the business and purposes of the undertaking, and subject to provisions of section 247 of the Railway Act, the company may acquire water-powers but not by expropriation.

This is just the same as if the Governor in Council were to incorporate a company by letters patent giving power to develop but no authority whatever to expropriate. There are no compulsory rights, and the only effect of the provision is that it authorizes the company to invest its funds in the development of electric power. The committee will also remember that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has already stated the policy of the government regarding water-powers, so that if that be at all material to the consideration of this Bill we have such a declaration. So, if the question were at all material to the consideration of this Bill, we have that declaration of policy on the part of the Minister of the Interior. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) is entirely mistaken as to there being any understanding that the Bill is to stand over. Had there been such an understanding, I am sure the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) would have informed me of it, and asked me to inform the committee. On the contrary, he said that he saw no reason why the Bill, as amended and reported by the committee, and now recommended by the committee, should not pass.

Mr. BRADBURY. During the discussion of this Bill a few evenings ago—and, I think, of another Bill—the minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) announced that the government had a well-defined policy with regard to these water-powers. As I understood the Minister of the Interior, he said that the regulations of the government applied to these two water-powers at the head of Lake Winnipeg. But, on looking over the regulations, I find that they apply to water-powers within any of the provinces. But the water-powers affected under these Bills are outside of any province. I take it, therefore, there is no regulation covering them. That is one reason the government should hold this Bill until the regulations are extended so as to cover these water-powers also. I think that on Friday evening last, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) said very clearly that this Bill was to stand over. I may have misunderstood his attitude. I do not wish to block the Bill or block any Bill; but, this railway

charter, as it is called, seeks powers to start from some point at the mouth of the Saskatchewan or at the mouth of the Nelson rivers—points fully 100 miles apart—making it evident that the scheme is immature. The committee never was in possession of proper information to warrant them in passing the Bill, according to my opinion. I took very strong ground in committee on that point. I think it would be a mistake, in advance of the formulation of some policy by the government, to regulate these water-powers outside of the province, to proceed with this Bill. If the regulations gave the Minister of the Interior authority to deal with water-powers outside of the provinces as they do with water-powers inside the provinces, that might remove some of the objections. But I submit that the regulations as they exist do not give that power, and therefore the Bill ought to stand over.

Mr. LENNOX. I have spoken two or three times on this question, and I propose now to let this matter rest with the government. They can take the responsibility of their action. This Bill was up on Tuesday evening, and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) decided to let it stand over until we had a discussion of another Bill which is coming up in the Railway Committee. It stood until last Friday evening. On that occasion, I called the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that the other Bill had not been reached in the meantime, and suggested that it would be advisable not to spend the hour for private Bills in a useless discussion of this Bill. The minister acquiesced in that, and was prepared to let it stand over. Unfortunately, the promoter of the Bill thought it necessary to discuss the Bill and other gentlemen joined in the discussion, and so the hour was wasted. It was distinctly understood that we should delay this Bill until the other Bill to which I have referred had been taken up in the Railway Committee; and I think it was pretty clearly understood that the Minister of Railways or the government would announce some definite general policy as regards dealing with these waterways. It comes up now as a comparatively new question. Until recently, we have had no problems of this kind. But, so anxious are parties who wish to enrich themselves by securing these rights, that, even after Bills were advertised and introduced, attempts were made to amend them so as to give the promoters water-power rights. What I am endeavouring to impress upon the Minister of Railways is that the country should have some return from these franchises belonging to the country, that we should not give them to private parties and allow those parties to have the whole proceeds—preferably, that the province should have the profits, but that either the province or the Dominion should have some revenue from these great water-powers. I have no desire whatever to delay this Bill. I believe it will go through. But I have every desire that the progress of the Bill should be stayed until other Bills of the same nature are brought into the House, and that then we shall have a clear, definite policy from those who are responsible for the management of our national resources. It is a peculiar thing: first I succeed in staying the Rainy River Bill during the absence of the Minister of Railways from the committee. Until this moment, we have had no intimation that the Minister of Railways was disposed to let the present Bill go through until the other Bill to which I have referred was reached. Until this moment, on the contrary, we had as clear an intimation as possible that the minister would acquiesce in the suggestion of delay until the other Bill came before the House, so that we could have one policy applying to all such Bills. That seems a reasonable proposition. Thus, we have this extraordinary position—I think an undesirable position—that the first day the Minister of Railways is absent this matter is to be shoved through. However, it is for the government to say whether they want to have this gone on with or not. If they have decided to push it through, let them do so, so far as I am concerned. I have done what I could to serve the public interest in this matter by having the government come down and declare some policy on which they proposed to protect the public interest in this very important matter. For these waterways are more valuable than coal. This is the propelling power of the future; it is the manufacturing power of the future; and, if the government are prepared to give to these franchises without investigating them and allow railway companies—so-called railway companies—under the guise of building a railway to develop these water-powers, and dispose of the surplus energy, well and good; for the present let it be so. But I venture to think that thoughtful people will not regard it as wise in the public interest. There is no use in us on this side trying to compel the government to do anything. Speaking for myself, I have done all that I could to urge the government to adopt a wise, general policy in regard to this matter.

Mr. CARVELL. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) take this high stand, because in the absence of an express declaration to this effect, some hon. members on this side might have had the impression that there was some attempt to delay the progress of this Bill. I take it for granted that hon. members who have discussed this matter on three different occasions have been sincere in

their expressions concerning it. They have been discussing it as though the proposition in this Bill was to give this company the right to go on and expropriate water-powers and use them at their own sweet will. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) knows better than that. He has been following this measure through the Railway Committee. So does my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) who has taken an active part in this discussion in the committee. He must know that as this Bill is amended, and as it is now before this committee, all that this company has is the right to legally hold the water-powers if they can get them. They have not the right of expropriation; they have not the right to acquire these water-powers otherwise than as I might acquire them if I went up there to do business. We are simply creating an entity having the legal right to own those properties, or those rights, if they can get them. It seems to me that is as far removed from the position which my hon. friend has been arguing as the North Pole is from the South Pole. All we are doing, if we allow this Bill to pass, is to create an entity which has a right to hold these water-powers if they can succeed in getting them from the proper authority, whether it be from the federal government or from the province of Manitoba after this land comes into the possession of the province of Manitoba. I do not know whether the time is far distant or near at hand when that will take place. We do know, however, that there will have to be a wonderful change in policy on the part of both governments ever since confederation if, when this territory becomes the property of Manitoba, the Manitoba government will have the right to deal with it. But even if they should get that right, and if there should be that change in policy, then all this company will have a right to do is to go to the province of Manitoba and make a satisfactory trade if they can do so; if they cannot, they get nothing. If these rights do not go to the province of Manitoba, then if they have a right to come to this government and make a satisfactory trade if they can. They are simply placed in the position I would be in, or the hon. member for Simcoe would be in, or anybody else who went out there and bought these properties, if they could do so. Now, it is passing strange that my hon. friends so strongly oppose the passage of this Bill and want a declaration of policy on the part of the government as to what they are going to do in the future when applications are made to them to lease or purchase water-powers, when only two weeks ago these hon. gentlemen had no compunctions of conscience in voting for Bill (No. 118) in which section 12 gave the company the right to operate these water-powers in the province of British Columbia. And perhaps they will say why such a change of sentiment has come over them, evidently, during the last week.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a growing time.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, it is a growing time on the part of the hon. member for Simcoe, I think, and of some other hon. gentlemen who have grown so rapidly in their ideas of the preservation of natural resources since Bill (No. 118) passed the House. However, that is a matter for them to answer. But, it seems to me this Bill has been discussed pretty thoroughly, and my hon. friends opposite have kept as far away from the real principle of the Bill as they could. I hope that possibly this reminder may awaken them to the true import of the Bill, and that they will devote their attention for a few moments to the Bill itself, and not to some fanciful grievance which they have conjured up in their own mind. I am satisfied if they take that advice they will not see anything wrong in allowing this Bill to pass, and let us proceed to other Bills of as much importance as this.

Mr. J. HAGGART. We understand the nature of the Bill before the House just as well as the hon. gentleman. He says that the power of expropriation is taken away. What good would the power of expropriation in a Bill be against the Crown? What right would you have to expropriate against the Crown even if the power of expropriation was in it?

Mr. CARVELL. I am assuming now that if it goes into the province of Manitoba, then we would have the right to expropriate.

Mr. J. HAGGART. That would have to be granted in the province just the same. Any way, it is in the possession of the Crown, and of the Dominion at the present moment, and no power of expropriation would be worth one cent to the parties that would have it. That is not the contention of my hon. friend. We have no objections to the Bill, we know it only gives to a corporate power the same power as an individual has at present. All we ask is that there should be some declaration of policy by the government in reference to these waterways, the same as there is in every civilized country in the world. In the United States they have regulations by which companies and individuals can obtain possession of them, and, as he says, the same power of expropriation is included in the British Columbia Bill. In British Columbia the sale of water-powers is regulated by statute. All we ask from the Minister of Railways is a simple statement that any individual or corporation may ap-

proach the government on equal terms for the purpose of possessing the water-powers, and that, above all things, something which is the heritage of the people of this country shall be retained for them, or shall not be parted with without an equivalent. Now there is no use talking about opposition to the Bill on this side of the House. We are not opposing the Bill. We simply say, if you want your Bill, let the government make a pronouncement in reference to it. It seeks to obtain property which is valuable to the public, in regard to which property there are no regulations nor statutory obligations at all. All we ask from the government is that they will at least make regulations in reference to these waterways so that a moiety of them shall be retained for the people who own them.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman says that members of the opposition are not opposing the Bill. I would like to know what different course they would find it possible to take if they were opposing the Bill. They have delayed its progress now for at least three times. They say they are not opposing the Bill, but apparently I think they are using it as a cudgel to force the government to lay down a policy as to what they shall do in the way of giving water-powers to persons who may apply therefor. But I would like to know what consistency there is in taking the stand they do in refusing to let this Bill go through until the government declares its policy as to the granting of water-powers, when no member of the House, who has spoken in opposition to this Bill has pointed out a single section or a single word in the Bill that alienates to any extent one single drop of water or the rignt to use water. Until they can do that, I do not see any consistency in their argument.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the hon. member's argument is very strong, especially in view of Canadian history. We know how individuals have become possessed of many of these waterways, even from the Crown, without the Crown realizing anything in return. Now if we had a declaration from the government as to what their policy was, if we had regulations by which the public would own what was got out of these water-powers, and upon what terms they would be alienated, then we would understand it, and we could provide against any dangers happening in future, similar to those that have happened in the past.

Now, the hon. gentleman who spoke previously (Mr. Carvell) said they cannot get control of this by expropriation. In what other way could they get control? There are many other ways, but one way is that they may get control of it secretly from the government at a low rental, not to the advantage, but to the disadvantage, of the country. The hon. gentleman made reference to the incorporation of the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company. He says that the members of the opposition are not consistent because they were willing to allow that Bill to pass. The hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Haggart) gave, to my mind, a very satisfactory answer to that, and that was that the right to get control of water-powers must be according to the law of the province and, therefore, it is plain and open to the world, but to say that there is any comparison between that Bill of the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company and this Bill, is to say what is not justified by the facts. What is the situation there? There are three corporations, they want to have a highway between these corporations, which highway must pass over the water or under it by tunnel, and they have joined, not for the purpose of private speculation by any means, but for the purpose of accommodating these three great cities. It is true that it was put in the name of private individuals, but these individuals were satisfactory to these corporations and were acting for them, and they do not desire to go into this undertaking for the purpose of making personal gain for themselves but for the purpose of accommodating these cities. Therefore, the committee went farther than they would have done had they been dealing with private individuals in giving the rights which they did under this Bill. There is no reasonable comparison between the two Bills. But in reference to this other Bill, I have it before me here, and it says that they are to acquire these rights under section 247 of the Railway Act, but they are not to have the right to expropriate. Of course, my hon. friend from Lanark says what is strictly correct, that they cannot expropriate what belongs to the Crown, but they can get it sometimes privately from the Crown for very much less than it is worth. If the government in future would lease all these water-powers at a reasonable rental, it would be a very good policy in the interest of the country. We should lease them and get a return for the country. If it is the federal government that own them, the return would come to the federal treasury; if it is the provincial government, the provincial government would get the rent. That would be a wise policy, and I have wondered for years and years why the government never gave the House any inkling of its desire to conserve what belongs to the people so that they could get the benefit of such water-powers rather than that they should be handed over to enrich private corporations. We want to know what the government intend to do with these water-powers, because almost every week during

the session we have some Bill that seeks to acquire some rights of this kind. We have to view these Bills in such a way as we deem to be proper, because the government have not yet laid down any wise policy or rule to guide us in dealing with these questions. It would save the time of the committee and of this House if they did so, it would as well preserve to the country a beneficial interest in what belongs to the country, and it would put a stop to the practice of giving these water-powers to private individuals without a fair and reasonable return to the country.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), I think, entirely misunderstands the true purport of this Bill. He undertakes to say that there is no inconsistency between the stand which hon. gentlemen opposite took upon the British Columbia Bill and that which they now take upon the present Bill. Why, Sir, possibly he has not read it, but section 12 of the British Columbia Bill takes the power out of the hands of British Columbia and gives to this company the right to expropriate powers anywhere, whether they belong to private individuals, corporations or to the province.

Mr. SPROULE. By British Columbia's own consent.

Mr. CARVELL. Not by British Columbia's own consent at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. Section 12 is as follows:

For the purposes of its undertaking, and subject to the provisions of section 247 of the Railway Act, the company may acquire and develop water, electric or other power.

And so on. Now, my hon. friend from East Grey ought to know that it was settled that under a decision of the Privy Council in a British Columbia case a corporation created by this parliament with expropriation powers has the absolute right to expropriate from private individuals or from the province.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no remembrance of any such decision.

Mr. CARVELL. Therefore, this Bill which my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen allowed to go through so easily gives to this corporation the right to expropriate any water-power in British Columbia no matter to whom it belongs. Then, these hon. gentlemen come and say, as the hon. member for East Grey says, that is not a parallel case with this one. I agree it is not a parallel case; it is a case the iniquity of which is a hundredfold greater than that of the Bill under discussion.

Mr. BRADBURY. Admitting that to be so, would the hon. gentleman say that it is right for the House to pass this Bill?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not know of my hon. friend opposing it. I do not know of any hon. member who opposed it, and I did not hear any opposition to it when it was brought up for the third reading.

Mr. EMMERSON. I opposed it.

Mr. CARVELL. Did you?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the Burrard Inlet Bill gave that corporation power to expropriate water-powers in any portion of British Columbia. Did he read clause 8 of the Bill, which shows the distance that the corporation intends to go and which extends only a few miles?

Mr. CARVELL. That is only drawing a herring across the path. It gives this company the right to expropriate water-powers in British Columbia within the purview of its extent. It does not make any difference whether these powers belonged to private individuals or not; the company has the right to expropriate them and use them for the purposes of its undertaking. There are no such rights granted by this Bill at all. No expropriation rights are granted or claimed. The only right to be created is the power to purchase and hold these properties if they can do so. When I am discussing this subject it may not be out of place to say that in my opinion we are spending a lot of time discussing what is only a fetish of the province of Ontario regarding these water-powers. You would think that there never was a water-power on earth until four or five years ago when some gentleman in Toronto discovered such things. There have been water-powers developed all over Canada and all over the world for the last three or four hundred years. Almost every day when anything comes up in this House in which water-powers are mentioned some hon. gentleman gets up and says: You are taking away the inalienable rights of the people; you are taking away the water-powers which belong to the people. I would like to know what earthly good these water-powers are until they are developed. The water has been running away for thousands of years and you never can bring it back, and unless these water-powers are developed the water will continue to run away for thousands of years. I do not agree with the hon. member for East Grey when he says that in this case there should be a great big rental demanded, that these people should pay a large rental before they get these privileges. Take the case of the city of Ottawa. Under the terms of this Bill when the company have acquired water rights they may create electricity, but the rates to be charged for this electricity are to be governed by the Railway Commission. If this company are compelled to pay—I

do not care whether it is $1,000, or $100,000, or $1,000,000 to the federal or local government, whichever may have the right to lease the power to the company—the Railway Commission, in establishing the rates to be charged to the public, must take that into consideration, and the rates will be just that much higher or just as much higher as the rental which the company is compelled to pay bears to the whole amount of the work done. Take the city of Ottawa. The electric company in Ottawa probably pays no rental, I presume it acquired its rights in the old days before the attempt was made to tie up everything in Ontario. Suppose the electric company in Ottawa were compelled to pay $500,000 to the Ontario government, does my hon. friend suppose that the citizens of Ottawa would get electricity at 8 cents a kilowatt hour, the cheapest rate in Canada? People get cheap electricity simply because the company get cheap development. If the company had to pay a high rate the people of Ottawa would pay the scorching, and the price instead of being 8 cents a kilowatt hour would be 9 cents, 10 cents, 11 cents or 12 cents, as it is in many other places. We have heard so much about this doctrine of giving away no rights to water-powers that it is time some one spoke on the other side and showed that this is only a fetish, something not sound in principle and which will not work out properly when put in practice, which will increase rather than diminish the cost of these public utilities to the users. After all, the main object of these public utilities is to give to the consuming public as low rates as possible and not to increase the exchequer of some municipality.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The argument of my hon. friend would lead to some curious conclusions. The coal in the mines of Nova Scotia is of no value until it is dug out; the timber in the forests of Ontario is of no special value until it is cut—

Mr. CARVELL. Can you replace the coal in the mines of Nova Scotia, or the timber in Ontario, as you can water-power?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You can replace the timber by a proper system of cutting and planting.

Mr. CARVELL. In fifty years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But surely my hon. friend would not contend that on this account they should be given away without rental or royalty?

Mr. CARVELL. There is no comparison whatever.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. His argument would lead logically to that conclusion, because he would say that if you gave away the coal without royalty and the timber without rental, people would get them so much the cheaper and in that way the general interests of the country would be well conserved. I do not believe you can carry the argument to that extent in that way. The great difficulty about these water-powers is that there is a tendency in the United States, there may be a tendency in Canada to get them all under one control in different parts of the country; eventually they might come in this country under one gigantic control, and I do not think that would be desirable. The water-power, it is true, is of no use until it is utilized, but the conditions under which it should be utilized must require consideration on the part of the government.

As to the hon. gentleman's remarks in respect to the expropriation of property owned by a provincial government, I looked at the decision which he brought to my attention last year, and I also examined some 18 or 20 other cases in the Privy Council, in the Supreme Court of Canada, and in the Court of Appeal of the province of Ontario, and I would not be quite prepared to accept the conclusion at which he arrived. In the Privy Council Sir Arthur Wilson based his conclusion on two grounds, in the first place on the ground that the property in question was part of the foreshore, and in the second place on the ground to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. If that argument were to be accepted, it would necessarily follow that a provincial government would have the right to expropriate the property of the Crown held in right of Canada; I see no distinction, because every one knows that in the case of the Liquidators of the Maritime Bank of New Brunswick against the Crown, it was held that the executive and the legislature of a province are as supreme and sovereign within the ambit of their jurisdiction as the executive of Canada, and the parliament of Canada are supreme within the ambit of their jurisdicion. As a matter of fact in the case of the Privy Council neither in the argument nor in the judgment, was there cited, a section of the British North America Act, which has a very important bearing on the case. I do not observe that it has been cited anywhere except possibly some years ago in one Ontario case. That is section 117, which provides that:

> The several provinces shall retain all their respective public property not otherwise disposed of in this Act, subject to the right of Canada to assume any lands or public property required for fortifications or for the defence of the country.

There is one case expressly provided in which Canada can take the property of a

province, and I would be inclined to think that a very strong argument would be made from that for the right of the province to hold its property absolutely against any invasion by he government or parliament of Canada, except in the particular case so specified. I appreciate the hon. gentleman's courtesy in handing me the decision, and I looked into the question at a good deal of length because it was very interesting; but I cannot come to any conclusion other than this in respect to the Privy Council case, namely, that it will hold precisely the same position in Privy Council jurisprudence that the decision upon the Canada Temperance Act, has held within the last 15 or 16 years; that is to say, in a case in every possible respect absolutely within the decision it might be followed, but I would have my doubts as to whether there might not be a good deal of hesitation in following it any further.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure if I could make a suggestion that would expedite the disposal of this Bill, the committee would be pleased in view of the time that has already been taken. I understand from the remarks of those hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken that they are not opposed to the Bill, but they think before it is passed there should be some declaration of policy upon the part of the government as to the disposition to be made of water-powers which are owned by the Dominion government. I may say for the information of the committee that the Conservation Commission have this matter under careful consideration, and they expect to submit very shortly a report to the government on the subject. I need not say that their report, while I could not say it will be adopted, will be given the most careful and favourable consideration possible. The committee may, I think, rely that the public interest will be fairly safeguarded and that we will endeavour to act in accordance with the recommendation of the Conservation Commission.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. A word with reference to clause 12 of the Burrard Inlet Bill, which was referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Carvell). Those members who voted for that clause did so in the public interest.

Mr. CARVELL. No doubt.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. These incorporators represented five or six municipalities which contained within their limits one half the population of the province of British Columbia and therefore, in giving to this company those powers we were giving the benefits of those powers to one half the people of British Columbia because those incorporators produced there a trust deed by which they acknowledged that they were procuring these rights as trustees for the benefit of one half the people of the province of British Columbia. They went further and said they were going to operate their works free of charge to the public, they agreed they would not charge the people using the works to cross the river. We contend for that in the interest of one half of the people of the province of British Columbia and therefore in the public interest.

Mr. NEELY. Since the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) has given his reason why he supported in the Railway Committee the Burrard Inlet Bill which contained the same clause as this Bill which he is now opposing, I have to say with regard to the Burrard Inlet Bill that while it is true the municipality in the vicinity of the town where the bridge and tunnel were to be erected did support the Bill, as being a benefit to the people of British Columbia, the Bill was in fact promoted by private individuals. The company was incorporated for $3,000,000, and the only information the committee had was that the municipalities were prepared to subscribe about $300,000 or 10 per cent of the stock; the balance, so far as we know, being held by private individuals. On the first day the Bill was considered in committee it is true that the company agreed that no tolls should be charged over the traffic part of the bridge, but they substantially withdrew that guarantee and the Bill as it passed the House provides for the charging of tolls on that traffic bridge. When my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) gives that as a reason for supporting the Burrard Inlet Bill he consequently cannot reconcile his assent in that case with his opposition in this case. The whole trouble seems to be that certain hon. gentlemen opposite want the government, in connection with this Bill, to pronounce a policy on the disposition of water-powers. Since this Bill passed the Railway Committee, this is the third time it has been before the Committee of the Whole, and I think, Sir, that some strong objection should be shown against the Bill before it is held up in this way. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they are not trying to obstruct the Bill, but if they are not what in the name of common sense are they doing? When the Bill was first before the committee the member for South Simcoe asked for the policy of the government, and the Minister of the Interior answered him by stating that his department had a stated policy as to the disposition of water-powers in the prairie provinces and in the north-west territories.

Mr. BRADBURY. The minister was mis taken.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was that policy?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To rent the water-powers.

Mr. NEELY. I have the words of the Minister of the Interior before me, and I read them from 'Hansard,' page 4949:

Mr. OLIVER. The demand has been made that this government should come forward with a policy with regard to water-powers. In so far as the waters of Canada are under the jurisdiction of this government, the government has a very definite policy in regard to water-powers, which has been in force for some time. With regard to the water which exists in the three prairie provinces, by the terms of the Irrigation Act, this water was vested absolutely in the control of the Dominion government. Under the terms of the Dominion Lands Act, passed in 1908, provision was made for the development of power upon these waters. Under the terms of the Act regulations have been passed and have been in force now for something like a year, providing the method by which rights in water-powers are acquired, making provision that a rental may be charged for the use of the water by the power company, which rental may be determined from time to time—that is at periods of 21 years—and making provision for the regulation of the charges which should be made to the consumers of the power generated from the water, such charges to be under the control of the Railway Commission, and to be subject to adjustment at periods of seven years.

And further he said:

Mr. OLIVER. I should have mentioned that I think the Irrigation Act applies to the Northwest Territories as well as to the three prairie provinces, but at any rate the Dominion Lands Act does and under the authority of that Act regulations have been made which would certainly apply to the water-powers that would be affected by either of these Bills. There is no question as to the policy of the government, or as to the administration of the government in regard to water-powers, which are unquestionably under the jurisdiction of the Dominion government. The present Bill applies to the Northwest Territories outside the limits of any province and therefore no question of provincial rights is involved.

That was the statement made to the committee by the Minister of the Interior, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite seem to want something further in the nature of a policy. Now, if the regulations already passed by the Minister of the Interior under the Dominion Lands Act and under the Irrigation Act are not satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite, it seems very strange that this particular private Bill must stand over until the whole question has been reconsidered and new regulations put in force. The objection of hon. gentlemen opposite is absolutely absurd. Are not the people of Canada quite satisfied that the water-powers under the control of the Dominion government are just as satisfactorily administered as those which are under the control of certain provincial governments? I think they are. I shall not discuss the situation in Ontario, but I do not know that the people of Ontario are getting very much cheaper power as a result of the Hydro-Electric Commission than are the people in the vicinity of water-powers controlled by the Dominion government. It is sufficient for me to call the attention of the House to the fact that the water-powers which are under the Dominion government are operated, leased and handed over to those who develop these powers under regulations framed by the minister by virtue of the authority given him in the Dominion Lands Act and in the Irrigation Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to make a little correction. I am reported as having said that the water-power regulations apply to the territory affected by this railway charter, which is the territory now known as the Northwest Territories, and is not within the three prairie provinces. If I am correctly reported, I was in error in making that statement. The regulations only apply directly to the three prairie provinces, but so far as any declaration of policy by the government can be made, these regulations are a declaration of the policy of the government, and the fact that they do not apply to the Northwest Territories is only an inadvertence and is not intentional. The policy of the government is set out in the regulations, and will be made to apply to all waters under the jurisdiction of the Dominion government.

Mr. EMMERSON. What is the charge per horse-power?

Mr. OLIVER. That will be fixed in the license and will vary according to circumstances. Where the cost of development is great in proportion to the amount of power, it would not be sound public policy to charge a heavy rental; but where the quantity of horse-power is large, and the cost of development comparatively low, it would be only right that the general public should receive some benefit. The policy is to provide for a rental charge which is to be adjusted every 21 years and the charge is to be at the discretion of the Governor in Council. The charge per horse-power furnished by those who have developed it, will be subject to adjustment by the Railway Commission in periods of seven years. It would not be proper to make a fixed charge for the power to be used which would apply under all circumstances and in all cases.

Mr. SPROULE. What would be the action of the government in the event of a canal company, such as the company in

the present Bill getting an Act of incorporation, and then, under the powers of that Act, desiring to take possession of water-powers—what would be the policy of the government with regard to these water-powers? Would the corporation have the right to take them under terms different from what the government would fix in the case of a private company?

Mr. OLIVER. The duty of answering that question does not devolve upon me, but I would say most certainly that one company would be exactly in the same position as any other company or as a private individual. If a company wanted to secure water-powers belonging to this Dominion, they would have to get it under the policy of this government, which is expressed in the regulations already made and applicable to the three prairie provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. In these charters we give the right to take possession of water-powers in provinces where the land does not belong to the federal authority. Why should not the government go a step further and say it was their intention not to give such rights in charters but refer these companies to the provinces? We would then have a guarantee that no injustice would be done any province.

Mr. OLIVER. Do I understand my hon. friend's suggestion to apply to the prairie provinces?

Mr. SPROULE. Any province.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a difference between the position in the prairie provinces and that in the other provinces. Jurisdiction with regard to the land and the water which covers the land in the prairie provinces rests in the Dominion government, but in the other provinces it is vested in the provincial governments, so that the responsibility, which rests distinctly upon the Dominion government in respect of the three prairie provinces, does not rest upon that government at all in the other provinces. As regards the water-powers in the other provinces, the question whether we have any jurisdiction at all, is one I cannot answer. I am only speaking of the policy of the Dominion government as regards lands and waters unquestionably under its jurisdiction. We have declared our policy in that regard most unmistakably.

Mr. SPROULE. We had a Bill before us a short time ago for a canal, and it was contended that the federal power was the only one which could deal with a canal. If the company took possession of valuable water-powers belonging to a province for the purpose of running a canal, they would take them under the rights we gave them as a canal company and without regard to provincial interests, notwithstanding the land was the property of a province. The only way they would be checked would be by the refusal of the federal government to grant corporate powers to any company which would enable them to take what belonged to a province.

Mr. CONMEE. This discussion has taken a somewhat wide range. I have been listening for some time to the criticisms on the Bill and the reference made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to a Canal Bill which, he supposed, has taken away from somebody the right to water-powers. Now, I submit, that no such Bill has been presented to the House. All that ever was presented to the House was that the water-power, in so far as it was developed by the canal company, might be used for the purpose of operating the canal, and the surplus sold under certain regulations. The hon. gentleman seems to think that would perhaps give the company the right to take a great water-power and utilize it and, according to the language we hear on this matter, alienate it from the people. I submit that no such Bill has been presented to this House since I have been here. What is the principle of this Bill? It simply empowers a corporation which, without the Bill, would not as a corporation have powers, to expend its money for the development of water-powers that can acquire it. It is said this Bill differs a good deal from others because it is dealing with water-powers in the western provinces, and the question of expropriation is not as vital to the company as it would be under different circumstances. I do not see that that makes any difference in the principle. Because these gentlemen may acquire water-powers, whether they get them by expropriation or by agreement, how is the public prejudiced? That would be something hon. gentlemen should address themselves to. What can the public get from the development of a water-power? The leader of the opposition has compared water-powers to coal or timber. I do not think the comparison holds, for the reason mentioned by the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell). Water-power is created by the flow of water past a given point. Once past, it is gone for ever so far as that portion of it is concerned. Coal can be exhausted, timber can be exhausted, but water-power can only be used as it presents itself. So, to discuss this question from the point of view of such a comparison is an error.

Mr. BOYCE. If you do not use coal and timber, they are still there as an asset.

Mr. CONMEE. You can conserve coal and timber, but you cannot conserve a water-power.

Mr. THOBURN. Why not?

Mr. CONMEE. Because it flows and is gone.

Mr. GOODEVE. May I ask this question? Does not the hon. member know that all these powers are alike in this—that if you give away a water-power, a coal mine or a timber tract, they are all equally gone so far as the public is concerned.

Mr. CONMEE. If you give a water-power to a private individual, there might be some logic in the hon. member's question. But who has ever proposed to do anything of that kind? It is true that, twenty years ago, legislation might have been passed to give private control over water-powers. But does any hon. member pretend to say that parliament under recent legislation loses control over these water-powers, because it gives a charter to a company to develop them? Does anybody pretend to say that parliament loses control over a railway because it gives a charter to a company to build a line? I have here an Act of the legislature of Ontario, passed in 1907. It empowers the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario to take any water-powers they please.

Mr. LENNOX. For the people.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) says 'for the people.' This is not the place to discuss that question. But it does not make any difference whether it is in the interest of the people. The principle is that the Ontario legislature acted upon the principle that it had the power to take water-powers from private corporations, whether incorporated by the Dominion or incorporated by the province, and they empower their commission to take any water-power within the boundaries of Ontario. I grant that, in their view, they believed it was for the benefit of the people. But who knows whether it is going to be for the benefit of the people or not? Why, they got behind a private company and gave it plenary powers of monopoly for thirty years over the cities of Port Arthur and Fort William. I have the contract in my possession.

Mr. BOYCE. What company?

Mr. CONMEE. The Kakabeka Power Company. They give them a monopoly for twenty years of power that will cost the consumer at least $30. But I am not discussing that; I do not want to be drawn into that discussion, but the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) opened the door when he said it was for the public interests. Perhaps it may turn out to be more in the public interest than I think it to be. But that is not the point. This parliament does not lose its control over the water-powers We stipulate, in this very Bill, that the rates shall be subject to the Railway Board of Canada to adjust from time to time. Will any hon. member tell me what the public can get from the development of a water-power that they do no get under this Bill? If any hon. member can point out how, if the government develops a water-power, it could do better for the public or give more advantageous terms than can be secured from a company by the Board of Railway Commissioners, he will have made an argument, he will have made a point, and I shall be very glad to hear it. But I deny altogeher that it is possible for any government to develop and operate and supply power more cheaply than a company can do it. I would be very glad indeed to support a policy of development of water-powers by the government if the government would carry out that policy. But does anybody believe that this government, or any other, will develop the water-powers of this country as the people require them? It has been said by a great authority that water-powers are nature's gifts to the people. So they are. And, by the regulations which you are now adopting, and by the principle of public control for the public benefit, you are conserving those powers so far as they can be conserved, for the benefit of the people. But it is not for the benefit of the people to lock up these water-powers as has been done in Ontario. The Hydro-Electric Commission has been six years in operation, and it has not developed one water-power. Is that in the interest of the public? But this is not the place to discuss that. They have made arrangements concerning water-powers, and, perhaps, from their point of view, they are doing good work. I am not here to criticise or find fault with that commission. But what I say is that a community living within reach of the commercial use of a water-power ought not to be denied the benefits of that development simply because of the theory of some gentlemen that it ought to be held. Held for what? For a private company? Hon. members opposite are upholding a Bill which will have that effect. I do not accuse members opposite of knowingly or purposely playing into the hands of a corporation, but they did it just the same. In the case of the canal Bill, they forced the company that asked for the Bill—practically forced them—to abandon the Kaministiquia route. Why? To maintain the monopoly of a private company that has a thirty years' grip on the two great cities at the head of the lakes. That is what you accomplished.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask a question.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, any question you like.

Mr. BOYCE. By what process was that company forced, as the hon. gentleman puts it, to adopt another route? Was it not his own choice?

Mr. CONMEE. No, it was not my own choice.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman's statement in the Railway Committee.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) was one who opposed—as did a large number of others, backed by a strong deputation and assisted by a bench of lawyers—a particular feature of the Bill. This was done on public grounds. My hon. friend from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) and no doubt my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) acted in perfect good faith. I do not think they understood what they were doing, and it was not my place to enlighten them. But what they did was to compel that company to withdraw from the Kaministiqua route.

Mr. BOYCE. Did the hon. member say that they were lawyers of the opposition company, the Kakabeka?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, Mr. Chrysler and others were there—

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Chrysler was representing, as the hon. member knows, the city of Fort William, appointed by the council of that city.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member is entirely mistaken.

Mr. LENNOX. May I interject a word—

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, I want any question you like to ask.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to ask a question, but to make a statement. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) mentioned my name. Perhaps he will allow me to tell him that I was not present at all.

Mr. CONMEE. I was evidently mistaken about that, and so I withdraw my assertion. But the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) was there on another occasion; I have a distinct recollection of that. I say that my hon. friend from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) is misinformed as to Mr. Chrysler being there for Fort William. Fort William was there because this company wanted the Bill to be amended, and the moment the Kaministiquia route was dropped, Fort William, Port Arthur, Mr. Chrysler and the whole bunch of them with the public interest at heart disappeared from the committee room and you heard no more about it.

Mr. BOYCE. If the hon. member will pardon me, I will make this statement. He well knows that that Bill has been referred to a committee, and the chairman of it purposes that all these persons interested, Port Arthur, Fort William, the Ontario government, and everybody else who wishes to be heard shall be heard before that committee. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that they have disappeared from the scene?

Mr. CONMEE. I will tell my hon. friend. He may hear from the Ontario government, he won't hear from the rest, because they are out of this trouble just now. They have the monopoly, and so far as I am concerned, I am willing to leave it with them.

Mr. BOYCE. There is no monopoly.

Mr. CONMEE. There has been a monopoly for 30 years. I have the document in my pocket, and perhaps I will put it on 'Hansard' before this session is over; anyway I will give it to my hon. friend. I submit that the attack upon this Bill is unwarranted. Hon. gentlemen are mistaken when they say that this is handing over to a private company public interests. Parliament does not lose its control, parliament can take this power out of the hands of this company at any time. Parliament can empower the Railway Commission to impose such conditions as will be in the public interest. The minister has stated that under the regulations parliament has the right to impose the condition of a payment to the public revenue for the use of the water; that is one of the conditions upon which it must obtain the power. It does'nt matter whether that power is in the three prairie provinces or within the territory of Ontario, the regulation applies to any power within Dominion jurisdiction. Now, there are cases even on international streams where waterpowers exist upon Crown lands that are absolutely within the control and under the ownership of the federal government. These powers exist there, and they are dealt with on the same basis and on the same principle as are laid down in these regulations. Now, if hon. gentlemen will come forward with a policy and show wherein they can better protect the public interest than it is now protected by these regulations and by this legislation which they are opposing, then they will have accomplished something, but until they do that it seems to me that their arguments are not very strong. Now Bill (No. 118), section 12, gives absolute control for the sale of the surplus power, the very principle that hon. gentlemen are opposing; and they did not oppose that Bill seriously in the Railway Committee, they did not oppose it in this House. Why? Is it because it bore on the back of it the name of one of their own members? Is it because it was put through

by a colleague of theirs? Is that the only reason they were silent when it was going through the House? I do not say so, but the attitude of hon. gentlemen leads to that suspicion. I do not think it is in the public interest to attack private legislation, I do not think it is in the public interest to say that there should be no more development, no more enterprise, no more utilization of one of nature's great resources; you must wait on the policy of the Chinese empire, they have conserved a great many natural resources. Well, we do not admire that. To say that we must wait until parliament gets ready, until some administration appears that will develop these water-powers before you can have any use of them, I do not think it sound policy. I think parliament should conserve the public interest so far as it is possible to do so, but beyond that I do not think we should go.

Mr. GOODEVE. Some hon. members have stated that the members from British Columbia are obstructing this Bill after having allowed a similar Bill (No. 118) to go through this House. Now, as one of the members from British Columbia I desire to take exception to that statement. In the first place, I think the members from British Columbia have taken but very little interest in the Bill now before the House. Only one or two of them have spoken on it, merely setting forth that their only reason for taking any part in the discussion was a desire to obtain the view of the government in regard to the conservation of these water-powers. They have made that clear; so I think it is very unfair in hon. members opposite to say that the members from British Columbia have been obstructing the Bill. They have made certain comparisons, and I would also like to compare the two Bills. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) said that Bill (No. 118) had been brought forward in the interest of monopolies. Let me tell that hon. gentleman that while it is true that a number of private individuals appeared in the Railway Committee as promoters of that Bill, they produced before the committee a deed of trusteeship showing that they were acting solely in the interests of the various municipalities interested. The fact was clearly brought out in the Railway Committee that the Bill was promoted by a trusteeship. There is another point of distinction. Bill (No. 118) was a very definite Bill in a well known district having a large population; it was between two close points only a mile or two apart, namely, for the construction of a bridge and a tunnel. That was their only power. So when it is contended that Bill (No. 118) gave similar powers to the Bill now before the committee, I want to point out that these powers are absolutely restricted by clause 8 of that Bill. When we read clause 8 in connection with clause 11, you will see that the powers are very restricted, they definitely point out that they can only develop power for the purposes of their undertaking. Now, for the purposes of their undertaking they acquire power to build a bridge and a tunnel between two definite and well known points, therefore, they only make use of this clause 11 in developing any power that they may have to use in connection with this specific undertaking. What is the case in the Bill before the House? We must also read clause 7 in connection with clause 13, and we find that instead of being narrow and definite powers, they are powers of a very broad nature. That is the strong objection taken by every one who spoke on this Bill before the Railway Committee. Clause 7 reads thus:

> The company may lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches, from a point on Lake Winnipeg, at or near its outlet into the Nelson river, or at or near the discharge of the Saskatchewan river into Lake Winnipeg, or from a place between the said points, to a point of junction with any railway to Hudson bay which may be located by the government of Canada.

Now there is no railway at the present time connecting with the Hudson bay, so you can see how broad that is. As a matter of fact it means that the company getting this charter practically has control of all the waterways in that great stretch of country from Lake Superior to Lake Winnipeg, draining this whole water shed. Furthermore, there is, in connection with these particular rivers, a large number of well known water-powers. One of the members stated that there were at least fifteen known water-powers in the territory referred to, and there is no doubt that there are many more powers that are unknown in a country which is as little known as this, and that is one of the reasons why, great reasons why we are pleading that before this Bill is passed the government should pronounce some definite policy in regard to this question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has made the statement that this Bill will give to this company the control of these water-powers. Would my hon. friend be good enough to point out the section of this Bill that he says will give this company control of these water-powers?

Mr. GOODEVE. Under clause 18 of the Bill they have the right to acquire and develop waterways in connection with their operations and contributory to this is clause 7. I would like to ask the minister, in answer to his question, would they not have a certain existing right that would

prevent future companies from applying to acquire these powers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Absolutely not.

Mr. FIELDING. Does this Bill give, or pretend to give, any water-powers whatever?

Mr. PUGSLEY. None whatever.

Mr. GOODEVE. It gives them the right to acquire water-powers—

Mr. FIELDING. Any man has that right.

Mr. GOODEVE.——in connection with their railway, and I venture to say that if this Bill once passes and we attempt to give one of these water-powers to any other person, immediately these men would step in under clause 7 and say: You are taking away waters that we require for the purpose of our undertaking.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They would have no right to say so.

Mr. GOODEVE. My experience has been in regard to these corporations that when they get a Bill containing a clause, such as clause 7, they will make a strenuous effort to exercise their supposed rights, and it was along that line that the British Columbia legislature proceeded to pass their Water Clauses Act. That brings me to another point in the argument. The company incorporated by the Burrard Inlet Bill will be subject to the control of the Water Clauses Act of the province of British Columbia whereby they would pay a proportionate amount depending upon the number of units of water they took.

Mr. CONMEE. Where is that to be found in the Burrard Inlet Bill?

Mr. GOODEVE. They would come under the Water Clauses Act of the province—and it is not necessary to put it in the Bill. That is exactly the point that we are contending for. We say that if the government would lay down a fixed policy whereby these water rights, which now are the property of the country, could be regulated, and whereby any one applying for them would be under one jurisdiction, we would have no objection to this Bill. I agree with the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) and some other members, and I think I agree with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals himself, in what they have said in regard to this aspect of the question. I want it distinctly understood that until such time as the government will develop these natural resources I am strongly in favour of their development by private parties, and I would be the last to make any objection to the development of these natural resources. We are not asking to prohibit their development but we would like that they should be properly conserved in the interest of the people as a whole.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not the field within which the Burrard Inlet Company are to operate, and where they are to get their water-power within the railway belt?

Mr. COWAN. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had the impression that the company would operate twenty miles on each side of the railway.

Mr. GOODEVE. I think it is outside of the railway belt.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think we have travelled a great distance from the point raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). As I understand his objection to this Bill it is that there should be provision made——

Mr. GOODEVE. I was merely answering a question put to me by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was the answer of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. GOODEVE. That it would not be within the railway belt.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The railway belt extends twenty miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. GOODEVE. I know, but it is not in that particular district. It terminates at the other end of Port Moody.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But these water-powers would be developed east of Port Moody.

Mr. GOODEVE. No, they would be west.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If these water-powers are within the railway belt, under a decision of the Exchequer Court, they would stand exactly in the same position as water-powers in the Northwest.

Mr. GOODEVE. I quite agree with the hon. minister, but they are not within the railway belt. I have no desire to obstruct the Bill, and I intend to confine my remarks to the comparison between the two Bills. I could go farther afield, and discuss the general proposition as was done by the hon. member for Rainy River, but I do not intend to do so.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) had resumed his seat, and then he was asked a question. That question was answered by another hon. member from British Columbia, and I assumed that my hon. friend had finished his remarks. I beg his pardon for even seemingly having interrupted him. We have travelled a long distance from the point that was raised. As I understand the point of the hon. member for

South Simcoe it is that he objects to this Bill on the ground that there is no provision made by the government to impose any charge upon the water-powers which may be utilized under the authority of the Bill. The answer given by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to that is very complete. I would join with my hon. friend if his objection was not met. Therefore, in view of the answer of the Minister of the Interior as regards the regulations now in force and enforced, his objection to this Bill falls absolutely to the ground.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member is not stating my position at all. I have no doubt he is inadvertently misstating it. My position is this: Regulations made by the department and which the department administer, from time to time, getting an order in council for them, is not such a broad, definite, specific, well known policy, as Canada should have as to so great an interest, but there should be some declaration by parliament, and parliament should be, to some extent, consulted upon the broad lines upon which this government shall administer this great asset, instead of the administration being provided for merely by regulations.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think my hon. friend has bettered his position in any way at all.

Mr. LENNOX. That may be, I am only putting it as well as I can.

Mr. EMMERSON. The answer has been made by the minister in that way, and it strikes me that the objection to this Bill must fall to the ground. Had the same objection been taken to the Burrard Inlet Bill I could have seen the force of it, because there we were doing something that we are not attempting to do by this Bill, as we are not giving any powers of expropriation. Under Bill (No. 118) relating to the Burrard Inlet Company we were giving powers to expropriate, and we were giving the company power to take the property of the people of British Columbia without making any recompense.

Mr. S. SHARPE. For the benefit of the municipalities.

Mr. EMMERSON. That contention with respect to the municipalities must fall entirely to the ground. It is not the property of the municipalities, but it is the property of the government and people of British Columbia. Bill (No. 118) is not incorporating municipalities, and nothing was shown to the committee whereby the municipalities would have control. They might have some interest, somebody might hold stock in the company for them. Whom do we incorporate in Bill (No. 118)? The section reads:

E. Mahon, E. W. MacLean, James P. Fell and Lambert Bond, all of the city of Vancouver, and John Y. McNaught and J. C. Keith, both of the city of North Vancouver, in the province of British Columbia, together with such persons as become shareholders in the company, are incorporated under the name of 'The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company,' hereinafter called 'the company.'

These are the gentlemen and they have the power, there is nothing to restrain them and there is no hold, so far as this parliament is concerned, upon any one of these gentlemen in behalf of a municipality or in behalf of a province, it is all moonshine to talk about that being a corporation under the control of municipalities, there was no such evidence, no sufficient evidence. The evidence that was presented did not carry us to the point to which my hon. friends would wish us to be carried. In this Bill (No. 118) we are not making any provision for a recompense for the rights which we granted, rights that under certain circumstances belong to the province of British Columbia, but by virtue of our declaration that it was a work for the general advantage of Canada we were infringing upon their rights, usurping property that was theirs and not imposing on this company any compensation for the province of British Columbia. When this Bill was before the committee on a previous occasion, I called attention to the rules adopted in some of the United States and particularly the rule that is applied in the state of New York. The Minister of the Interior says that under our system the federal government regulations do not impose any specific rate with respect to all companies but they impose a rate dependent on the circumstances which govern each case. Our system of government, it will be admitted is quite different from the system in the United States or in a state of the American union. As was shown to the committee the other day, the state of New York, whenever they incorporate any company granting power-rights or granting lands in connection therewith, or granting any franchise relating thereto, impose upon that company a fixed tax at the very inception of the Bill. That tax is increased annually until they are finally an operating company, and then there is so much imposed on the company for every horse-power developed by them. I quoted the rate at page 4939 as follows:

Upon all amounts up to 25,000 electrical horse-power, at the rate of 75 cents per horse-power; upon all amounts in excess of 25,000 electrical horse-power and up to 100,000 horse-power, at the rate of 50 cents per horse power; upon all amounts in excess of 100,000 electrical horse-power, at the rate of 25 cents per horse-power. In case said corporation

shall generate or develop water-power as mechanical power without transmuting the same into electrical power, then for so much of said water-power as may be developed payments shall be made at the above mentioned rates per mechanical horse-power.

We should have that system in this country and I think we do have it according to my understanding of the statement of the Minister of the Interior. These charges made by the state of New York are applicable to the development of the water-power at the Long Sault so-called, that portion of the waters of the St. Lawrence that flow over American soil; and if like powers were granted by this parliament to any company to develop that power, in connection with the American company, I would assume that the government of Canada, before granting any rights to any such company, would impose amounts, at least equal to the amounts imposed by the legislature of the state of New York. Our parliamentary system is somewhat different from theirs, our governmental system is different. There, in the absence of any general governmental regulations, the legislature in respect to each individual company imposes what they deem to be right and proper in the interests of the state as well as in the interest of the corporation seeking the powers. If we had imposed upon the Burrard Inlet Company a charge such as is imposed under this Bill of Incorporation by the state of New York, we would have done what I would conceive to be proper because the regulations of the department could not apply to the development of the British Columbia water-power and the regulations referred to by the Minister of the Interior only apply to waters that are under the control and within the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada. If we are going to impose such charges on this company we should have inserted a similar provision in the Bill relating to the Burrard Inlet Company. We allowed the Bill to go through and, therefore, it would seem to me if it would be manifestly unfair to further delay this Bill which has in my judgment been unwarrantably delayed. Much time has been occupied, there are no features about it that are a menace or peril either to Dominion or provincial property. I opposed the Bill at its inception because of certain features, which features were amended. I feel now that any objectionable features connected with the Bill have been removed and that it stands upon the same basis as many other Bills which we have permitted to pass both the Railway Committee and this Committee of the whole House.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The Minister of the Interior has told the committee that he intends applying to the Northwest Territories certain regulations which have been in force for a year with regard to water-powers in the prairie provinces, and to that extent, at all events, the action of the opposition in discussing this Bill has been productive of some good.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be an awful thing to say you were no good.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) has stated that this Bill contains provisions similar to the Burrard Inlet Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only less so.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) is wrong in that statement. In the Railway Committee the trust deed that was executed by the promoters of the Burrard Inlet Bill in favour of the municipalities was produced and read, and it is therefore not correct for the hon. gentleman to say that the promoters were not trustees for the municipalities.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said there was not sufficient evidence to show that.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I do not know what stronger evidence could be produced than the production of the trust instrument executed by the promoters of that Bill in favour of the different municipalities. The Burrard Inlet Bill promoters were trustees for the people, but the Bill now before us incorporates a private company which no doubt will exact the maximum fees out of the community. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) also told us that we conferred powers of expropriation upon the Burrard Inlet Company without providing that the province should be compensated, but in that also he is mistaken, because under the Railway Act the company must compensate for the property expropriated whether it belongs to the province or to individuals. What we ask in connection with this Bill is that the government shall declare a policy with respect to these water-powers. At present the Minister of the Interior can act on his own discretion; he can charge anything he likes or he can charge nothing, and we know how easily these important franchises are granted to the friends of the administration when we consider the easy methods by which our grazing and timber lands were alienated from the people. What we feel is that the moment this company gets immense rights all over that great territory they will seek to grasp the water-powers, and the Minister of the Interior will no doubt facilitate them. The fees for these water-powers should be fixed by statute so that all may know them, and so that all may have an opportunity to obtain them on equal terms. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) cast reflections on the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission, and

for his information I would say that the policy of that commission has met with absolute approval from both sides of the House in the Ontario legislature, and has received the almost unanimous support of the people in every municipality in which it was submitted for their approval. The mere declaration of policy by the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission was sufficient to reduce the price of power to consumers from one-third to one-half. The Toronto Street Railway Company had been paying one of the power companies $57 per horse-power, and the Hydro-Electric Commission are 'about to sell' citizens power at $25 per horse-power. That is something which the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission has done for the benefit of the people. We were told by the Minister of Public Works that the Commission on the Conservation of Our Natural Resources are considering a broad policy in this matter, and as we are also told that their report is expected very soon, what is the harm of asking that this Bill should stand until we know from that report whether it is advisable to pass it in its present form or not.

Mr. NESBITT. The Minister of the Interior has clearly defined his policy which is that each application for the use of power will be dealt with on its merits, and when hon. gentlemen opposite consider that some water-powers may be worth a great deal more than others I think they will agree that such is the only policy that can be thought of. The water-powers concerned in this Bill are a long distance away from any probable users, and the exaction of any high fee would of course make development prohibitive. This Bill does not authorize them to generate power; it simply places them in a position whereby they can negotiate for the right to use and develop water-power. Indeed, under the provisions of this Bill the powers given to this company are very restricted, and limited. So far as I am concerned, I am not going to say anything to hon. members opposite for having voted for the Burrard Inlet charter because I voted for it myself. I do not see why it is mentioned here, because it has nothing to do with this particular charter, and because in the Bill before us, the charter is surrounded by some very stringent conditions. There is a little amendment which I could suggest to clause 11 when we come to it, and which is in one or two other charters, and it is one to which I am sure the promoters of the Bill will agree to. Everything else is so surrounded by conditions that I think hon. gentlemen opposite should be satisfied to let the Bill go through. I do not see how the country runs any risk, nor do I see how it ran any risk when the Burrard Inlet charter went through. As to the contention that the promoters of the Burrard Inlet charter were acting as trustees for the municipalities, we had nothing to show that they were. If they had been, they should have incorporated the trust deeds in their charter, and that would have been absolute proof. Now, this matter was fully discussed in the Railway Committee, and passed that committee, and I hope hon. members opposite will withdraw their opposition. I ask them in all fairness to do so.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The only water-powers available to this company are those owned by the Dominion, and I cannot see why the government, before they convey any water-powers to this company, should not declare that they will 'consider the whole question and lay down some definite policy.' The House should have the power to pronounce whether the water-power will be alienated or not. There are no people out there now and no market for the water, and the individuals who are seeking this Act of incorporation do not live in the territory. One of them is from Campbellton, New Brunswick, another from Montreal, and another from London, England. They have no personal interest in the locality and are simply company promoters.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does the hon. gentleman forget that we are giving them simply the right to acquire water-power in connection with their undertaking and not for general purposes, and the undertaking is to build a certain railway? When they come to build it and want water-power, the Minister of the Interior can deal out justice to them, and at the same time, protect the public interest.

Mr. THOBURN. I have had something to do with water-powers for the last 25 or 30 years, and the question to me is whether it is in the best interests of the people in general that water-powers, at the disposal of the government, should be acquired by either railway companies or canal companies, or whether it is not better that they should be left for the general use of the public. Take as an illustration this whole Ottawa valley, from the town of Brockville to Pembroke, where there are some ten or twelve towns and villages, and several streams that afford from one to ten water-powers in each town or village, I have never known that a railway company or a canal company had any control over those water-powers, and as a consequence they are developed by private parties for manufacturing purposes. The question to me is this, whether it would not be better in these towns, where these railways are going through, to have the water-powers under the control of the government, either Dominion or provincial, than under the control of a railway or canal company. From my experience, I believe it would be

in the interest of the development of this country that whatever water-powers the government control should be retained by the government, because people would much prefer going to the government to get the franchise of a water-power than to a railway or canal company.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask whether this Bill is not intended to give the incorporators the right to control water-powers under clause 15 of the Railway Act? That clause provides:

> Enter into and upon any Crown lands without previous license therefor, or into or upon the lands of any person whomsoever, lying in the intended route or line of the railway, and make surveys, examinations or other necessary arrangements. * * *

Admitting that there is a water-fall, if the company ran its line within a few feet of that water-fall—and I think they have the right to take 100 feet for right of way—if in that 100 feet is included that fall, would not this company thereby get control of the water-power, and actually, if it was not necessary to put a dam there to raise the water, get the beneficent effects of the stream and convert it into a power on their own property? It seems to me they could by that very means take possession of numerous valuable water-powers. If the minister has passed through Kenora in daylight, he must have noticed that the Canadian Pacific railway passes right by the edge of a water-fall, close to the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, where the fall is on the right of way of the railway, and the railway would have the right to go on that property and utilize that power. Notwithstanding the fact that that power is in the province, the province would be deprived of the right and the beneficial interest which they have in the stream because of the fact that this special company acquired the right to expropriate the land for the purpose of running its railway. Could not this company, by the same means, get control of valuable water-powers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is entirely right if the water-power happens to be on the right of way of the railway. The railway would then be the owner of the water-power because it is the owner of the property. But it would have that right irrespective altogether of section 13. If my hon. friend imagines that a railway company will be allowed to go zig-zagging here and there to cross a water-power, of course, that might possibly occur, but it is a most improbable supposition. Under section 13, the company could not erect a dam without coming to the Minister of Public Works for the approval of the Governor in Council. It could not flood back the water without authority. And I think my hon. friend will agree with me that there are very few water powers in this country that can be utilized to advantage without the building of a dam, or without going to a large expense to sink flumes to carry the water from above the dam to the foot of the falls, which, in the great majority of cases, would carry a considerable distance beyond the right of way which the company is authorized to take. But the point to which I draw my hon. friend's attention is that it would not affect the case he refers to even if section 13 was struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. What I object to is giving a railway corporation the right to take over water-powers. I think they should have no such rights and have thought so for a long time. The minister said they would not zig-zag their railway to reach water-powers. But they may run a line straight to reach a valuable water-power, and their engineer would probably take good care of that. The minister knows that on the Canadian Pacific railway in the west are several water-powers under the control of the railway company. There are instances where there are substantial water-powers that could be used without erecting a dam at all.

Mr. CONMEE. The conditions at Kenora to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) refers are against his own argument. It is true the Canadian Pacific railway runs over the water-power at that point—and not one but four water-powers, for the Lake of the Woods has three different outlets discharging into Winnipeg river. The railway crosses each of these at the head of the falls. But that does not give the Canadian Pacific railway the right to these water-powers. All four water-powers are developed, but they are in the hands of private corporations. The Lake of the Woods Milling Company was not a power development by reason of the falls, but by reason of the narrow strip of land between the river and the lake, and they tunnelled underneath across the railway. At the other outlets they made their power at Keewatin. The railway company got no control. At Keewatin, they have a 300-foot right of way, because they have sidings, but even that did not give them control of the water-power, because the water could not be taken from the head and vented in that space. They cross the Wabigon river where there is a water-power and, though the railway crosses right over the falls, that power is developed by a private company, and for the same reason. It is inconceivable that a narrow strip of right of way under any circumstances could give a railway control of a water-power. The best evidence that this cannot be done is the fact that there is not a single case that can be pointed out. I have travelled a good deal in this country and I do not know of

one such case. I do not believe that any hon. member can point to a case where the railway right of way gave control of a water-power.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) has cited instances where, although this power was within the right of way of the railway, the railway companies never used the water-powers they reached. It is for that reason that I say we should not put it in the Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. What I said was that not only the railway company did not control, but that other private companies have developed and used the water-power and are using it to-day. The power to which he has referred is all developed and is running great establishments.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that some of them at least were by negotiation with the railway company.

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps the hon. member is better informed than I am, but I am not always disposed to take what he says without further evidence than his mere statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose that there are valuable undeveloped water-powers in that country, would it not be desirable, seeing that they are at a long distance from coal supply, to operate the railway by electricity? And, in that case, would it not be well for the railway to have authority to utilize water-power for that purpose? It seems to me the very thing the development of which we ought to facilitate if we are giving the company a charter.

Mr. SPROULE. We are told that they have millions of tons of coal in that country. But is there good reason to provide now by the incorporation of a company for what may happen a hundred years hence, tieing up, in the meantime, valuable assets of the country in the interest of private corporations? I do not think there is.

Mr. S. SHARPE. If it would pay the railway company to develop and use the water-power, would it not pay the government to develop it, then let the railway come to the government for what power it needs? The government could sell to the railway company what they want and get a reasonable return on the capital, and they could supply any municipality or others at favourable rates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. S. Sharpe) is opening up a very broad question of government ownership. I would not like to say that it would not be wise for the government to do it, but I do not think the country is, at the present moment, prepared to approve of the government going into a large scheme of developing water-powers all over the country.

On section 11:

11. The company may purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, hold, enjoy and manage such lands, water-lots, wharfs, docks, dockyards, slips, warehouses, elevators, offices and other buildings as it finds necessary and convenient for its purpose, and may construct any of such works or buildings, and sell or otherwise dispose thereof for the purposes of the company, and may carry on the business of warehousemen and wharfingers, and charge wharfage and other dues for the use of any such property, and may enter into any agreements with any such company respecting the use of any of the property of such company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has placed in my hands an amendment which he has asked me to suggest to the committee. The amendment is to strike out the words after the word 'property' in the third line from the bottom, and insert the words, 'but no such wharfage or other dues shall be charged or taken until they have been approved of by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, who may also revise such wharfage and other dues from time to time.' I think that is a very good provision.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I would ask the minister whether, in this section, the words ' or otherwise acquired ' would cover acquisition by expropriation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that would mean by purchase, lease or otherwise acquired. It must be by some voluntary arrangement. It would not give power to expropriate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am not prepared offhand to say that this amendment would be in order, as rule 111 provides that it must have one day's notice.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not press it unless it had the unanimous approval of the committee. But it is limiting the powers of the company, it is making a charge of wharfage and other dues subject to the approval of the Railway Commission. I submit the amendment revised as follows:

But no such wharfage or other dues shall be charged or taken until they have been approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, who may also revise such wharfage and other dues from time to time.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me there is an anomaly here. Nearly all wharfage dues imposed by the government are imposed through the Marine and Fisheries Department, but we are transferring them now to the Railway Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are dues upon a private wharf owned by a railway company. But the wharf would be owned in

connection with terminal railway facilities, and it seems appropriate that the Railway Commission should have charge of these dues.

Mr. SPROULE. There will probably be a mix-up. You can imagine that this railway reaches several towns where there is much shipping, and private wharfs exist alongside the company's wharf. In one case control of rates would be vested in the Marine and Fisheries Department, and in the other case in the Railway Commission.

On section 13,

Mr. S. SHARPE. I understand this section in connection with section 4 will give them no right to sell to the municipality without a by-law on the part of the municipality.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is clear.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Later on, by the amendment, it gives them express power to sell and distribute in a municipality.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will be subject to the provisions of section 247.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I doubt whether it goes that far. In the general clause at the beginning of the section, we make it subject to section 247 of the Railway Act, and then, apparently contradicting that, we give them power to sell and distribute to the municipality.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose we put in the seventh line on page 3 the words 'may subject to the like provisions'?

Mr. S. SHARPE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Subclause 8 of section 247 of the Railway Act has this provision:

Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize the company to exercise the powers therein mentioned for the purpose of selling or distributing light, heat, power or electricity in cities, towns or villages, without the company having first obtained consent therefor by a by-law of the municipality.

That requires them to get a by-law of consent from the municipality?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I would move:

That immediately after the word 'may' where it occurs in line 7, on page 3, there shall be inserted the words 'subject also to the provisions of said section 247 of the Railway Act'.

Mr. SPROULE. If they get this power subject to that section, and having regard to the subsection that I have just read providing that they may sell power after getting the authority of the municipality, would they not then have the power to sell without coming under the clause which provides that the Board of Railway Commissioners may approve of the tariff?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the last clause covers that. There is a double security. There is the consent of the municipality under section 247 of the Railway Act, and then the rates must be approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners under the last clause.

Amendment (Mr. Pugsley) agreed to.

On section 16, issue of securities other than railway.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Should not the Minister of Public Works or some other responsible minister have some supervision over the amount of the securities to be issued under section 16? Suppose the company acquired a water-power, they could issue bonds away beyond what is necessary to construct a dam or other works, and then when they came to fix the rates the Railway Commission would not have in mind the cost of the construction so much as the amount of capitalization. The company would want a revenue upon the amount of the capitalization, and not upon the cost of construction.

Mr. CONMEE. The board is not bound to do that.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I know, but they always look at that for stock is transferred to widows and orphans, and the protection of vested rights comes in, and they say that we must give an income on the amount of capitalization, and not on the cost of construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend says, but the objection to doing that is that you would have the Minister of Public Works certifying to the value of the property, investors would rely upon the certificate of a responsible officer of the government that the value would fairly represent their security, and it might do more harm than good. The investor usually looks out as to these things where the securities are issued upon floating property. They are simply upon the security of vessels, and other works which may be undertaken.

Mr. S. SHARPE. They would include water-powers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be better to leave it to the investor.

Mr. S. SHARPE. We limit the amount of securities that may be issued with respect to the railway. Why not with respect to the other works of the company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In regard to the railway you limit it to so much per mile, but I have never known it to be limited in cases where railway companies are authorized to build steamers or other works. You cannot say that a company should not issue beyond $200,000 or $300,000, and

if you say they cannot issue bonds beyond their value it means that the Minister of Public Works fixes the value and makes these bonds good. The idea is given to the public by the issue of a certificate of a reponsible officer of the government that the value is equal to the amount of the securities issued. If investors, relying upon that certificate instead of making an examination for themselves, were to suffer loss they would feel that the government had done them a very great wrong, and I think it would be very objectionable to attempt to make any provision in regard to that rather than to leave it to the investor to make the examination for himself.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

At six o'clock committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER TRANSMISSION COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company Limited.—Mr. Pardee.

Mr. S. SHARPE. This Bill has many objectionable features even with all the amendments made to it in the Private Bills Committee. In its original form it had many objectionable provisions, some of which were removed after many days' discussion in the committee. When the Bill came up for discussion in the Private Bills Committee, I moved that it be referred to the Committee on the Conservation of the National Resources of Canada for report. The promoters naturally objected and asked, in somewhat querulous tones, what the Conservation Commission had to do with a transmission line? On a division, however, the Bill was referred to the commission and we had a report from the chairman. In that report he objected to 9 clauses out of 19. I have his letter here, which I think ought to be placed on 'Hansard'.

Referring to the letter of your clerk on the subject of Bill (No. 115), I beg to state that the Bill has been examined as carefully as time and information permits.

The St. Lawrence Power Company is at present seeking authority to develop a power scheme by damming the St. Lawrence river at Long Sault. This project is being opposed by the Commission of Conservation for reasons, some of which have already been made public.

An examination of Bill (No. 115) indicates clearly that the introduction of this Bill is a portion of the St. Lawrence Power Company's plans. It is to be noted that the president of the power company and one of its engineers are the first named among the proposed incorporators, and the powers asked for are of an unusual and very sweeping character.

The passage of the Bill as it stands would give parliamentary sanction to an important portion of the St. Lawrence Power Company's proposals, and would complicate the situation unnecessarily.

On the other hand it is urged that some of the towns affected, particularly Prescott and Brockville, are without a supply of power, and that a transmission line is necessary in their interest. There does not appear to be any reason why authority for the construction of a transmission line, simply, should not be given, and if Bill (No. 115) were for such a purpose alone there could be no serious objection to it.

Your particular attention is drawn to sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 as being objectionable, on account of the large and unnecessary powers asked for. These clauses apparently contemplate monopolization of powers on a very large scale. It is to be noted also that there are no provisions in the Bill protecting the municipalities in regard to the use of streets or roads, nor anything requiring the company to acquire or pay for a right of way. Difficulty has already arisen in regard to this latter point in other cases, and it requires to be specifically provided for.

Under these circumstances it is recommended—

First, That sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 be struck out, and that, in lieu thereof, there be substituted proper provisions giving authority for the construction of a transmission line, and for power to buy, transmit and sell power within Canada.

Second, That a clause be added declaring that the Act shall come into force only on proclamation of the Governor General in Council and upon such conditions as the Governor General in Council may by order provide, such conditions to be read as forming part of the Act.

The latter provisions will place upon the Governor in Council the responsibility of seeing that the Act is not made use of except for the purpose for which it is properly intended, and to protect the municipalities concerned.

Part of the objections raised by the chairman were removed by the Committee on Private Bills, but a great many of the objectionable features still remain. As the chairman of the Conservation Commission says, this Bill is merely a part of a much larger scheme promoted by a number of very wealthy American gentlemen, who desire to get control of the St. Lawrence power proposition on the St. Lawrence river. One significant fact was that the promoters would not say where they purposed getting their power. But the engineer and the chief promoters of this measure are applying for permission to dam the St. Lawrence, so that that is where they purpose getting their power. Another very great objection is the fact that this is a private Bill, promoted for commercial purposes and private gain, and contains some very large expropriation powers. This is a vicious principle

to introduce into private legislation. What some member of the committee desired was that the promoters should specifically mention the clauses of the Railway Act they desire to apply to their company; but instead of doing this, they make the general provisions of the Railway Act apply where it suits them. But, instead, of that, they made the general provisions of the Railway Act apply to the company where applicable. These powers are very broad and general. By reason of the privileges and rights conferred upon them, they accept some of the provisions of the Railway Act and reject others. They accept such clauses as they think applicable to their enterprise and reject those detrimental to their interest and disadvantageous to the company. A company applying to parliament for a private charter to carry on a private enterprise of this kind ought to be made to declare specifically the powers they desire to have, instead of making the general Railway Act applicable to the enterprise.

Another great defect in this Bill is that under it the company may enter and expropriate the lands of the municipality and construct transmission lines upon them without the consent of the municipality. This question was raised last year under the Bill of the Ontario Michigan Power Company. It was amended by inserting the clause 10, which says:

> The company should not enter within the limits of any municipality with any transmission line or sell or distribute electrical or other power therein without the consent of such municipality expressed by by-law.

The promoters of the present Bill state that this provision is covered by section 247 of the Railway Act, but that clause merely provides that a company shall not sell or distribute electricity within a municipality except by the consent of a municipality. It does not prevent them from running transmission lines without the municipality's consent.

Mr. CARVELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. S. Sharpe) to say that, in his opinion, there should be a clause under which the company could not sell electricity within the municipalty without the consent of the municipality?

Mr. S. SHARPE. No, that is already provided by section 247 of the Railway Act.

Mr. SPROULE. If the company comes under that section?

Mr. S. SHARPE. Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. That is the expropriation section?

Mr. S. SHARPE. I refer to subsection 8 of section 247 of the Railway Act, which reads:

> Nothing contained in this section should be deemed to authorize the company to exercise the powers therein mentioned for the purpose of selling or distributing light, heat, power or electricity in cities, towns or villages, without the company having first obtained consent therefor by a by-law of the municipality.

This merely refers to the selling and distribution of electricity within a municipality, and has nothing to do with transmission lines. Under the Bill now under discussion the company can build their lines through any municipality by their powers of expropriation, without the consent of the municipality. Some of the municipalities which this company will traverse have already conferred rights on other companies to transmit electricity. If we grant the powers proposed in this Bill in its present shape, those powers will override the powers under that municipal by-law, and without the consent of the municipality this concern will be able to expropriate the works of the companies already doing business within the municipalities under by-law.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. And doing business under provincial charter.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Yes. Another great objection to the Bill is in connection with the question of provincial rights, a question which has repeatedly come before this House in connection with such Bills. If the province has an asset which this company desires to expropriate, it can expropriate under the powers proposed to be conferred. Mr. Lynch Staunton, counsel for the Ontario government, appeared before the Private Bills Committee on this subject, and I may say that there were very few members present at that committee, mainly for the reason, I suppose, that there was a meeting of the Railway Committee at the same time. I think that the rules of the House should provide that no two such important committees as railways and private Bills should sit at the same time. At the time that this Bill was being discussed before the Private Bills Committee, the energies of many hon. members were being directed against the Bill proposed by the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee); that is, we had the spectacle of two private companies making—

Mr. LENNOX. Raids at the same time.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Yes, two raids at the same time, one in the Railway Committee and one in the Private Bills Committee; and both with respect to water-powers,

which they sought to obtain through legislation in this parliament. It is quite reasonable that this Bill should be discussed in the light of the policy of the Hydro-Electric Commission of the Ontario government. We have heard much discussion of this policy. It was alluded to this afternoon by one hon. member, who, I am convinced, was not very familiar with the facts—who certainly did not speak by the book. He expressed a doubt that the policy of the Hydro-Electric Commission in Ontario had caused a reduction in the price of power. Everybody knows that the Hydro-Electric policy of the Ontario government has met with the absolute approval of both sides of the House in the local legislature. The present opposition in the legislature dare not challenge that policy—has never dared to challenge it. That policy has been submitted to many municipalities and has been carried by ten to one. The people are unanimous in its favour, except certain interests that are affected by it. Everybody knows that this policy is carried out on the plan of the maximum of service at the minimum of cost; and everybody knows that the private enterprises are carried on on exactly the opposite plan. Anything that will detract from the effectiveness of the Hydro-Electric Commission policy should not be encouraged by this parliament. The policy known as the Hydro-Electric has reference to every part of the province of Ontario. The commission, I understand, has laid out the province into several divisions, and has had its experts and engineers making reports on these divisions. I have here the fourth report, which is to be found on file in the library. It deals extensively, in a wise and comprehensive way, with this Ottawa and St. Lawrence district. Speaking of undeveloped locations—page 9—the report says:

Along the St. Lawrence river, which has no laterals in this part of Ontario, except a small stream at Gananoque, a peculiar situation has been created by the construction of the various ship canals.

These canals can be used to a limited extent as head races for power developments, but evidently extensive use is objectionable to the navigation interests, due to the creation of currents, and therefore no very extensive constructions of this type need be expected. The St. Lawrence has enormous potential water-powers, and the future outlook in this locality would seem to be in the nature of very extensive developments, possible only by placing dams in the main river, or else, as at Hoople Creek, near Cornwall, by means of an expensive head canal, circumventing and not interferring with the ship canals themselves.

It proceeds:

In general, it may be said that, with the exception of a small area, lying between the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers and east of Smith's Falls, the whole district covered by this report is bountifully supplied with water-powers capable of being developed for reasonable costs per horse-power.

Your commissioners, following the policy outlined in their earlier reports, have not thought it necessary to consider any but the more important undertakings, where electrical energy is being generated for power as well as lighting purposes, and transmitted some distance.

A partial list of plants in the district coming under this head are Andrewsville, Mattawa, Pembroke, Perth, Renfrew and Morrisburg. The St. Lawrence Power Company and the Hawkesbury Electric Light and Power Company have not furnished the necessary information asked for by your commissioners.

I will not delay by reading the full report, but it is exhaustive, and deals with water-powers and transmission lines in this particular district. I have a letter in my hand from a gentleman who is deeply interested in the success of the hydro-electric policy throughout Ontario. It is dated February 17, 1910, and reads as follows:

My Dear Sir,—I note that Bill (No. 115), to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited, has been referred to the commission. When the Bill comes before the commission for consideration, I desire that the commission should know that as early as 1906, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario had the second and fourth reports on water-power prepared, copies of which are inclosed. The territory covered by these reports lies between Toronto and Brockville. Eleven municipalities in the teritory have asked for estimates and negotiated with the commission for a supply of power, and others are about to apply.

The object of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission is to supply power at cost to as many municipalities as possible, and the commission propose to provide a supply of power for all municipalities that can be advantageously served.

If the Bill is passed, the company would have authority to transmit power into a large section of the territory to be supplied by the commission, and a dual system of transmission lines would be the result. The commission has always considered that where municipalities are prepared to co-operate and so increase the demand for power from one source that a dual system is a hindrance to municipalities in the working out of their plans, and such a system should not be encouraged.

I shall be obliged if your commission will give the facts I have mentioned careful attention.

Yours faithfully,

Now the opposition that should be raised against this Bill is on the ground stated in that letter that it is a duplicate of those transmission lines.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is the writer of the letter?

Mr. S. SHARPE. The letter was written in confidence to myself, but I will show it

to the hon. gentleman if he wishes to see it. As I was saying, the great objection the writer of this letter has to the Bill is the fact that it is duplicating these transmission lines. They have made a report which covers this very territory. If this transmission line is run along this territory it means that there will have to be dual rates in order to maintain two lines. The commission has made a report upon this very territory, and has provided a plan whereby municipalities can be served, and all it requires co-operation on the part of the municipalities in order to call into operation the wise policy of the Hydro-Electric Commission.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. What municipalities have offered to take this power from the Hydro-Electric Commission?

Mr. S. SHARPE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has asked the question, because it gives me an opportunity to read an interview in the Toronto 'Globe' given on March 2, 1910:

> Fight McGuigan Bill—Province to Combat proposed Federal Measure—Contractor for construction of Hydro-electric Line seeks Power Rights on the St. Lawrence—Commission to Develop the East.
>
> Ontario will oppose the Bill to be submitted to the Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons to-day to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company.
>
> The situation is interesting. Mr. F. H. McGuigan, contractor for the building of the Hydro-Electric Power transmission line, is the head of the gentlemen who seek incorporation. They desire to generate power from the St. Lawrence and transmit it to the United States, portions of the province of Quebec and the counties of Leeds, Grenville, Stormont and Glengarry in Ontario. The proposition is opposed on behalf of the province by the Hydro-Electric Commission. Mr. Geo. Lynch-Staunton, K.C., left for Ottawa last night to represent Ontario in opposition to this Bill, and the Long Sault project.
>
> In an interview with the 'Globe' last night Hon. Adam Beck pointed out that the McGuigan Bill was a menace to the successful working out of the government power policy, in eastern Ontario, in that its adoption would mean the establishment of a dual system of power supply with all the embarrassments that such a condition invariably entails.
>
> 'The purpose of the proposed company,' said the Minister of Power, 'is not to supply the small consumers or serve them for any distance. It looks for a home market and a sale in large quantities. The commission wants the power for distribution on the same plan as that adopted in the west. Our object is to supply power at cost to all municipalities that can be advantageously reached.'
>
> From eastern Ontario, towards which the attention of the commission is now being directed, applications for power have been received from Kingston, Belleville, Deseronto, Brockville, Oshawa, Cobourg, Bowmanville, Port Hope, Picton and Durham, while reports have been made for Prescott, Napanee, Peterborough, Madawaska, Almonte and Renfrew.
>
> 'If the proposed Bill is passed,' observed Hon. Mr. Beck, 'the company would have authority to transmit power into a large section of the territory to be supplied by the commission, and a dual system of transmission lines would be the result. The commission has always considered that where municipalities are prepared to co-operate and so increase the demand for power from one source, that a dual system is a hindrance to municipalities in the working out of their plans, and such a system should not be encouraged.'

That is an interview giving the opinion of the chairman of the Hydro-Electric Commission opposing this plan of dual transmission lines.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I did not hear the discussion in the Private Bills Committee. Did any of the municipalities the hon. gentleman has just enumerated, Belleville, Cornwall, Brockville, Kingston, Renfrew, make any opposition to this Bill?

Mr. S. SHARPE. I think they were represented by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) and the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), and they offered strong opposition to the Bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE. As municipalities?

Mr. S. SHARPE. I do not suppose that the municipalities knew that this Bill was coming before the Private Bills Committee, although I suppose it would be advertised in the usual way. But this interview states that several of these municipalities have made application to the commission to develop and transmit electricity to the various municipalities, and they were in negotiation with other municipalities. The Hydro-Electric Commission served this very territory through which this transmission line is proposed to be run.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. When and how?

Mr. S. SHARPE. That might be a very pertinent question for the hon. gentleman to direct to the promoters of this Bill. When they proposed to build a transmission line they had already proposed to get the power. The same sources of power for this transmission line are available for the Hydro-Electric Commission. The commission have power to expropriate any power in Ontario situate within the province for the purpose of the municipalities, and if there is no power available for the Hydro-Electric Commission, there is no power available for the promoters of this Bill.

I think it is well that this House should show their appreciation of the gravity of the situation as far as the natural resources of the country are concerned. The time of this House is occupied with fighting these power Bills. We are only coming to a proper sense of appreciation of the

value of these water-powers. An hon. gentleman this afternoon spoke about the fetish that we are worshipping with respect to these water-powers. It is only of late years that these powers have been utilized for the purpose of developing electricity, and we are only properly appreciating their value and that we should not alienate them without proper consideration. We have had companies incorporated year after year lately for the purpose of acquiring these water-powers. Great octopuses are reaching out and gathering in these powers before the people are coming to a proper sense of their value and utility. Private members are occupied more than half their time in framing objections and fighting the piratical propositions of these companies for the purpose of acquiring these water-powers. The discussion of a Bill that was proposed this afternoon is apropos to the discussion in reference to this Bill, inasmuch as the same point is involved, that the government should have some definite policy with reference to water-powers. They should have some definite policy in reference to the right to expropriate municipal lands or rights as well as provincial rights, and we should have some expression of opinion from the ministry in connection with these Bills. I think there should be some rule provided as to the propriety of the whip of either side of the House being sponsor for any private legislation, particularly when he enjoys the popularity that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) enjoys on both sides of the House. We know that these private promoters have the faculty of ingratiating themselves in the good opinion first, of the whips, then of the other members, and we know with what facility the whips can always get the party in line. I think it would be wise that we should adopt some rule whereby the whip should not be the sponsor of any private Bill when it has for its purpose the taking away of provincial or municipal rights. In connection with this Bill this company seem to have unlimited finances behind them. It is stated in one of the Ottawa papers today that there are millions behind this proposition, and that this transmission line is merely a subsidiary undertaking in connection with the bigger scheme of damming the St. Lawrence river. They have practically taken advantage of every method to get both parties in line on this Bill. We had a prominent Reform lawyer before the Private Bills Committee advocating with great ability the many good features of this Bill, and, on the other hand, we had a Conservative lawyer advocating the splendid features of the Bill, in order to catch both sides of the House. Then we had the hon. member for West Lambton promoting this Bill and endeavouring to get it through notwithstanding that there was great opposition in the Private Bills Committee.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am opposed to the whole principle of the Bill, but I think the promoters should consent to two amendments in the public interest. One of the amendments was suggested by the chairman of the Conservation Commission. They did not adopt that suggestion. It had reference to clause 10, and it was suggested by the chairman of the Conservation Commission:

That a clause be added declaring that the Act shall come into force only on proclamation of the Governor General in Council and upon such conditions as the Governor General in Council may by order provide, such conditions to be read as forming part of the Act.

The object of that amendment is to throw the responsibility upon the Governor General in Council of adopting the principle of the Bill. If the Bill is not a good one, the Governor General in Council will not bring it into force by his proclamation, and if he brings it into force, he can annex such conditions to it as he sees fit. But the promoters of the Bill did not adopt that suggestion in toto. They made a pretense of adopting it. The Bill as finally agreed to by the Private Bills Committee reads as follows:

10. The powers conferred upon the company by this Act shall not be exercisable until the company has first submitted to the Governor in Council plans of such works, and has received his assent thereto.

There is a vital difference between the amendment as suggested by the chairman of the Conservation Commission and that adopted by the Private Bills Committee. Under the clause that was suggested by Mr. Sifton in his letter to the Private Bills Committee, the responsibility of adopting the principle of the Bill is thrown upon the Governor in Council, whereas the amendment merely throws the responsibility upon him of assenting to certain plans. One is a question of principle, the other is merely a question of routine. As a matter of fact, when the company get their charter and their plans are submitted to the Governor General in Council, he merely consents to the plan. It is merely a matter of administration or routine, whereas the amendment suggested by the chairman of the Conservation Commission throws the responsibility of adopting the principle upon the Governor General in Council.

Mr. CONMEE. Do I understand the hon. member to advocate that this House should delegate to the Governor General in Council the policy to be adopted in regard to a matter of this kind? That would seem to

me to be a very peculiar policy to come from the opposition.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I would say in answer to the hon. member for Rainy River——

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It comes from the chairman of the Conservation Commission.

Mr. S. SHARPE—that this House is going to be asked to place in the estimates $50,000 to be placed at the disposal of this Conservation Commission. We are spending $50,000 to ascertain the best means of conserving our natural resources. A member of the Private Bills Committee has no means of ascertaining the true facts in connection with the Bill and cannot possibly pass an intelligent opinion upon it, but when the matter is left to the Governor General in Council, he can obtain the advice of the Conservation Commission and of their expert engineers. The Conservation Commission and the Governor General in Council have money and engineers at their disposal, they can ascertain the true intent, meaning, purpose and objects of this company, and unless they are proper to be brought into operation, the provisions of the Bill need not be brought into operation, but the Governor General in Council has means at his command to ascertain these facts that a private member cannot possibly have.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member is willing to delegate all the powers of parliament, under such circumstances, to the Governor General in Council? I would like to have an answer to that point.

Mr. S. SHARPE. We are willing to incorporate the company, and if it is a proper company to be brought into operation upon the conditions being ascertained, the Governor General in Council should assume the responsibility of bringing it into existence.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not think the hon. member will get many to support that principle.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Another amendment which the promoters of this Bill should accept is in connection with the rights of municipalities:

The company shall not enter within the limits of any municipality with any transmission line, or sell or distribute electrical or other power therein without the consent of such municipality expressed by by-law.

That was inserted last year in my hon. friend's Bill, the Ontario and Michigan Power Company Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. That is already in the general law of Ontario, chapter 5 of the Statutes of 1909.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What has the Ontario legislature to do with this?

Mr. CONMEE. It has control over the municipalities and no company can distribute power in an Ontario municipality without its consent.

Mr. S. SHARPE. This is a transmission line.

Mr. CONMEE. That is how power is sold.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The hon. gentleman does not mean to say that the Ontario legislature can pass laws that will have superiority over the laws passed by this parliament?

Mr. CONMEE. No, I do not say that.

Mr. S. SHARPE. If this Bill is allowed to pass in its present shape it will override provincial legislation and will invade municipal and provincial rights without the consent of these municipalities. This Bill says too that the plans shall be approved by the Governor General in Council, but it makes no provision for their publication so that the municipalities will have notice that the plans are being submitted to the Governor in Council. In an important matter of this kind where a transmission line will affect municipal and provincial rights, as this does, the plans should be published in the local newspapers in the municipalities affected, and announcement should be made that the plans will be considered by the Governor in Council and that the different interests will be heard before they are finally approved by the railway board.

Another amendment which I would propose is in connection with the question of provincial rights. This amendment was suggested in the Private Bills Committee and voted down by the friends of the promoters:

Nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to authorize the company to enter on, take or use any land or water, the property of any province, without having first obtained by order in council of the Lieutenant Governor the consent of the province to such entry, taking or user.

That protects provincial rights and there should be a similar clause to protect municipal rights. Before the Private Bills Committee the representatives of Montreal protested vigorously——

Mr. M. MARTIN. And we are here again for that clause.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Because this Bill in its present form gives the company power to enter Montreal and expropriate a right of way without the consent of the city of Montreal. That is an extraordinary power

to be contained in such a Bill and the representatives of Montreal were quite right to appear before the Private Bills Committee and oppose it in its present form. There should be a clause to protect not only the provinces but the municipalities as well.

If the preamble carries and the Bill is discussed I purpose moving one or two amendments and discussing it further but at the same time I desire to register my general opposition to the whole Bill. My main reason is that it is duplicating the very line the Hydro-Electric Commission purpose taking in connection with the wide and comprehensive policy the commission has adopted for transmitting power to the municipalities.

Mr. J. D. REID. When the Bill was before the Private Bills Committee the promoters made it a special point that this transmission line was to be constructed to furnish power to Prescott and Brockville. When it was before the Private Bills Committee I suggested that a clause should be inserted providing that work was to be commenced within one year from the time the Bill was passed and to be completed within three years. The Private Bills Committee, however, inserted clause 15, providing:

This Act shall go into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Suppose we pass this Bill in its present shape, then they may not commence this transmission line for a number of years and this will prevent others from building a line and furnishing power to Prescott, Brockville and other municipalities.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. J. D. REID. The very fact of our passing this Bill will prevent others from building a transmission line. I would ask the committee to change clause 15 and to make it read that they must commence work within one year. This line can be built in two or three months and I submit that it is not fair to tie up the power that could be supplied to Prescott and Brockville by other parties who have water-power.

Mr. CONMEE. How does it tie up the power, what clause in the Bill?

Mr. J. D. REID. In this way that this parliament grants another company power to build a transmission line. There is not sufficient power required at Prescott and Brockville to warrant two companies building transmission lines to supply that demand. If this company will agree to build a transmission line immediately and furnish power that is satisfactory to Prescott and Brockville; we want power at these places. The St. Lawrence Company at Cornwall have plenty of power, they have admitted that at the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman say that if the Bill is amended so that they shall commence the work within one year the opposition to the Bill will be withdrawn?

Mr. J. D. REID. So far as I am concerned, if they will agree to that my opposition is ended so far as that clause is concerned; but I also submit that the amendment suggested by Mr. S. Sharpe should be inserted, that is to protect provincial rights. The hon. member (Mr. Pardee) was quite willing in the Private Bills Committee to insert a clause that this company should not take property belonging to the municipality without the leave of the municipality.

Mr. PARDEE. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. That clause is in the Bill.

Mr. PARDEE. That is provided for in the Railway Act.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) is willing that this company shall not expropriate municipal property without the consent of the municipality why should he not insert a clause in the Bill that they shall not expropriate provincial property without the consent of the province?

Mr. PARDEE. Section 47, subsection 5, of the Railway Act absolutely protects the municipality.

Mr. J. D. REID. It protects the municipality, but not the province.

Mr. PARDEE. You do not agree with the member for Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), who said the municipalities were not protected.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the amendment of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) is passed, and also an amendment that they shall commence within one year and complete within three years I shall be satisfied.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend (Mr. Reid) objects to the Bill unless it provides that the construction shall be completed within a certain period, because otherwise, he says, other corporations may be prevented from giving a service to the people; and my hon. friend from North Ontario taking an opposite view does not want the Bill passed because he says it will be an interference with the plans of the Hydro-Electric Commission. Let these two gentlemen reconcile their divergent views. As I do not belong to the province of Ontario, I

may be able to give an impartial opinion from the standpoint of an outsider. I cannot agree with the hon. member (Mr. Sharpe) as to the many benefits to be derived by the province of Ontario from the operations of the Hydro-Electric Commission. True, I have not made a careful study of the matter, but during the last ten years I have had considerable experience with water-powers, and I have yet to see a case wherein competition has made electricity dearer. I do not see what harm can come to the municipalities along the river St. Lawrence from having just as many transmission lines as possible, because I believe the result will be cheaper electricity to the people, and less profit to the company. In my province a man would be drummed out of public life who would do anything to prevent an electric company or a railway company from spending money, and placing these utilities within reach of the people. If the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Sharpe) should be adopted the promoter of this Bill might as well fold up his papers and withdraw it. There is no use disguising the fact that the opposition to this Bill is being put up by the Hydro-Electric Commission or their friends. It is the same old bogie we meet whenever water-powers have been mentioned in this House for the last five or six years. Every time you talk water-power you will find this Hydro-Electric Commission objecting, and why? It is in order to maintain for themselves an absolute monopoly of all electric energy in the province of Ontario, and from that policy I dissent. I do not believe in monopolies by private individuals, corporations, or provincial governments, and I do not believe it is in the best interests of the people of Ontario that the Hydro-Electric Commission should have the monopoly of all electric energy.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is the hon. member aware that the Hydro-Electric Commission constructs these lines and charges the municipalities with the mere cost of construction, plus a small sum? What objection can there be to monopoly in such a case as that?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, and I have been told that the Hydro-Electric Commission makes the municipality pay for peak loads which they may only use once in a year.

Mr. J. D. REID. You are wrongly informed.

Mr. CARVELL. Not by any means, and they grant monopolies for thirty years in order to prevent any one else getting into the cities, and they pretend to sell horsepower for $25 when as a matter of fact the cost amounts to $60 or $70.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is not right.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Just mention such a case

Mr. CARVELL. Wait a moment, my hon. friend from Westmorland had to call you down this afternoon. This commission pretends to sell electricity at a low rate, but that only means the charge for it at the substation outside the municipality, and then they have to pay their share of the cost of transmission lines, and the cost of transforming, and the cost of distribution, and the cost of different other things which sometimes amounts to $60, and $70 per horse-power.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Give an instance where the Hydro-Electric Commission stated they would furnish electricity for $25 per horse-power and charged $60 or $70.

Mr. CARVELL. The town of Stratford is one, and the town of Ingersoll is another.

An hon. MEMBER. And the town of Galt.

Mr. S. HUGHES. What does Stratford pay?

Mr. CARVELL. As near as I can figure it out, it is $60 or $75 per horse-power.

Mr. S. HUGHES. It is $29.

Mr. CARVELL. Oh yes, but that is only at the outside station. The hon. gentleman wants to get acquainted with this business. They have to pay for different other things which adds to the cost. To come back to the Bill—my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) is mistaken as to the Railway Act with reference to municipalities. The Railway Act does not provide that a municipality can by its mere ipse dixit refuse to allow an electric company to do business within its borders. Subsection 5 of section 24 provides that if the company cannot obtain the consent from a municipality, the company may apply to the board for leave to exercise the power, and upon such application it shall present a plan of the highway, square, or other public place, showing its powers in this territory, subject to whatever conditions they may consider fair. My hon. friend (Mr. Reid) will see that a municipality, under that Act, has not the absolute right to exclude an electric power company. But if the amendment of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) should be adopted, it would give the province of Ontario the absolute right to exclude this company from any portion of the public domain of that province; and we may assume that the province, exercising the policy to which it is committed at present, would absolutely prevent this undertaking from going

on, and the whole thing would become a nullity.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to argue that this Bill would give this transmission line power, under the Railway Act, to enter a municipality and do business there in so far as the furnishing of electric light is concerned?

Mr. CARVELL. No. Under the Railway Act this company would have the right to go on the public streets or other places in a municipality with its consent; but if it could not make a satisfactory arrangement with the municipality, it would have the right to apply to the railway board, and that board would grant its application subject to conditions. The company is obliged to go to the municipality first, but if the municipality will not be reasonable, it can apply to the railway board which has authority to act. If, however, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) were adopted, the province of Ontario would have the right to absolutely forbid this company from crossing its property, and that would be the end of the whole transaction.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood in the Private Bills Committee that the intention was that whenever this company desired to enter or pass through a municipality the municipality alone would have the power to grant or refuse permission, and I understood that the promoters of the Bill were willing to have it amended in that sense.

Mr. CARVELL. The question arose as to what right should be given the company to enter a municipality. It was thought that if the Bill were passed as drawn, in which section 247 of the Railway Act was to apply only where applicable, that possibly there might be lack of definiteness; upon the request of one of the members of the committee, who was opposed to the Bill, section 247 was made to refer specifically to the matter of crossing or going through a municipality.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I happened to be in the committee at the time, and had with me the Ontario and Michigan Power Company Act. Speaking to Mr. McCarthy, the solicitor for the company, I pointed out that there were provisions in that Act which were not to be found in the Bill in question. I pointed out particularly sections 9, 10 and 11 of the Ontario and Michigan Power Act, and Mr. McCarthy said the promoters of this Bill had no objection to this clause being put in it. The clauses I refer to are as follows:

> The company shall not enter within the limits of any municipality with any transmission line or sell or distribute electrical or other power therein without the consent of the said municipality expressed by by-law.

I understood that the promoters were willing to allow that clause to go into this Bill. Then there is this other clause:

> None of the powers conferred by this Act shall be exercised within the limits of Port Arthur or Fort William or any other city unless a by-law has been submitted to the qualified ratepayers and duly passed by them authorizing the exercising of such powers within the limits of the municipality.

That gives the municipality the absolute right to say whether or not even a transmission line shall go across it. My understanding was that a similar restriction would be put in the Bill before the House.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is exactly what I understood. I understood that this Bill would come down with that clause in it. That clause gives the municipality absolute power, and it is that which I want in this Bill, and I think the committee should agree to it. I cannot see why there should be any objection. If that be agreed to, in so far as municipalities are concerned, why not agree also to a similar clause with regard to provincial property. With those two clauses in and another providing that the company must commence constructing this transmission line within one year and complete it within three, the Bill would have my approval. There is another company which has already purchased the right of way and is prepared to go on with a transmission line this spring, and furnish power to those two municipalities. Should this Bill be passed, it may block the other Bill, because I do not think that at present there is a sufficient quantity of power required in those municipalities to call for more than one company can supply. I understood the promoter of the Bill to say that he was willing that clause 15 should be amended so that the company must begin work within one year and finish within three.

Mr. PARDEE. This Bill is in the same form as that in which it came from the committee, where it was absolutely satisfactory to all the members, even my hon. friend.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, it was not.

Mr. PARDEE. I think the hon. member for Ontario contended that what the terms of this Bill should be and when it should go into operation should be settled by the Governor in Council. Of course, that was an absolutely novel and unique proposition. It simply meant leaving to the Governor in Council the right to legislate absolutely for the whole House, and was a proposition utterly untenable. Consequently we put in clause 15 to provide that the Act should come into force on the day fixed in the proclamation of the Governor in Council, and that clause is to be read

in conjunction with the one dealing with the plans and specifications. The clause relating to municipalities was struck out in committee, and it was agreed to by every member of the committee that section 247 of the Railway Act absolutely protected the municipalities. As regards municipal and provincial rights, which we hear so much of to-day, if you were to put a provision in the Bill such as hon. gentlemen opposite desire, you would put it into the hands of a province or a municipality to stop the construction of the work at any minute. Even if we were at our last link and putting up our last pole, the province or a municipality might prohibit our going a step further. Suppose this company had expended large sums of money and suppose, at the completion of that work, it were necessary to put a pole or wire along the bed of a stream, and the province were to refuse to give us that power, we would be absolutely out of court and might just as well have thrown our money into the deep sea. It is all very well to talk of provincial rights, but surely there are some Dominion rights. Surely we have the right to give companies which we incorporate the power to carry on the works we have authorized them to do.

Mr. BRODER. Would the hon. member give them the power to expropriate Dominion lands without the consent of the Dominion government?

Mr. PARDEE. We are discussing provincial lands, just now.

Mr. BRODER. That is a point I would like the hon. member to settle. They cannot, under this Bill, expropriate Dominion lands—

Mr. PARDEE. But put the converse question, and would it be fair the other way? Two wrongs do not make a right. It is the Dominion parliament that is doing this.

Mr. BRODER. Then my suggestion would be, either take away this right that was given them over provincial land, or give them the power over Dominion lands.

Mr. PARDEE. This parliament is asked to give rights within its jurisdiction. To say that before we give these rights that are within our jurisdiction we must go to the province and ask them if we may do so would be to render the granting of a charter here clearly ridiculous. So far as municipalities are concerned, they are absolutely protected under subsection 5 of section 247 which provides that if the company cannot obtain consent from the municipal council or other authority—which clearly shows that, in the first place they must go to the municipality to obtain that consent—then the Board of Railway Commissioners is empowered to step in and say under what conditions they shall come in with their line. Surely, the municipality is protected under that. It is also provided under subsection 8 that nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize a company to exercise the powers conferred upon it for the purpose of selling or distributing light, heat, power or electricity in cities, towns or villages unless the company has first obtained the consent of the municipality by bylaw to that effect.

Mr. HUGHES. Could not they sell to some one who would step in and sell?

Mr. PARDEE. They cannot distribute without a by-law.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, they can.

Mr. PARDEE. I think not.

Mr. HUGHES. I would remind the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) that in the London Bill the other day, we put in a special clause to cover that very point.

Mr. PARDEE. I think it was entirely surplusage—it merely cumbered the Bill. My hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. S. Sharpe) talks about the gravity of the situation and about natural resources. Within the four corners of this Bill, waterpowers are not mentioned. This is nothing more, and it is nothing less than a transmission line, pure and simple. You say, this is part of a larger scheme. But this committee must recollect that, if the company incorporated by this Bill cannot get the power to distribute—and, as I understand it, they have to come to this parliament for that—then the whole Bill is absolutely of no use to them. How, then, can the public be prejudiced, how can any one's rights be interferred with by the granting of a charter for a transmission line alone? So far as the Hydro-Electric Commission is concerned, it is very well to say that for six or seven years they have been contemplating coming in. I venture to say that, so far as the municipalities affected by this Bill are concerned, you will not find one man in fifty—not one man in a hundred—who, if there is a chance of having power transmitted by a bona fide company, will not hold up both hands for it. No municipality would think for a moment of getting in the road of competition in the distribution of electrical power, the same as competition in anything else. There is no reason why the Hydro-Electric Power Commission should be in a position to say to the people of this eastern portion of the province that they will come or stay away as they please, but that, in the meantime, even though a bona fide company comes and proposes to distribute the power this parliament shall not grant the necessary authority. As to this argument of a dual system why it answers itself. Whether dual, treble or quadruple

—the more competition you have the better for the people. I submit that, so far as the argument against this Bill is concerned, my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. S. Sharpe) and my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) in their endeavour to find objection, in their supersensitiveness to objections, have really bumped into each other. This Bill was objected to as vigorously as possible in committee.

My hon. friend from North Ontario told us, to use his own terms, that the Conservation Commission would protect the rights of the people. The Bill went to the Conservation Commission; we had no objection to that. It came back with a letter, which the hon. gentleman has read, from the chairman of that commission. And the hon. member (Mr. S. Sharpe) himself says that with one exception, the provisions of the Bill were cut out. It is true, nearly the whole Bill was cut out. But we felt that, if the Conservation Commission thought these clauses should come out—that there was danger, that there was something lurking here not visible to the naked eye—we would take out these provisions. And we did take them out, down to the last suggestion in the letter of Mr. Sifton, the chairman of that commission. Surely, we have gone as far as it is possible to go. Every objection has been met, and every right safeguarded. The promoters of this Bill are asking nothing in the way of waterpower, they are not touching the natural resources of Ontario, they are here simply asking for a transmission line to run through certain counties and cities, And if they get the current to transmit, well and good, if not, so far as I can see, it is absolutely their own lookout.

Mr. EMMERSON. I desire to say a word here, largely for the purpose of securing information. I have not followed the Bill; I was not a member of the committee before which it was heard and considered. But I had supposed that this Bill was a preliminary to some other Bill that might, within the very near future, be brought under the consideration of this House. That is, I had supposed that this parliament would have under consideration at this session a Bill which would be a counterpart of a Bill passed by the legislature of the state of New York. Now, what I wish to know is this: Is it not within the knowledge of some hon. members of this committee that the authority to dam the St. Lawrence is at this moment held by a company, which company is associated with this power transmission company?

Mr. J. D. REID. Same crowd.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I understand it, some time in the nineties, a company was incorporated by the parliament of Canada with power to dam the St. Lawrence, and that this company did exercise its powers in part. They have built a dam, and have generated power, and the Cornwall canal, and other establishments in that vicinity are to-day enjoying, I believe, the benefits accruing therefrom. We have heard, in times past, in this parliament a great deal of discussion with respect to that company, and concerning contracts entered into between them and the government of Canada. And, if I understand it, that company is a part and parcel of this company, and that the danger in connection with this Bill is because the parliament of Canada has already given the powers to generate electrical energy by damming the St. Lawrence, and that the original company has since changed hands. That company, I understand, did not have the powers necessary for the transmission of the energy in many directions. Therefore it is they come here for these large powers which they consider requisite and in connection with which they will exercise the powers already given by this parliament. The point to which I would invite your attention in this debate is this: I have in my hands a copy of the Bill passed by the New York state legislature, and when we know that in giving these powers to a company having the same purpose in view they insisted upon that company only exercising that power for a consideration, I wonder why it is that the parliament of Canada is willing to grant this stupendous franchise for nothing. You say that is not involved in this Bill. I say that it is, because if there is any ground for suspicion that this privilege is to be exercised in conjunction with a company that we incorporated years ago in this parliament, it is time this parliament should halt and inquire how far the powers which we then gave to that original company are to be exercised. That great American company, in the exercise of their powers must pay into the state of New York a large sum of money annually. The very first tax upon them is $10,000. The purpose of the Bill is thus set forth:

An Act to incorporate the Long Sault Development Company, and to authorize said company to construct and maintain dams, canals, power-houses and locks at or near the Long Sault island for the purpose of improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence river and developing power from the waters thereof, and to construct and maintain a bridge, and carry on the manufacture of commodities.

Now that is the company which is incorporated by the state of New York. It can exercise all the powers and rights that they wish in connection with that portion of the River St. Lawrence which flows over American territory. They could not come over across the boundary line into the Canadian waters of that river, and therefore it was necessary for them to secure the same powers in this parliament. I apprehend

that they soon discovered that there was a company that had all the powers that were necessary and that were granted at a time when the full exercise of those powers was not realized. Now, as hon. members who live down in that section will know much better than I do, there has been a dam constructed by that company on the Canadian side. If they will refer to the original Act they will find that company has powers which are still unexercised and which may be exercised in connection with other dams. For instance, they have a power—I am now speaking subject to correction, because I have not studied the Bill—they have power to construct a dam in connection with this company which has been incorporated by the state of New York. A company incorporated a few years ago by this parliament has the power to build in conjunction with the American company a dam for its purposes on the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. They have no such power.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed they have. I am informed that those powers have been granted by this parliament. If that is a fact, I cannot vote for this Bill, because I see lurking in it a menace to Canadian interests. If, however, it can be shown to me that this is merely a transmission line for power that may be generated under the authority which they are yet to secure from this parliament or some other legislative body then I would not have any great objection to this Bill.

Mr. PARDEE. They only have the right to import, not to export, even suppose they had those powers he speaks of.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see no advantage in it.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend misapprehends my point. Not with respect to expropriation, because that is regulated; even though they had the power, I understand that could be regulated. If the parliament of Canada can realize that they had granted powers which they did not contemplate would be exercised in the way that it is now proposed to exercise them, then it is time for us to consider how far we should supplement the powers which we have already given to a company which controls the rights which were granted by the parliament of Canada twenty years ago.

An hon. MEMBER. How does this Bill affect that?

Mr. EMMERSON. If that company got certain powers by that original Act to dam the St. Lawrence, but has no power of transmission in Canada and cannot exercise that power without our supplementing it, and giving through the medium of this Act advantages and franchises which are of value, then we can well understand why they are coming here now and seeking these privileges. Therefore I say that this parliament should hesitate, they should at least enact this legislation with their eyes open. If it were true, and could be demonstrated to parliament that, without realizing the full extent of the powers which they gave in the Bill of 1901—I think that was the year.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The hon. member for West Lambton would be able to tell us what the date was.

Mr. PARDEE. About 1894.

Mr. CARVELL. It must be ten years ago. There must be some limitation to it.

Mr. EMMERSON. They have exercised their rights and they have built a dam.

Mr. PARDEE. There is no dam there.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman may be confusing that with the contract that was given to M. P. Davis and Company, for all the surplus power of the Cornwall canal for 84 years, and which was entered into about 1896. There was a renewal when the present government came into power. It was for 21 years, and it was renewed for four times, and although he had control of that power he could not distribute it without the power to construct a distribution line. It may be in connection with that, although there is another power company in addition to that.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is another power company in addition to that, a dam was built, the company is in existence to-day, and I am informed that it is controlled by this great American syndicate that have acquired permission from the legislature of New York state, and are now seeking powers from this parliament to enable them to complete their great scheme of controlling the powers of the St. Lawrence river in connection with the Long Sault dams. If these facts are true, surely we, as a parliament, should have respect enough for ourselves to hold our powers in as high esteem as the legislature of the state of New York place upon the powers that they have to grant. When the scheme is consummated, and when they construct these dams and create these powers what will be the result? The state of New York will be receiving annually a very large sum of money from the company. The province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada will not get one cent —no, they will not even get 'thank you'

for it. This company of American capitalists will simply laugh at the parliament of Canada for being so guileless as to grant these powers without a thought as to the full effect and force of the powers that they have thus granted. That is the point I raise and it seems to me we should hesitate in a matter of this kind and at least learn as to whether there is a basis for these statements which are openly made. I had heard of opposition to this measure. I had read in the Toronto papers and the papers of Canada generally of the opposition to this transmission power Bill. I could not understand why there should be such serious objection to the incorporation of a company of this character for the purpose of transmitting power. If they had no power to transmit they would have to purchase it from somebody else. But that did not involve interference with the waters of the St. Lawrence. It in no way affected anybody's rights to transmit this power. They had to acquire it, they had to purchase it from somebody and distribute it. I therefore assumed that the objection to the Bill arose from the fact that there was in contemplation an application to the parliament of Canada along the lines of the successful application that was made to the state legislature of New York for a consideration, and that the applicants would be here seeking the powers which were given to their sister corporation in the state of New York.

Mr. JAMESON. In what year was the power given by the legislature of New York state?

Mr. EMMERSON. Several years ago. Reference can be had to it in the statutes, but I have a typewritten memorandum in regard to it

Mr. BRODER. Are these the people that propose to construct a dam at the Long Sault?

Mr. EMMERSON. At the Long Sault, I did not think that this transmission Bill was a dangerous Bill until information came to me from a reliable source. I was not interested, I am not now in any way interested in the matter only as a member of this committee, and therefore I have no connection with it. But information came to me to the effect that this transmission power company had rights in connection with the St. Lawrence under powers that were granted to a former company, a company which they now control, and which will be incorporated as part of their scheme in connection with this transmission power company, should they secure legislation from the parliament of Canada. If there is any truth in it, if there is any basis of foundation for these statements, then I say that it would be the duty of every Canadian to say: No, we will not grant to you gentlemen these powers that you want; we, it is true, granted to you certain powers in connection with the building of dams on the St. Lawrence, but we did not contemplate that anything of this kind would take place; we did not contemplate, when we gave you these powers, that it would result in interference with the navigation of the St. Lawrence, which will be effected as a national scheme; we did not take that into consideration; you have all these powers given to you for this purpose that are no good to you unless you get this supplementary legislation that you are coming here and asking for; it is true that we might impose upon you terms such as the New York state legislature imposed upon you, but we are going to hesitate to grant you any of these powers until at least a full and complete understanding is had with respect to the objects that you have in view, what your purposes are, how far you propose to interfere with that international stream, and how far you propose to affect Canada in relation to her position as a co-user of the waters of the St. Lawrence. These are matters of supreme moment, these are matters which the government of Canada certainly should take into consideration before this Bill takes many steps forward in this parliament. If there is nothing in what I am stating, if these statements that are made by men of responsibility, are not true, then, of course, it is only a question of the incorporation of a transmission power company which is stated to have been properly safeguarded by the committee. But I think it goes further, and I think that lurking about it is a something that shows, when there is so much interest in it, and when there are so many great American capitalists interested in it, that this Bill is worthy of inquiry on the part of parliament, that this parliament should hesitate before taking a leap in the dark, before committing itself to the disposal of powers that will be used to the advantage of a foreign country and to the detriment of our own.

Mr. BRODER. I wish to make a few remarks in reference to this Bill. There has been a good deal said about the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario. The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) seems to know just what they are charging here, there and everywhere. He must have got his inspiration from the hon. member for Rainy River. That hon. gentleman has locked horns with that commission in Port Arthur, and I think he came out of the struggle with the horns off. The people there had a chance to pronounce on his scheme in connection with the Ontario and Michigan Power Company and the Hydro-Electric Commission. Port

Arthur pronounced against him, and defeated every candidate he put up in January to try and further his interests. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) is not a good judge of matters in Ontario. His information has come from the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), and he is prejudiced against the commission.

I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to say that this company which they are proposing to incorporate shall have powers paramount to the powers of the province of Ontario or any other province. Why should they give a body corporate, composed of a few individuals whom they may not know at all, a preference over the property of the province and leave the province nothing to say about it at all? The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that New York state had legislated in regard to the damming of the Long Sault. While the state of New York has legislated, it is also necessary for the federal authorities of the United States to legislate before the river can be dammed there. But while they respect state rights on the other side, and the federal authorities say to the state: You must first legislate, and we must then give concurrent legislation, hon. gentlemen opposite will ride rough shod over the rights of the province and not allow a word to be said. There is the difference between the two countries. The province of Ontario should have something to say in regard to this, and should be free to say that some fee shall be charged for that water. What is the policy in regard to water-powers in Ontario, where the province has control? The provincial authorities say to the individual who wants a water-power: Yes, you can have a lease of that water-power for so much rent a year; that rent will start at once, and unless you develop within a certain time your lease will be cancelled. That is why hon. gentlemen come here to get Bills granting water-powers; they want to get away from the laws of the province of Ontario which protect the peoples' rights.

Every one knows that this Bill is simply the forerunner of something bigger, and every one who saw the Bill when it was first submitted to the Private Bills Committee, realizes that this company propose to ride rough-shod over the peoples' rights to this extent that they did not intend to respect those rights if they could get the power to override them. They proposed to go right across the territory represented by a few of us who strenuously opposed the measure, to cut down trees, dig ditches or conduits, put in poles without consulting the people. So we have a perfect right to look with some apprehension on this legislation. There is no doubt it is part of a bigger scheme. They talk about the great public interests. Look at the company having control at Milles Roches. There has been a development there, and they get $63,000 a year for lighting the canals and running the gates for this government. The peoples' rights are very much respected by these gentlemen. At Milles Roches, a village two miles from the power-house, I am told the people are paying 40 cents a month for a 16-candle power light, that is $4.80 a year. In my little village, where the people own the plant, we get a 16-candle power light for $1 flat rate. We have a right to look into this matter and to attempt to protect the peoples' rights. It is all very well for the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) to talk about the Hydro-Electric Commission. Does any one dispute the statement that they have caused the price of power all over the province to be decreased owing to their policy? If there is a reason for the power costing less under that commission, it is because of the overhead charges. If several municipalities apply to the commission and put up the transmission line in common, it means that the power will cost less than under other circumstances.

Mr. CARVELL. Then you force every one to come under the Hydro-Electric Commission and make it a monopoly?

Mr. BRODER. You are making it much dearer. I think the province should have a right to say whether these people shall be permitted to put up poles or towers on property of the province. Subsection 4 of section 11 provides:

> Wherever in the Railway Act the word 'land' occurs, it shall include any privilege or easement required by the company for constructing or operating the works authorized by this Act, under, over or along any land, without the necessity of acquiring a title in fee simple.

Is that a fair thing, to say that these people shall run their lines over head over any man's premises without being obliged to buy the right of way?

Mr. PARDEE. Read subsection 6 of that clause.

Mr. BRODER. That does not overrride this.

Mr. PARDEE. Yes it does.

Mr. BRODER. Then we might strike out clause 4. There have been lawsuits in Montreal with the Power, Heat and Light Company to determine this matter. There should be no doubt as to the rights of individuals over whose lands they pass. The ordinary man in the country cannot go to law with a great corporation with millions behind it. For that reason, it seems to me it should be made so plain that there would be no doubt as to the rights of the

company so far as these matters are concerned. If a motion is not moved by some one else, I shall propose one later that will amend clause 12. It seems to me that the right of the provinces in respect to property under their control should be protected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I merely wish to enter my earnest protest against the Bill passing in its present form. It certainly interferes with provincial and municipal rights, and the Hydro-Electric Commission are opposed to it. The chairman of the Conservation Commission has been utterly opposed to it, and very few of the clauses which the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) gave us to understand were struck out in compliance with that request seem to have been struck out. In the Hydro-Electric Power Commission's report No. 4, on page 21, will be found a table of estimated annual charges, on fully developed generating plants in the very same towns through which these lines are liable to pass.

Transmission of Power.

In connection with the hydraulic developments in the Ottawa Vallay and that portion of the province bordering on the St. Lawrence river, four transmission schemes have been considered, viz., one, 20,000 volts, three phase, from Iroquois through Prescott to Brockville; one, 30,000 volts, three phase (scheme A), from High Falls through Perth and Smiths Falls to Brockville, Prescott and Carleton Place; one, 20,000 volts, three phase (scheme B), from High Falls through Perth and Smiths Falls, terminating at Carleton Place; one, 20,000 volts, three phase, from Fountain Falls through the Cobalt mining district, terminating at Haileybury.

In the following estimates, the use of high class wooden poles with concrete bases is assumed, the telephone line being mounted on the same poles.

It gives a thorough estimate of the cost of the line. The commission has at present under consideration a proposition similar to that contained in the Bill which it is sought to force through the House. The member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) in his wisdom, told the people of Ontario what they should do about this matter, and he said the town of Galt would have to pay $5 per horse-power. If you will turn to the first report of the Hydro-Electric Commission you will find that the cost of twenty-four horse-power in the town of Galt for the full load would only be $17.35, for three-quarters load $17.79, and for half load $19.90. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) also said that the town of Stratford would have to pay $75 per horse-power, and no doubt he was prompted to say these things by some of his friends on the other side, because you will not find many men in Ontario who will get up to condemn the action of the Hydro-Electric Commission, and their splendid administration of their affairs. Now, in Stratford the cost of twenty-four horse-power for a full load is $20.48, for a three-quarters load $21.41, and for half a load $24.04. The above cost of power is based on the estimated rate of $12 per twenty-four horse-power per annum for high tension power at Niagara Falls. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) to these facts just to show that his statement is absurd.

Mr. CARVELL. Is the Hydro-Electric Commission selling a single horse-power at Stratford at the prices quoted by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman knows they are not in a position to sell power up to the present time, but that is a carefully prepared estimate by expert engineers of the cost at which these different municipalities will be supplied, and on which they have accepted the building of a transmission line. The hon. member for Westmorland stated that he had in his possession a Bill which was passed by the New York legislature showing that they had absolute control of water-powers in that state, and along the boundary line. Why should the people in the province of Ontario be interfered with in this regard and why should they not expect that a reasonable amount of money should be collected from these transmission lines. I quote from 'Hansard' the speech of the hon. member for Westmorland:

I have received, on an application which I made some weeks ago, a copy of a Bill passed by the legislature of the state of New York, being 'an Act to incorporate the Long Sault Development Company, and to authorize said company to construct and maintain dams, canals, power-houses and locks at or near Long Sault island, for the purpose of improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence river and developing power from the waters thereof, and to construct and maintain a bridge and carry on the manufacture of commodities.' Having a copy of that Bill in my hand, I will call the attention of the committee to this fact, that in the very inception the company is required 'to pay into the treasury of the state the fixed sum of $10,000, and in addition to the payment just mentioned, the company shall pay into the treasury of the state for the year 1910 the fixed sum of $15,000, and for the year 1911 the fixed sum of $20,000. For each year after 1911 the said corporation shall pay at the following rates upon the average amount of electrical horse-power generated during such year under the authority of this Act, that is to say: upon all amounts up to 25,000 electrical horse-power, at the rate of 75 cents per horse-power; upon all amounts in excess of 25,000 electrical horse-power and up to 100,000 horse-power, at the rate of 50 cents per horse-power; upon all amounts in excess of 100,000 electrical horse-power, at the rate of 25 cents per horse-power. In case said corporation shall generate or develop water-power as mechanical power without transmuting the same into electrical power, then for so much of said

water-power as may be developed payments shall be made at the above mentioned rates per mechanical horse-power.'

Well, that is a practical common sense business arrangement, and the province of Ontario is perfectly justified in claiming, so far as the transmission of power to that section of the country is concerned, that they should have something to say in regard to what they would like to collect from that company, and, how they would like to control the transmission of power in that district. I shall certainly vote against the Bill as it is at present framed.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I beg to inform the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) that the estimates that have been quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) were carefully prepared by the engineers of the Hydro-Electric Commission, and since then contracts have been let by the Hydro-Electric Commission, and it is found that they will be able to supply these municipalities with power at a cost much less than that estimated by the engineers. I have here the St. Lawrence Power Company's Act of incorporation, 1901, and I call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) to this clause:

The company may—

(a) manufacture, use, supply and dispose of electricity, water and gas, and water, hydraulic or other power by means of wires, cables, pipes, conduits, machinery or other appliances; and construct, maintain and operate works for the production, sale and distribution thereof, and for the purposes aforesaid may construct, acquire, use, maintain and operate canals, water courses, raceways and water-powers in or adjacent to the St. Lawrence river, on the north side thereof, at any points eastward from Hoople's creek, in the county of Stormont, in the province of Ontario, to the eastern end of the Soulanges canal, and construct dams, wing-dams, sluices, conduits and buildings in connection therewith: provided that the works hereby authorized shall not be commenced until the plans thereof have first been submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council;

(b) acquire patent rights, letters patent of invention, processes, options and other rights and privileges and again dispose thereof;

(c) manufacture, acquire and dispose of pulpwood, pulp or the products thereof;

(d) manufacture and sell calcium carbide and all products produced in its manufacture; acetylene gas and other gases and products manufactured from calcium carbide;

(e) manufacture and deal in all minerals and the by-products thereof; construct furnaces, ovens and retorts for the reduction of such minerals;

(f) construct tramways, wharfs, docks, offices and all necessary buildings, and purchase, hire, build and repair vessels required for the business of the company;

(g) construct, acquire and operate by electricity, steam or other motive power, vessels for the transportation of passengers and freight, or towing of barges or other vessels in the River St. Lawrence and the lakes, canals and rivers connected therewith.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

That gives them all the power they want. I understand the St. Lawrence Power Company have disposed of their rights and interests to the promoters of this Bill. When we read section 9 of the Act of 1901 we can learn why the present promoters are not applying for an extension of the rights under this Act of 1901, and it is for the simple reason that the Act of 1901 provides that they shall not exercise rights in any municipality without first obtaining the consent of the municipality. Section 9 reads:

9. The company, for the purpose of constructing and maintaining its works may, with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over the same, enter on any highway, square or other public place, and as often as the company thinks proper, may, with the like consent, break up and open any highway or public place.

Under the Act of 1901 they must get the consent of the municipality but under the Bill now before the House they will have expropriation powers without the consent of the municipality. So we can readily understand why they are not asking for an extension of powers under the original Act of 1901. They are simply a subsidiary company getting distribution powers under the Railway Act and with full powers to expropriate, which they could not obtain if they were to ask an extension of these powers. They could in that case only exercise these powers and privileges with the consent of the municipalities. In view of the many objections raised, not only by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) but by many others, I think that this Bill should be referred back to the private Bills committee for further consideration. I move therefore that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH (Stormont). I desire more particularly to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Westmorland because he is labouring under an entire delusion as to what has occurred. He is under the impression that this company had obtained the power to build dams and had actually constructed them. There is no foundation for that statement. It never acquired any power to build a dam, it has no power to dam any part of the St. Lawrence river, and has not built any dam. The dams to which my hon. friend refers are the famous Sheiks island dams which are a part of the Cornwall canal, and were constructed by the Dominion government. The construction of those dams and the building of the Cornwall canal developed incidentally a certain amount of water-power. That water-power belongs to the Dominion, as a part of the Cornwall canal, and was leased by the Dominion government to the St. Lawrence Power Company.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is not that owned by this company?

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. No, it is owned by the Dominion of Canada and is held under lease. The water-power generated by those dams in the Cornwall canal is under lease to this company.

Mr. EMMERSON. And the company is owned by these parties.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. They have no right to generate any other power except what is developed by the construction of these works by the Dominion government. My hon. friend might just as well refer to all the other powers leased along the Cornwall and Welland canals. At the town of Cornwall, the various mills have obtained by lease from the Dominion government water-powers which are developed by drawing water from the canal. The St. Lawrence Power Company do the same thing. They draw water from the canal at a point further up and discharge into the river.

Mr. CONMEE. What do they pay?

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. $1,000 a year That was a bargain entered into by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power. The dams were constructed during the regime of the Conservative party, and were leased to Mr. Davis prior to the change.

Mr. BLAIN. And renewed by the present administration some years ago.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. Yes. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Bill obtained from the New York State legislature authorizing a certain American company to dam the St. Lawrence, and he assumes that that confers upon that company the power to dam a portion of the St. Lawrence. That is not the case at all. It requires the assent of the federal government of this country coupled with the authority of the State of New York, to authorize the damming of the St. Lawrence, because the St. Lawrence is a navigable stream.

Mr. S. HUGHES. Does the hon. gentleman not know that there is a Bill at present before the House of representatives confirming the law of the State of New York and the damming of the St. Lawrence—Bill No. 14531.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. I do not see how that affects the argument. The federal government at Washington and the New York State government combined could not dam the St. Lawrence without the consent of Canada. Canada must be consulted.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Canada has been consulted and has given her consent.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. No, she has not. The only application made to Canada is the application which is before the International Waterways Commission. This company has applied to the joint commission for a recommendation, so far as that commission can give it. The International Waterways Commission has been investigating that application for some two years. The proposition was first referred to a certain board of engineers to investigate and report. That board reported that the plan was feasible, but the International Waterways Commission is still considering the question. It is to hold shortly another sitting and take further evidence and proposes to have further investigation by engineers. The result is that there is no danger whatever, such as the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) contemplates, of any power being given for the damming of the St. Lawrence without first obtaining the consent of this parliament.

Mr. BRODER. This International Waterways Commission is supposed to pronounce either for or against. Their decision will only affect our legislation because the Americans are acting independently of it. Have they not already got the consent of their own branch of the commission?

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. I understand that the American branch of the commission have reported to their authorities in favour of the scheme and that may affect the American federal legislation. But the Canadian branch has not, and the Canadian branch is conducting this investigation. What the final report may be, nobody knows; but no matter what may be the report of the commission, that has no effect as law. Nothing can have effect without the consent of this parliament, so that there is absolutely no danger of this damming scheme becoming the law of this country or of any one obtaining the privilege of damming the St. Lawrence until a Bill to that effect passes this House. The present Bill is solely for a transmission line. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the company expect to get power to transmit over this line through this particular scheme. No doubt if they succeed in obtaining the consent of parliament to dam the St. Lawrence, they will. But they can get the power elsewhere. Power can be developed from the Long Sault rapids without this scheme going through in its entirety, and for that reason the transmission line may be a necessity and may be useful, quite independent of the scheme of damming the St. Lawrence. A very large amount of power has already been developed at this point. There is the power scheme first started by English capitalists in American territory. The Americans did not object at all to English capital going in and developing their own power. The Englishmen were unfortunate enough to lose all their money, and the works they had constructed went over to a new company. That work has been completed and a very large development is taking place from the Long Sault rapids. A considerable development is taking

place on the Canadian side by means of the works of the Canadian government, and further development is possible without the actual damming of the river, but the large scheme would be carried out by the damming of the St. Lawrence. For that reason I do not see why hon. gentlemen should be so much alarmed about the effects of this Bill. The Bill itself can confer no other rights than are contained in it, and those are simply and solely for the construction of a transmission line from Montreal to Kingston. I do not see why the Ontario government should be consulted. As will be seen at once, the Ontario government, and the branch of that government known as the Hydro-Electric Commission, take the stand that any opposition to their schemes or their possible schemes should not be allowed by this parliament. And if they can stop any other scheme, no doubt, with the views they entertain, they will stop it. It was admitted by Mr. Staunton, when arguing in the Private Bills Committee on behalf of the Ontario government, that that government claimed the right of property in the bed of all streams. They claim that they own the soil under the bed of the St. Lawrence river. That is confirmed, I believe by the Privy Council. There are several streams that would have to be crossed by this line, and the provincial government could, under the amendment suggested, step in and say: You must not plant a pole in the bed of that stream; you must not lay the foundation of a tower. And, entertaining the views they do, that every possible scheme in opposition to the Hydro-Electric Commission must be squelched and killed, it follows, as a matter of course, that, under the amendment proposed, this scheme could be nipped at many points between the boundary of Quebec and Kingston.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. member name a stream that would require a pole in the middle of its bed?

Mr. ROBERT. SMITH. Yes, at the city of Kingston, crossing the mouth of the Rideau river.

Mr. HUGHES. The Rideau does not flow there.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. What is the stream there?

Mr. SMITH. There is Cataraqui creek; you could jump across it.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH There is the one over which a bridge about a quarter of a mile long is carried, the bridge that the troops have to cross in going from the city of Kingston to the camp ground.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is not a hundred feet wide.

Mr. S. HUGHES. It is not fifty.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. There is a very long bridge there.

Mr. HUGHES. There is no line across there.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) perhaps, does not understand that is not the only right the government might have. If the Ontario government own the bed of a stream they have a right to prevent a line crossing that stream in the air. You cannot run a line, as a matter of law, across a man's land without buying that right, even though it does not touch his land. The same principle would apply to the property of the Ontario government in the stream.

Mr. BLAIN. Why should the Ontario government's rights be interfered with?

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. For the same reason that the Ontario government's rights are not considered when any other great national undertaking is going on. For instance if we wished to build a railroad from Montreal to Kingston, we would not consider the Ontario government. And the transmission of power to-day is growing as important to the people as the building of a railway. And, when we have a transmission line that is of national or interprovincial importance, the parliament of Canada has the power to provide for that line, and they ought to exercise that power in their discretion.

Mr. TURRIFF. This appears to be a larger question than we understood that it was when the discussion began. I happen to be a member of the Private Bills Committee and I attended rather regularly when the Bill was under discussion, and I want to confess that we did not get anything like all the information that was necessary, for I have heard a great deal to-night and have received a great deal of information on this subject, much that we did not get in the Private Bills Committee when the Bill was cut down very materially from the shape in which it was introduced. The only point I want to make is with regard to the statements made by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). The hon. member himself does not say absolutely that those statements are correct, because he does not know of his own knowledge. But he says that he has what he considers reliable information, and it is to the effect that this original company was started in 1901, was given certain powers in connection with the damming of the St. Lawrence river, powers that might not be given to-day, in the light of

what we know now of the value of water-powers and of the facility with which power may be sent for long distances. Though this Bill does not deal with water-powers but simply proposes a transmission line—yet if, by passing this Bill, we enable that company, that big American company, which now owns the charter granted in 1901, to do something we would not grant power to do to-day, and if in the meantime they having carried out the provisions of their charter, then I say the hon. member for Westmorland is right and that we should hesitate about passing this Bill until we find out exactly the position in which this House stands. Far be it from me to seek to prevent any company or body of men from coming and developing the natural resources of this country. But here is an American concern that has privileges got from this parliament, privileges that, when accorded by the legislature of the State of New York for that side of the river will be upon the condition of the company paying $20,000 or $25,000 a year. If half the power got by damming the St. Lawrence belongs to Canada, I say we should hesitate before giving our half for nothing when the American side is being paid for at the rate of perhaps $25,000 a year. What I suggest is that we do not go on with the Bill at present, but either refer it to a special committee or send it again to the Committee on Private Bills for the purpose of ascertaining exactly the position of the matter and for the purpose of ascertaining whether the statements made by the hon. member for Westmorland are correct or not. I think that the promoter of the Bill will make greater progress if we are given an opportunity to understand exactly the position we are in with relation to this Bill.

Mr. HUGHES. I understand that the New York State Legislature has already passed an Act to authorize the construction of that dam, and that there is now a Bill before the United States House of Representatives, Bill (No. 14531) to confirm the Act of the New York State legislature—whether that Bill will pass or not is a matter of concern to many. Under the terms of this Act, how is the St. Lawrence river to be controlled? The great navigable portion of it is controlled by one lock, and the bed of it is to be handed over to the state of New York for ever, so that the growing navigation of the St. Lawrence river is to be practically handed over to the control of a monopolistic company for the generation of electrical power from which the state of New York will get a few thousand dollars a year, the Ontario nothing, and this government, I suppose, nothing but a little rake-off for politics. There is the situation as I am told it is. I would like the hon. member for Westmorland to look at this aspect of the case and tell us whether it is or is not true that by coupling up this company with the existing company and taking advantage of the New York and Washington legislation they can have the power to dam the St. Lawrence river. These gentlemen are worth watching. There is no great hurry in passing this Bill. It will stand over certainly for another session, and even this session long enough for this matter to be looked into. If this company can, under this Act, take possession by expropriation of the bed of the St. Lawrence river as far as the Ontario government owns it, and if they can control the waterway by expropriation, as they can under this Act, to the centre of that river, then the navigation of that river is closed in perpetuity. Every year that St. Lawrence river is a highway, traffic is increasing in volume, the navigation of these rapids is absolutely safe at the present time. Such a thing as a vessel of any size being wrecked is unheard of. More and more navigation requires that this river should be kept open and free. Now I maintain that in the interest of the province of Ontario, in the interest of the Dominion of Canada, in the interest of the St. Lawrence river, and in the interest of good fellowship with the United States, there should be no legislation passed here that will permit the damming of that river. We want to live in amity with our friends across the river, we want to stand shoulder to shoulder with them in promoting the interests of humanity the world over. But if these interests are permitted to get into the hands of private companies, it will bring discord, it will tend to breed dissension. That reason alone should be sufficient to prevent any such measure going through this House. It is a matter well worth looking into. The gentlemen who are behind this scheme have placed $2,000,000 for promotion. Now what promotion means I do not know, perhaps some one can tell us. But I am informed that $2,000,000 in capital has been set aside for promotion, and perhaps that explains the energy with which this Bill is being pushed through. At all events, I want this case to stand, and if it does not stand, then I want the rights of the province of Ontario to be guarded.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know that it adds to the strength of the opposition to this Bill to impute motives to those who are in favour of it. My opposition to this Bill is based entirely upon public grounds. I stated I had been informed that those who were seeking this legislation proposed to exercise the powers which would be granted them, in connection with certain other powers which they have secured, and that if they did so it would be a detriment to this country, and an advantage to the industrial world in the United

States. Now I think every word that has been uttered since I expressed these fears, and every act that has been cited, confirm the views I expressed, and the fears I entertained. Now my memory has been refreshed. I recall that away back in the 90's Mr. M. P. Davis secured a lease from the government of Canada for certain water-powers in connection with the Cornwall canal. Subsequently, after 1896, when the present administration came into power, that lease was renewed and wider powers were given.

Mr. SPROULE. And extended from twenty-one years to eighty-four years.

Mr. EMMERSON. Renewed and perhaps extended. Subsequently Mr. Davis had a company incorporated, to wit, the St. Lawrence Power Company, and he transferred all his rights and privileges granted to him under the lease which he had from the government of Canada, to the St. Lawrence Power Company. Then he entered into a contract with the government of Canada to sell them certain lighting privileges on the canals of the St. Lawrence. He enjoyed the privilege of that contract for a number of years. Subsequently, if I am correctly informed, the St. Lawrence Power Company assigned to certain other parties their rights, and M. P. Davis and his associates mentioned in this Act of 1901 do not now control the contract, and the lease in connection with the Cornwall canal.

Mr. HUGHES. How much did they receive for selling it?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not going to inquire into that, it is not germane to the question. The point is that all the rights contained in this Bill of 1901 are owned and enjoyed by a company that is associated with some great capitalists in the United States. Now, not only did they have the power under this Act in 1901 to secure, acquire, use, maintain and operate canals, water courses, race ways and water-powers, in or adjacent to the St. Lawrence river, on the north side thereof, but they have also the power to construct dams, wing dams and sluices, and buildings, in connection therewith. They have all the powers they require. I am going to read for the benefit of this committee, and in order to put it on 'Hansard' for the benefit of the people of this country, the powers which this great corporation enjoy on the American side of the line, in conjunction with the powers which they have secured or may secure on this side of the line, and the contrast between the conditions imposed by the American legislation and those which we do not impose, is certainly an appalling one.

Mr. NESBITT. Is that Bill of 1901 still in force?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, the Act of 1901 is in force. It has been exercised, and the company built the dam, and that is the company that holds the lease. It is called the dam of the St. Lawrence Power Company. Not only that, but they have the lease, which was granted to M. P. Davis. Now who are the incorporators in the Act of 1901? Michael Patrick Davis, Duncan Byron McTavish, D'Arcy Scott, Robert J. Devlin and William Hepburn Kerr, all of the city of Ottawa. These leases are held in the name of that company to-day, and that company, as I understand it, is owned and controlled not by the individuals whom I have mentioned as being the incorporators, but by gentlemen who live south of the boundary line. This is:

An Act to incorporate the Long Sault Development Company, and to authorize said company to construct and maintain dams, canals, power houses and locks at or near Long Sault Island, for the purpose of improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence river and developing power from the waters thereof, and to construct and maintain a bridge, and carry on the manufacture of commodities.

The people of the state of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:—

Section 1. Michael H. Flaherty, Frank S. Smith, Henry H. Warren, Walter F. Willson and John C. Crasper, and all such persons as are or may hereafter be associated with them, and their successors, are hereby constituted a body corporate and politic by the name and style of the Long Sault Development Company, for the purpose of erecting, constructing, maintaining, operating and using, in connection with the St. Lawrence river, a dam or dams, a canal or canals, a reservoir or reservoirs, and a power-house or power-houses and works appurtenant thereto, at or near Long Sault island, in the county of St. Lawrence, and of erecting and constructing a lock or locks, and works appurtenant thereto, at or near the same place, all for the development of electrical power and energy, and the permanent improvement of navigation on the St. Lawrence river at and above and below said place; and also of constructing and maintaining a bridge upon or in connection with said works, and of carrying on the manufacture of commodities with the said power.

2. Said corporation shall have power:

(1.) To have perpetual succession.

(2.) To have a common seal and alter the same at pleasure.

(3.) To acquire, by grant, gift, purchase, devise, bequest or other lawful means, and to hold and dispose of such property as its purpose shall require, subject to such limitations as may be prescribed by law.

(4.) To appoint such officers and agents as its business shall require, and to fix their compensation.

(5.) To make by-laws not inconsistent with any existing law, for the management of its property, the regulation of its affairs, the

transfer of its stock, and the calling of meetings of its members.

(6.) To borrow money and contract debts, when necessary, for the transaction of its business or for the exercise of its corporate rights, privileges or franchises, or for any other lawful purpose of its incorporation; and it may issue and dispose of its obligations for any amount so borrowed, and may mortgage its property and franchises to secure the payment of such obligations or of any debt contracted for said purpose, subject in all respects to the provisions of section two of the stock corporation law.

(7.) Said corporation shall have all the other powers, privileges and franchises now or hereafter conferred by the general stock and business corporation laws of the state of New York.

3. Said corporation shall have the right to erect, construct, maintain, operate and use all such dam or dams, canal or canals, reservoir or reservoirs, gates, sluices, trunks, pipes, bulkheads, piers, flumes, abutments and other works appurtenant thereto, as may be proper or useful for the purpose of the development of water-power, and of electrical power and energy therefrom, at such point or points upon or adjacent to the south shore of the St. Lawrence river, near Long Sault island or Barnhart's island, and upon the said islands, or either of them, and between said islands, and between said islands or either of them and the shores of the said river and Sheik's island (but not across the international boundary line unless consented to by the Dominion of Canada) as may be selected by said corporation, and also in and upon so much of the said river and the bed thereof as lies to the south of the international boundary line, at or near Long Sault island or Barnhart's island, either independently or in connection with like works now erected, or to be erected, in so much of said river and the bed thereof as lies to the north or Canadian side of said international boundary line, and upon and adjacent to the northerly shore of said river; and to erect, construct, maintain, operate and use a power-house or power-houses, and conductors, cables, wires, insulators and other appliances in connection with the said works for the development of electrical power and energy; and also to take and use the waters of said rivers at and above the points of location of said works heretofore authorized, and to construct and maintain upon, over and in connection with said dam or dams and other works, a bridge or bridges across or partly across the St. Lawrence river, with the approaches thereto, for the use of foot passengers, animals and vehicles, and to charge reasonable rates of toll for passage thereon; the said rights being granted upon the express condition that said corporation shall make just compensation to all persons injured by the exercise of the rights and privileges heretofore granted, and that said corporation shall also erect and construct a lock or locks as may be required by the United States of America, and shall provide electrical power or energy for the maintenance, operation and use of said lock or locks, free of charge, and shall in all other respects perform, fulfil and abide by all and singular the conditions and provisions of this Act, and also of an Act of the congress of the United States relating thereto, and also upon condition that the rights hereby granted shall never be so used as to impair or obstruct the navigation of the St. Lawrence river, but, on the contrary, that such navigation shall be preserved in as good condition as, if not better than, the same is at present, regard being always had to the amount of the natural flow of water in said river as affecting its navigability from time to time.

4. After the congress of the United States shall authorize the construction of dams, locks and canals hereby authorized and after the payment by said corporation into the treasury of the state of the fixed sum of ten thousand dollars, the commissioners of the land office shall, upon application of said corporation, grant unto it the title and interest of the people of the state in and to lands under the waters of the St. Lawrence river to be covered or occupied by said works and locks and power-houses, provided, however, that any of the lands of the state which may be so conveyed to said corporation shall be forfeited and title thereto shall revert to the state unless the same are actually used by said corporation and covered by its dams, canals, reservoirs, gates, sluices, trunks, pipes, bulkheads, piers, flumes, abutments or other works appertaining thereto, or are necessary to the enjoyment for said purposes of any lands so used or covered, within fifteen years from the conveyance thereof by the commissioners of the land office to said corporation under authority of this Act, and in consideration of the conveyance so made under the authority of this Act, as well as for the rights and privileges hereby granted, the said corporation in addition to the payment aforesaid shall pay into the treasury of the state for the year nineteen hundred and ten, the fixed sum of fifteen thousand dollars, and for the year nineteen hundred and eleven, the fixed sum of twenty thousand dollars. For each year after nineteen hundred and eleven, the said corporation shall pay at the following rates upon the average amount of electrical horse-power generated during such year under the authority of this Act, that is to say: Upon all amounts up to twenty-five thousand electrical horse-power, at the rate of seventy-five cents per horse-power.

Upon all amounts in excess of twenty-five thousand electrical horse-power and up to one hundred thousand electrical horse-power, at the rate of fifty cents per horse-power; upon all amounts in excess of one hundred thousand electrical horse-power, at the rate of twenty-five cents per horse-power. In case said corporation shall generate or develop water-power as mechanical power, without transmuting the same into electrical power, then for so much of said water-power as shall be so generated or developed, payment shall be made at the above mentioned rates per mechanical horse-power.

In determining the average amount of electrical horse-power generated and the average amount of mechanical horse-power generated or developed in any year, for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid to the

state, no day nor hour during which the works of said company are not in substantial operation shall be included in the total time for which such average is to be determined as the average for the year. In case the amount which would be payable at the rates aforesaid for either of the years, nineteen hundred and ten or nineteen hundred and eleven, upon the average amount of power generated during such year shall exceed the fixed sum hereinbefore required to be paid for such year, the said corporation shall also pay the amount of any such excess; and if for any year after nineteen hundred and eleven the amount payable at rates aforesaid is less than twenty-five thousand dollars, then said corporation shall pay for such year the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars instead of the amount that would be payable on or before the first day of February in the following year, and within ten days before the same shall become payable the said corporation shall deliver to the state engineer and to the state treasurer a verified statement showing the average amount of electrical horse-power generated, and the average amount of mechanical horse-power generated and not transmuted into electrical horse-power, by said corporation under the authority hereby granted, during the year ending on the thirty-first day of December next preceding the date of making such statement. The books or other records of said corporation, showing the amount of power so generated, and its works and plant shall at all times be open to inspection and examination by the state engineer for the purpose of verifying or disputing the correctness of any such statement.

The state engineer may prescribe the form of records to be kept by said corporation, and the character of measuring instruments and devices to be used and a reasonable standard of the accuracy thereof and the methods by which said accuracy is to be determined. Said corporation shall keep such records and shall provide and use such instruments and devices and have the same tested accordingly.

If any dispute shall arise in respect to the amount payable for any year at the rates aforesaid the court of claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the same.

In case the said corporation shall fail to pay any amount due hereunder within sixty days after the same is payable as herein provided, in addition to any other remedies which may exist by law, the rights and privileges hereby granted may be forfeited.

The payments above specified are based upon the assumption that the said corporation, under the authority of this Act, subject only to the lawful control of the United States government, may use for the purposes herein specified, at the places herein mentioned, all of the waters of the St. Lawrence river south of the international boundary line, but in case said corporation shall at any time be compelled to make any payment to the Dominion of Canada or the province of Ontario——

Mark this: They contemplate that Canada and Ontario would insist on a payment for the use of that water.

In case any said corporation shall at any time be compelled to make any payment to the Dominion of Canada or the province of Ontario for the use by said corporation of any portion of said water to generate power as authorized by this Act, said corporation shall be entitled to an equitable readjustment of the rate of compensation to be paid to the state for that portion of the said water for the use of which said corporation shall be compelled to make payment to said dominion or province.

They contemplate that Canada and Ontario would insist on a payment for the use of that water. We are going to give them our water and their own as well and they pay the State of New York. The State of New York is fair enough to say in its enactment that they expect the Dominion of Canada will look after its own interests and that there will be an equitable adjustment.

Such readjustment shall be made by arbitrators, one of whom shall be appointed by the said corporation and one by the governor of the state within thirty days after the receipt by him of written notice of such appointment by said corporation, and in case of their failure to agree the two said arbitrators shall choose an umpire. The decision of the arbitrators, or of the umpire, shall be made in writing, in duplicate, one copy shall be filed with the state treasurer and one delivered to the said corporation; such decision shall be final and binding on both parties, and from and after a date to be fixed therein, payments shall be made in accordance therewith, and pending such decision payments shall be made for each year at the rates aforesaid.

5. Said corporation may at any time, with the consent of the holders of at least two-thirds in amount of its capital stock at the time outstanding, given in writing or at a meeting of such stockholders duly called for that purpose, sell or convey all or any portion of its property and assets, and the franchises and rights appurtenant thereto, upon such terms as may be consented to as aforesaid, but subject always to all the conditions and provisions of this Act.

6. The existence of said corporation shall be perpetual.

7. The capital of said corporation shall be one million dollars, divided into ten thousand shares of the par value of one hundred dollars each; but said corporation shall not begin business until two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, par value, of the capital stock shall have been actually subscribed and paid for in cash, nor until the organization tax provided by the general laws of the state of New York shall have been paid to the state treaurer; and upon any increase of said capital stock such tax upon such increase shall also be paid.

8. The number of directors of said corporation shall be five. Said directors shall hold office for the term of one year after their election, and until their successors are elected and qualified. Michael H. Flaherty, Frank S. Smith, Henry H. Warren, Walter F. Wilson and John C. Crapser shall be the directors of said corporation for the first year and until their successors are elected and qualified. The first election shall be held on the first Monday after the third Thursday of February, in the year nineteen hundred and

eight. Any vacancy in the board of directors occurring before the first election shall be filled by vote of the remaining directors. The number of directors may be increased as provided by law.

9. The said corporation shall begin the work of constructing its dam pursuant hereto within one year after the congress of United States shall authorize the construction of dams, locks and canals hereby authorized, and in case such construction shall not be so begun the grants, rights and privileges hereby granted may be forfeited.

10. This Act, and all the terms, conditions and provisions thereof, shall apply to the successors and assigns of the incorporators named in the first section hereof.

11. This Act shall take effect immediately.

Certain powers are granted the company by the legislature of the State of New York. We have granted certain powers. There can be a holding company that can assemble all these powers, control the whole of the waters there and all the water-powers, and I apprehend that would not be a Canadian holding company but would be a company originating in the United States and composed of gentlemen of great capital in the United States. It is true that under our law there can be no exercise of these powers on the St. Lawrence even by a company incorporated by this parliament unless the plans were filed and met the approval of the Department of Public Works. I apprehend that has been done with respect to the works which that company, that is the St. Lawrence Power Company, have already constructed. I apprehend that when they come to exercise the powers which they seek and require to exercise they can take this Act and under its authority can prepare additional plans and go to the Department of Public Works, and if their plans are approved of, they can have a complete system controlling the water-powers of the St. Lawrence, with everybody at their mercy in that vicinity and for a long distance removed from there. It seems to me that this legislation is such, taking into consideration all that it involves, all that it seems to involve, all that it may involve of which we do not at this moment know, that it is right and just and proper for this committee to now hesitate, to say we shall require further information, we shall require to know more as to the purposes of the company to see whether it is proposed to have an amalgamation. It is true the legislature of the State of New York did not have the full powers to enable that company to exercise all the rights that they require. They have to go to the Congress of the United States, the federal authority, but they do it there by legislation. We have done it already, we have legislated in this regard. We, in all such cases under the general powers given to the Public Works Department, authorize that department to have a control, to give their approval to grant a license practically for the exercise of any powers which we may have enacted in behalf of any company. I say that for these reasons, if there were no others, I would oppose this Bill. I would not wish to have any question arise in a matter of this kind as between the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada. There is no necessity for anything of that kind. It is something that is beyond even the question of provincial and federal rights, it is something that affects the citizenship of Canadians, that might injure or might protect the business interests, the industrial interests on our side of the line, and if there is a possibility in that regard, if there are any dangers, if there are any hopes, surely we should guard against the dangers and we should preserve the hopes of the people of Canada.

Mr. ROBB. Has the State of New York power to sell the water-powers along the St. Lawrence river tributary to the State of New York?

Mr. EMMERSON. The New York legislature exercised rights which under the constitution belongs to them; they have the ownership in the soil under the waters of the St. Lawrence south of the international boundary, and by virtue of that ownership they assumed to exercise legislative authority in connection with the powers granted to this company. The congress of the United States controls the navigation and the international aspects of the river, and congress would not permit the exercise of these powers without granting legislation supplementing the legislation of the state of New York, and approving of it.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. Does the hon. gentleman contend that the authority of the state of New York, plus the authority of the United States government, would enable that company to dam the St. Lawrence south of the international boundary line without the consent of Canada?

Mr. EMMERSON. That question does not arise in connection with this legislation, but I admit most unquestionably that in the case of navigable waters and international streams the consent of the government of Canada must be first had. But what I say is: these people can do us no injury by reason of the legislation they have already secured from the United States or by legislation which they may secure. That can only become a menace and a peril to our conditions by reason of whatever unwise legislation we may pass here, and by reason of the action of the Dominion government. But we must not place the whole responsibility on the government, we have the responsibility as legislators ourselves. It seems to me that

whereas we in the past may have given powers which we did not contemplate would go so far, that now when we are called upon to supplement these powers we should hold the reins in our own hands and say that they cannot have these additional powers unless there is a full and complete understanding with respect to the exercise of them.

Mr. HUGHES. Does not the United States federal legislation make the erection of a dam conditional on similar legislation being obtained from Canada?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is to be found in the Bill I have read.

Mr. BLAIN. When this Bill was first introduced it was evidently thought to be an innocent measure, but now the hon. member for Assiniboia admits that many new phases of the Bill have presented themselves even to-night and which were not considered by the Private Bills Committee. The Bill we are now considering is a second reprint, which is conclusive proof that the Private Bills Committee found it necessary to eliminate some of the powers sought by this company in the original Bill, and consequently it demands careful consideration at the hands of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite would lead us to believe that the Ontario hydro electric commission only proposes to furnish power to western Ontario, but I commend to them the fourth report of the commission, in which they will find that in the St. Lawrence district (eastern Ontario) the commission proposes to supply power to six municipalities, in the central Ottawa valley district to 13 municipalities and in the upper Ottawa valley district to 7 municipalities. While, up to the present time the hydro electric commission and the Ontario government have concentrated on the development of the Niagara power it must be remembered that they intend to extend their operations in the interest of the people to every part of the province. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) suggested that the hydro electric commission and the Ontario government were making an effort to compel municipalities to come under the commission, but I would mention to my hon. friend that the option has to be submitted to the voters of the municipalities before they can have the right to receive power from the hydro commission, and, therefore, the whole thing rests with the municipalities themselves. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) spoke about monopolists, but I would remind my hon. friend that there are two kinds of monopolists. There are private individuals who are constantly coming to this House endeavouring to get control of public utilities in their own interests, and there are the other monopolists like the province of Ontario who seek to develop and utilize our natural water-powers in the interest of the whole people of the province, and without any idea of making gain for themselves. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that this is the foremost plank in the platform of the Ontario government. There are 107 members in the legislature, and although the government have a large majority, there is yet an active and enterprising minority led by an able man, and not one of that minority has ventured to say a word against the continuance of the hydraulic electric power commission and its efforts in the interest of the people of Ontario. There was some little criticism in the legislature as to details, but there was no opposition to the principle. Let me remind these gentlemen opposite also that a general election has taken place in the province since the Ontario government had the courage to adopt that as a plank in their platform, and that the government of the province has been sustained by the people by an overwhelming majority. I, therefore, contend that the provincial government should be consulted in matters of this kind, and that applies not only to the government of Ontario but to the governments of all the provinces who are anxious that the rights of their provinces should be protected. The Liberal party in former days claimed to be the great champions of provincial rights, but we have not heard so much about that claim since they became all powerful at Ottawa.

However I do not wish to introduce that phase of the question for discussion. What I want to point out is that it is high time the Dominion and the various provincial governments should come to some agreement in order that the rights of the people, both provincial and Dominion, should be protected, and protected not in the interests of men who come here from time to time seeking charters in order that they may sell them again. All these matters should be carefully considered, not alone by this government, but by this government in negotiation with the provincial governments, and not have the time of this House and its committees wasted upon these constant discussions regarding federal and provincial rights. This is a matter which should be settled between the provincial and Dominion governments. A clause should be put in all these Bills to provide that no charter granted by this parliament should be sold without the sanction of the Governor in Council. That would put a stop to some of the bartering and sale of charters. But if we allow Bills of this kind to pass, we are encouraging this kind of business and it will continue. I want to enter my protest as strong as possible against the granting of these important

privileges without taking every precaution to protect the public.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think my hon. friend, who is usually very logical in his remarks, intended this evening to draw the discussion away from its legitimate bounds; but evidently the result of his argument has been to waste one and half hour of our time in discussing the merits of the proposed Long Sault power question now before the Railway Commission. We are not discussing the building of a dam across the St. Lawrence. That is not involved in this Bill. The promoters are simply asking for the right to build a transmission line. They could not say that they are going to get their power from the St. Lawrence Power Company. They may get it from the Beauharnois canal or any where else they can. They simply ask the right to deliver power to the municipalities along the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. J. D. REID. They said in the private Bills committee they were going to get their power from the St. Lawrence Power Company.

Mr. CARVELL. I cannot help what they said in that committee, but I want to tell the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. S. Hughes) that I have not received, and do not expect to receive, any portion of that $2,000,000 we are told was set aside for promotion purposes. I am not a member of the private Bills committee, and I simply take the Bill as it came from that committee and is now before the House. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) did not take the cue which the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) gave, although the hon. member for Westmorland was doing yeoman service. He was trying to draw the attention of the committee away from the real point and divert it to the Long Sault question. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) gave his attention to the Hydro-Electric Commission, and that after all is the bogie at the bottom of the whole thing. It is a question whether the people of Ontario are to have any electrical development except what is controlled by that commission. I want to refer for a moment to the Act cited by my hon. friend from Westmorland, the Act of 1901. My hon. friend said that a gentleman of some authority informed him that the intention was to link up the St. Lawrence Company of 1901 with this company. I have read over this Act pretty carefully, and I find that by section 8:

The company may—manufacture, use, supply and dispose of electricity, water and gas, and water, hydraulic or other power by means of wires, cables, pipes, conduits, machinery or other appliances; and construct, maintain, and operate works for the production, sale and distribution thereof, for the purposes aforesaid.

And by section 13:

The powers granted by this Act shall cease and be null and void unless works of the company capable of producing at least 1,000 horse-power are completed within three years from the passing of this Act, and notwithstanding anything contained in any Act of parliament.

My hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Smith), who ought to know surely what he is talking about because he represents the constituency immediately concerned, says that this company has never spent a dollar and never built a dam and never created a water-power.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. If my hon. friend will allow me—

Mr. CARVELL. True they have built a power-house along the Cornwall canal and they are leasing water from the government, but they have not created one pound of water which would generate electricity. They have done nothing but build a plant with certain wheels and machinery in it and they get their water from the canal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that all the powers given in the Act of 1901 have become absolutely void?

Mr. CARVELL. If we are to believe the statement of the hon. member for Stormont, (Mr. Smith) that Act of 1901 is void.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But I understand that the company is supplying power to the government to-day.

Mr. CARVELL. But not under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under what Act then?

Mr. CARVELL. They have not complied with the requirements of section 13.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The result of that is that all their powers have ceased and are absolutely void. What I desire to draw the attention of my hon. friend to is this, that that does not seem to be consistent with the situation as it exists at present, because that company is actually supplying power to the government, and it has not authority to do so except under the Act of 1901. Therefore I can hardly come to the conclusion that all the powers given it are void, since the government have actually made a contract with it.

Mr. CARVELL. As I consider this section, they have not complied with it:

The powers granted by this Act shall cease and be null and void unless works of the company capable of producing at least 1,000 horse-power are completed within three years from the passing of this Act, and notwithstanding anything contained in any Act of parliament.

They have not complied with those requirements. However I do not think that makes much difference.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. There is no doubt that the company have complied with the Act. What was contemplated was that this company should construct a power-house which involves also the cutting of the bank so as to lead the water from the canal into the power-house and the constructing of a tail race to let the water into the river after it strikes the water-wheels. Also it was intended to develop what was known as the Hooples creek scheme. That consisted of digging a canal from the power-house some ten miles inland and conducting the water from the Sault rapids into the Hooples canal. That part has not been done.

Mr. CARVELL. I was just going to say that, as I view this case, it makes no difference whether the rights granted under this Act are null and void or not, because there is not in this Bill any evidence whatever that there is any intention of linking up with this company. I want to come to the argument of the hon. member for Westmorland.

Suppose it were provided in this Bill that the company now seeking incorporation might make an agreement with the St. Lawrence Power Company, with the right to purchase electricity—go even further than that, and suppose that they get the right to join up with the company organized by the legislature of the state of New York, and, if you will, dam the whole St. Lawrence river—wherein would the people of Ontario be injured by carrying out the scheme proposed by this Bill? Wherein would the people of any part of the Dominion be injured? I do not care if you admit that we are going to bring electricity from the state of New York into Ontario and Quebec and distribute it in Montreal, Prescott, Brockville, Kingston and other places up and down the St. Lawrence, does that hurt anybody in Ontario? I may not understand what the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) means. Section 12 of the Bill prohibits the exportation of electricity. They are only given the power to buy electricity and distribute it. I do not care whether they buy it from the New York company, from the St. Lawrence Power Company, or whether they have to go down to the Beauharnois canal and get it there. The people along the St. Lawrence want electrical energy, and this company wants the power to transmit it. It is said that if the old company is in existence, under section 8 they can transmit power. I think the statement of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. S. Sharpe) is correct, that they would have to get the authority of the municipalities before they could go through their borders. Under this Bill, we are taking the modern method, provided in a good many cases by the Railway Committee, and asking that the operations under this Bill be governed entirely by the Railway Commission. If they want to go through a municipality, they must go to the municipality and try to make a trade; if they cannot do that, then the Railway Commission is empowered to make the conditions on which they shall go through. Let us get away from this Long Sault proposition that my hon. friend from Westmorland brings up so industriously; let us get away from the idea that we are going to export electricity; let us get away from the idea that under this Bill we are going to produce electricity. These things are not in the Bill. When we come down to the Bill we find that it is for the organization of a company to buy electricity where they can get it, and to distribute it to the people on the St. Lawrence, who are sorely in need of these facilities. I think hon. members are travelling far afield when they attempt to bring up such propositions as that of my hon. friend from Westmorland, unless they take the ground of my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) who is quite consistent——

Mr. EMMERSON. I desire to ask a question. Is the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) not aware that owing to the topography of the country, all the power on the St. Lawrence would be on the American side, and that that is the reason this transmission company want to import power—that the whole power will be generated on the American side?

Mr. CARVELL. So much the more reason for having this Bill. If you cannot generate power on the Canadian side, are you going to say that the people on the St. Lawrence shall not have power because it has to be imported?

Mr. HUGHES. If the object is to create a dam.

Mr. CARVELL. I say that, if the hon. member for Westmorland is right—I do not believe he is—and we cannot create power on the Canadian side, so much the more need for this Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not say that. I say that, by reason of the topography of the country, the effect of the works here proposed would be to throw the generating of the power to the other side. I remember that, a year ago, when I was in Massena, which is right near the Long Sault rapids, it was pointed out to me that under the legislation the people on that side of the line were going to get, the whole advantage of the proposed dam on the St. Lawrence, and they said that we ought to look out for it.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend admits now that there can be some power develop-

ed on the Canadian side. If that be true, why should not the people along the St. Lawrence have the right to use it?

Mr. EMMERSON. This company does not intend to do it.

Mr. CARVELL. Of course not. This company intends to transmit power. Now, I come to my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain). I say he is consistent. He does not try to draw a herring across the trail as does my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson). He comes out like a man, plump and plain, and says that the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission intend—sometime within a hundred years, I suppose—to come down and develop water-power, and distribute it, and therefore nobody else should be allowed to get in—let the people get along without these utilities until the Hydro-Electric is ready to serve them.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) has overlooked the reports of the Hydro-Electric that are in circulation.

Mr. CARVELL. That is not the first report sent out in the way of a prospectus that has not fulfilled what is propnesied. Let me tell my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) that this talk about hoping to sell power in Galt and Stratford at $20 or $21 means distribution at a central station. Let me give two illustrations. Down home, or rather just across the border, in the state of Maine, in the town of Halton, they are buying electricity at two and a half cents a kilowatt hour, but it costs the people ten cents per kilowatt hour for their electricity. The difference goes in the cost of distribution. In the towns of Perth and Andover, in the constituency of Victoria, N.B., the electricity costs four cents at the station, and costs ten cents when it is distributed. When you talk of the price of delivering at the station, that is not a criterion of what it will cost to distribute it to the people.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not the hon. member know that in the face of such things as he is stating, the people have voted strongly in favour of the Hydro-Electric power?

Mr. CONMEE. They were deceived.

Mr. BLAIN. The people of Fort William were not deceived.

Mr. CARVELL. I am ready to leave these two hon. gentlemen to fight that out, while I get back to the Bill. The object, as I have said, is to distribute electricity, and to give the people the benefit of this utility. I contend that the measure ought not to go back to the committee, and it ought not to be subject to what the province of Ontario might decide. For, as as pointed out by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Robert Smith) the moment a proposition of that kind is put in the Bill the Ontario government would find means to destroy the enterprise.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. member think that the state of New York is justified in demanding, and receiving from the Long Sault power the large sums of money they are receiving from year to year, and that the province of Ontario should not receive any remuneration?

Mr. CARVELL. Under this Bill, the price at which this commodity should be distributed, and sold, is in the hands of the Canadian Railway Commission. If you place a big royalty upon it, the people will have to pay that much more for it; if you do not place that much royalty the people will get it for less.

Mr. CONMEE. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the statements made by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). With regard to the Bill of the state of New York, to which he has referred, I understood him to approve of that Bill. I would like to know whether that is the case—is it a Bill that he would approve of it either in Ontario, or the Dominion parliament passed it? Would the hon. member oblige me with an answer?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know that it is involved at all in my argument, as to whether I do approve, or do not approve. One thing I do approve of, and that is, if we grant these powers to a private company, I approve of the action of the state of New York in imposing obligations upon them. They are not doing it for their health, they are not going to the legislatures for these powers for any other interest except their own. They propose to make money out of it, and I think it is right that the province, and the Dominion, in granting these franchises should impose obligations.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend has brought in a Bill, and has placed it on 'Hansard,' and has given it a certain amount of approval. Now I do not think that my hon. friend nor any other member can approve of that Bill. I say that between that Bill and the legislation which we are passing from day to day, and the legislation in the very Bill under consideration, there is no comparison in the public interest. Under that Bill the state of New York gets about $30,000, and then they get a small percentage per horse power per annum. There is not a word in the Bill that protects the people of the state of New York either as to prices, or hours of service, or conditions of service. There the water-power is alienated from the people of the state for a paltry sum, and put into the hands of a private company. When you put in the

Bill before us a condition that the Board of Railway Commissioners, the high court which the government has established for the protection of private interests as against railway or other companies, shall control the rates to be charged, then you put in conditions that conserve to the people the benefit of these great facilities. There is no comparison as regards the public interest between the legislation in the state of New York and the legislation which we are considering here.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend say that the company has the right to fix their own charges in the general Bill of the state of New York? The private company to which my hon. friend refers has no right to fix the charges, they are fixed under a general law of the state of New York. My hon. friend understands that very well.

Mr. CONMEE. No, I do not understand it that way, if that is the case it is of recent date, but the reverse. I know that by a report made a couple of years ago by the president of the United States, wherein he pointed out that that was the weak point in the legislation of the various states of the union, that it should be guarded by the federal power, and upon that very ground he vetoed the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company's Bill, which was a federal Bill. Let me point out to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) wherein I think he and other hon. gentlemen are not consistent. We had a Bill to-day that was severely criticised because it had a provision to allow the sale of a surplus of electricity in the case of a railway. That was criticised for several hours, and no sooner had it passed than the hon. gentleman passed another Bill which had on it the name of a prominent gentleman who is leader of the opposition in the Senate (Mr. Lougheed) a canal Bill, in which were all the powers my hon. friends are objecting to in this Bill. I have in my hand an Act, chap. 128, to incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship canal. Hon. gentlemen spent the whole afternoon criticising a Bill having the same powers, they voted for in that Bill, which gives power to sell in the province of Ontario power generated from the St. Clair river and the St. Clair lake, and to exercise all the powers to which they are objecting now.

Mr. HUGHES. Does it give them all the rapids on the St. Clair river?

Mr. CONMEE. I cannot answer that question. It gives them power to generate electricity from the St. Clair river and lake, to sell it and to distribute it.

Mr. SPROULE. How could they get power in a canal where there are only two locks, one at the commencement and one at the other end, where there is no fall at all?

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend knows very little about power, or he would not ask that question. Where you have a lake such as Lake St. Clair to supply the power, and where you have the privilege of making a conduit, there is no limit to the power you can generate except the capacity of the lake to supply it. Now if it is the policy of the hon. gentleman opposite that when one of their friends has a Bill it goes through, no matter what powers it carries, but when some one else has a Bill it must wait for the Hydro-Electric Commission, I do not think that is a sound policy, either in the interest of the Dominion or of the province of Ontario.

Mr. STEWART. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) said that members on this side of the House who are opposing this Bill are guilty of some crime, because they say that it is in the interest of this country that the line should be built by private companies. I want to tell him that if he goes into a municipality and submits that question, and endeavours to satisfy the ratepayers that they are better off in the hands of a private company than in the hands of the Hydro-Electric Commission, he will find himself badly left. I know that in the city of Hamilton, where we have the largest power producers in the province, the question has been submitted three or four times to the ratepayers, and has been carried in favour of the Hydro Commission nearly three to one every time. The hon. gentleman also said that the horse-power was going to cost $75 per horse-power from the Hydro Commission. He has not proof for that statement, it is mere imagination on his own part; his figures is about three times as high as they ought to be. In the city of Hamilton our contract provides for $17.92 per horse-power. Power is $9.42 at the Falls, and $8.52 goes to make up the cost of the trunk line, the loss in transmission, building the plant in the city, and in other ways bringing the power right to the motor ready for use.

Mr. CARVELL. What do the people of Hamilton pay for electric light, and until what hour?

Mr. STEWART. They pay many different prices.

Mr. CARVELL. What is the average price?

Mr. STEWART. There are as many as three dozen different prices charged in the city of Hamilton.

Mr. CARVELL. I ask the hon. gentleman a fair question. What do the people pay?

Mr. STEWART. I cannot tell you how they make their charges but I paid somewhere in the neighbourhood of $30 per

year for light for my house, which I consider very high. I pay $35 per horse-power in Hamilton to-day and I only use the power for eight hours. If I were getting my power from the Hydro-Electric Commission I would be paying $17.92 and only paying for the power for eight hours while under the present arrangement I pay $35 for eight hours. We were paying $85 per lamp for our street lighting for ten years in the city of Hamilton which claims to be the electrical city of the Dominion. Since the Hydro-Electric Commission has been inaugurated we are getting it for $47.50 per lamp.

Mr. CARVELL. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in my town, which is a company town, we are only paying $35 per year per lamp.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know anything about your service, but I know that the Hydro-Electric Commission is entitled to the credit for the cost of lights being reduced from $85 to $47.50. We have been paying anywhere from $35 to $40 per horse-power. The Cataract Power Company offered to give us power for $16 per horse-power and ten per cent less than the commission's price, no matter what it may be. Still, in the face of that the rate-payers would not take their offer but turned it down three to one. Surely, you do not mean to tell me that you would advise the people of this country to place themselves in the hands of a private company and pay their price for power when they could get their power from the Ontario government at cost price. Not only that but the Ontario government can borrow money at a less rate than any company can get it for, and surely the Ontario government is in a position to furnish power cheaper than any private company could furnish it for. I will venture to say that if you put a clause in to provide that this company should furnish power at cost price to the consumers you would not get anybody to come and ask us for a Bill of this kind. I said that we paid $17.92 per horse-power. Toronto pays $18.10 and Toronto gets 10,000 horse-power while we only take 1,000. If we were to take 10,000 horse-power the same as they do in Toronto our power price would be cut down about $4. Neither you nor anybody else can tell us what Stratford's power price would be unless you know how many horse-power they will take. If they took 500 horse-power the price would be in the neighbourhood of $30 perhaps $29, but it would not exceed $30 or $31. You cannot say that it would be possible to get any better prices than those which I have stated here because the Ontario government has employed the best engineers that could be got in this country to make these assessments and valuations, and the cost of trunk line, copper wire and all those things has only been a trfle over half what the estimate was. As it is we are getting power at $17.92.

Mr. CONMEE. Do I understand that the prices that the hon. gentleman is quoting are prices that the consumer has to pay for power in these different cities?

Mr. STEWART. The price I am quoting is the price that we pay for power. If the municipality sees fit to charge its customers a profit it can do so.

Mr. CONMEE. My question was if that was the price after they have distributed it or is that the price in bulk?

Mr. STEWART. It will cost $17.92 delivered from the motor to any customer in the city of Hamilton.

Mr. CONMEE. That is at the power station?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. CONMEE. Does my hon. friend know what it will cost to distribute that to the consumer?

Mr. STEWART. Along the trunk line through the heart of the city it will not cost any more than that, but where there are lines at a distance leading to factories it will cost more. Will it not cost more by your company too? You cannot carry it along fences and sidewalks; no matter what power it is, you require a line to carry it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the question is put I would like to say that if this Bill involves the damming of the St. Lawrence, interference with navigation or a possible alteration in that great inland waterway, it is a very large proposition. I believe that the question is at the present moment before the Waterways Commission. It appears, however, according to the argument of the hon. member for Westmorland, that it is involved in the very Bill that we have before the House. The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) referred to section 8 of the Act of 1901. The hon. member for Westmorland and other hon. members have asserted that that charter is now controlled by the gentlemen who are promoting this Bill. The hon. member for Carleton referred to section 8 but he did not refer to the important part of section 8. The important part of section 8 is this—I will eliminate the immaterial words

The company may construct canals and water-powers in or adjacent to the St. Lawrence river, on the north side thereof, at any point eastward from Hoople's creek, in the county of Stormont, to the eastern end of the Soulanges canal, and may construct dams,

wing-dams, sluices, conduits and buildings in connection therewith.

There is power to construct a canal and water-power and to construct and maintain dams in connection with them.

Mr. McCOLL. Dams upon the St. Lawrence?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will read it again:

The company may construct canals in or adjacent to the St. Lawrence river, on the north side thereof, at any point eastward from Hoople's creek, in the county of Stormont in the province of Ontario, to the eastern end of the Soulanges canal, and may construct dams, wing-dams, sluices, conduits and buildings in connection therewith.

I understand that legal opinions have been given by gentlemen of very high rank in the profession to the effect that under that power, coupled with the power contained in the Bill which has been passed by the legislature of New York, a dam may be constructed and maintained across the St. Lawrence from the Canadian side to the United States side. I do not know whether these powers are sufficient for that purpose. It would require one to investigate the locality and to apply the words of the statute to the physical conditions before he could come to a very definite or sure conclusion as to that. But, at all events the argument is a plausible one, the argument has been made, and legal opinions have been cited in support of it. Well then, if that be the case, the proposal before the House at the present time, embodied in this Bill, is to confer certain powers on the company now proposed to be incorporated which already controls these powers contained in the Act of 1901, and which, therefore, upon the passage of this Bill, would be in a position to control all necessary legislation on the Canadian side, the legislation on the other side having been secured or the company having made application therefor. It would seem to me that these considerations might very well give the government some concern, and I would not think it advisable that the committee should pass this Bill until the government are in a position to announce their policy in regard to it, and say whether or not, particularly in view of the applications before the Waterways Commission, they should give their sanction to legislation which would have that result.

Something has been said as to the rights of the province of Ontario, and hon. gentlemen have been inclined to make rather light of the position of Ontario. The people of Ontario, through their government, have decided that they will embark upon the project of undertaking the development of water-powers in that province and supplying power to the people of that province at cost. By what warrant should the parliament of Canada undertake to give any corporation power to interfere with that project? Is there any good reason in the public interest which can be adduced in favour of such a proposal? The people of Ontario having decided through their legislators, and government that it is in the public interest of that province that water-powers in the province of Ontario should be developed not by private corporations for gain, but by the people of the province in order that every person requiring power in that province should receive it at cost, is it within the fair purview of the parliament of Canada to pass any legislation which will interfere with that project? If any other province in Canada should enter upon and establish the same policy is there any good reason why the parliament of Canada should empower a corporation created for gain to interfere with a public utility of that kind proposed to be carried on by the province itself in the interest of the people of the province? And not only does this Bill propose to do that, but according to hon. gentlemen who have viewed this proposal with favour, the province of Ontario is to have its own lands expropriated, lands which it may require for the purposes of this project, and is to have its own scheme of development interfered with in order that a private corporation may be enabled to make money out of the expropriation of those lands, and out of the scheme carried on by that expropriation. Assuming that the parliament of Canada possesses such a power, it should not be exercised. The people of any province in Canada having determined to enter upon a project of this kind, a project of development of their own natural resources in the interests of the people of the province, should not have that project interfered with in any way by legislation passed by the parliament of Canada in favour of those who seek to develop the same water-powers for the purpose of gain. Such legislation would seem to me to be most undesirable for this parliament to embark upon, and yet if the argument of hon. gentlemen is correct as to the powers of this parliament, that certain result would follow.

The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, (Mr. Carvell) referred to the desirability of granting these powers, because he said it might result in the creation of power on the United States side which would thus be imported into Canada, so giving to the people of this country greater opportunities of obtaining power than would otherwise be the case. So far as the development of power on the Canadian side or the United States side of the

St. Lawrence river is concerned, it seems to me that would depend a great deal on where the dam is constructed. You might construct a dam on the St. Lawrence at one place and find the power nearly altogether on the American side; you might construct it at another place some distance away, and find that the power would be developed on the Canadian side. So I would not agree in the view that it is eminently desirable to pass this legislation, because under it the power to be created will be created on the United States side, and not on the Canadian.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend misunderstood my statement. I made no such statement. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) stated that from his knowledge of the location the power would be developed on the American side. I said: So much the more necessity for this, if you cannot get the power on the Canadian side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I apologize if I misunderstood my hon. friend; that is the way I understood his reference to the statement of the hon. member for Westmorland. It seems to me this consideration is another reason why we should not be too hasty about this legislation. If the St. Lawrence is to be dammed to create power —and as to the expediency of that, as at present advised, I would have a great deal of doubt,—I think it might be important to come to a conclusion as to the best place in the interests of the country for building such a dam and creatig power, for the very reason to which I have just alluded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I understand my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) aright, his principal objection to this Bill is that in some way it would be interfering with the project of the Hydro-Electric Commission of the province of Ontario.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say that was the principal one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If that were so quite a strong argument could be presented, but has any one suggested that the Ontario government or the Hydro-Electric Commission propose to develop this water-power?

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No one has suggested that; it does not appear in the report that they propose to develop this power and the complete answer to the suggestion is that the Ontario government has no power on earth to develop this water-power. It is a power contained in a navigable river which, under the British North America Act, is obsolutely under the control of this parliament. Another insuperable objection is that it is an international river, and no power can be created there by the building of a dam unless that dam extends all the way across the river into American territory and I do not think any province has power to engage in the construction of a work which of necessity extends outside of the limits of the province. Therefore, for two reasons, neither the Ontario government nor the Hydro-Electric Commission created by it would have power to engage in this work, first because it is a navigable water, jurisdiction over which rests absolutely with this parliament, and secondly, because it is an international river, and for that reason the legislature of the province of Ontario would have no authority over it.

Mr. SPROULE. Then how did they get it at Niagara?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do not, they rent from a company incorporated entirely outside the Hydro-Electric Commission.

Mr. HUGHES. A provincial charter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They got a provincial charter, but if I mistake not they came to this parliament and also got it confirmed. But the reason, and the only reason, why they were enabled to go ahead there, was that they leased the ground from the Park Commission. Then there is no dam at Niagara Falls.

Mr. SPROULE. It being an international stream the minister would say that power could not be developed by the province and I ask how it was done there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because the works there are wholly on the Ontario side. Here it is proposed to erect a dam and the same must extend across the river in order to develop power. The Ontario legislature could not, in my judgment, authorize the construction of a dam to connect with a dam on the American side, because it would be all one work and beyond the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario. Neither could it authorize an obstruction in a navigable river. I do not deny that the Ontario government has constructed works for the development of water-powers in navigable waters. In that respect, I think—and it is worth the attention of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) who dwells so strongly on provincial rights—in that respect, I think they have encroached upon the jurisdiction of this parliament and have sought to do what this parliament and this parliament alone can do. It does seem to me that I ought to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this Bill does not profess to give any authority to develop water-power upon the St. Lawrence or anywhere else. It merely incorporates a company for the purpose of distributing electrical energy.

Mr. BRODER. Don't you think the Bill should say where they intend to get the electric current from?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so. Before they commence operations the plans must be approved by the Governor General in Council, and the Bill will only come into operation by proclamation.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the minister state there is no proposition here to develop power along the St. Lawrence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in this Bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Read subsection 5 of section 11.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These expropriation powers would be the power to string wires and place poles, but not the right to develop water-powers.

Mr. HUGHES. Has not the power to be obtained from the St. Lawrence river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is not a word in this Bill which gives authority to develop water-power along the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not the minister think they will develop their power on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This Bill simply enables them to rent from another company which may develop power.

Mr. BLAIN. Where does the minister think they will get their power?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My own idea is that they will get their power from a company which may develop it along the St. Lawrence. I do not know that to be the case but I suspect it. This Bill simply incorporates a transmission company which would have to make an arrangement with another company for its power. The development of power upon the St. Lawrence must be provided for by another statute, but this Bill does not give the slightest authority to dam the St.Lawrence or construct any works in the St. Lawrence or anywhere else except such works as are essential for a transmission line. As head of the department which has been investigating this subject, the matter has come before me and hon. gentlemen are doubtless aware that the plans of the company were submitted to the government for the development of water-powers on the St. Lawrence. It was directed that these plans should be referred to the chief engineer of the Department of Railways, the chief engineer of Public Works, and the chief engineer of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under what statute did the company profess to be acting when it submitted these plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did not state, but I understood it to be under the St. Lawrence Power Company charter granted by this parliament some years ago. I also understood from them that they expected to have to come back to parliament to get authority to dam the St. Lawrence.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They have it under the other statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) thinks, but they did not lead us to understand that they had. The three engineers to whom the plans were referred reported adversely to the plans as originally proposed, and they suggested certain modifications which were accepted. The engineers reported that the project was feasible, that the dam could be erected without interference with navigation, and the matter is now before the International Waterways Commission. I can assure the committee—

Mr. HUGHES. I understand that the Waterways Commission have stated that while they are ready to hear any one, they are not ready to deal with the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The International Waterways Commissioners are hearing parties, pro and con, in order to get all the information possible, as the government desire they should do. They heard the statement of the transportation interest and representatives from the city of Montreal and others.

Mr. HUGHES. That is some time ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some few weeks ago.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What power has the International Waterways Commission to deal with this matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They simply advise. It must be borne in mind that there is no doubt that the American section of the International Waterways Commission seems to be very strongly of the opinion that it is to the public advantage to develop the water-powers in the St. Lawrence at the Long Sault, and that not only will navigation not be interfered with, but that it will be improved. It is, of course, desirable that the Canadian section should examine into the subject from every possible standpoint and be quite sure that the decision will be in accordance with the public interest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister was about to give some assurance to the committee when he was interrupted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was going to assure the committee that no plans would be approved of, no arrangement would be approved of, no agreement would be ratified by the government which does not amply protect Canadian interests. So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, I can assure the committee that the plans will not be approved of unless upon the express stipulation, which will be thorough-

ly safeguarded, that one-half of the water-power which will be developed will be reserved absolutely for the use of the people on the Canadian side of the line.

Mr. HUGHES. Are these the dam plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. The thing is under consideration then?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the view my department has arrived at, and that will be made a sina qua non of any action the department will take.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has your department power to do that without the consent of parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. Parliament will have to consent to the matter in the end, and my recollection is that some time ago, in answer to a question put by the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) the Prime Minister stated that before the plans were approved of, the whole matter would be submitted to parliament for consideration, and before definite action would be taken, parliament must be satisfied that the work will be in the interest of Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON. Were these plans which were submitted by the St. Lawrence Power Company to your department for approval, plans for the construction of a work to connect with another work that would come out from the American shore?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the plans were for damming the river across from the Canadian side to the American side, and also for the building of a lock for the purpose of improving navigation, the idea being to give an additional lock to the one that is already there, and which was constructed, and is owned by the Canadian government.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Does the plan provide for a lock on the American side?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and that is strongly objected to by the engineers of the department. They urge that the lock should be built on the Canadian side.

Mr. BRODER. Were those plans not submitted to the Waterways Commission?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand they were.

Mr. BRODER. But the people who appeared before that commission had not access to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When these gentlemen came before the government they were told to go before the commission, and submit their plans with the view of all parties being notified so that they should have an opportunity of seeing the plans. Then, after the commission had decided the matter, it would be further taken up, and considered by the government.

Mr. BRODER. Is the hon. minister aware that the Waterways Commission absolutely refused to consider the details of the matter at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Such information has not come to me and I am not aware of it having come to any other member of the government, or any other department. With regard to the compensation to be paid, I, as Minister of Public Works, have been called on to consider the matter with the view of determining what would be fair to Canada in case we should finally approve of these works; and I am prepared to say that, so far as my department is concerned—and it will have a good deal to do with the fixing of rates—it will recommend to council that no agreement be entered into and no approval be given the works of the company unless there goes into the treasury of Canada as much revenue from this power as will go into the treasury of the state of New York. I shall insist that Canada shall be treated on an equal footing with the United States; and although our information is that at the point where it is proposed to build this dam, about ninety per cent of the water is on the American side, yet I shall insist, if we take any action in the matter at all—and I do not say that we shall—that at least one-half of the power shall be absolutely reserved for use on the Canadian side, and the revenue we shall receive shall be reasonable, and not be less than that received by the state of New York under the Bill to which my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has referred.

Mr. HUGHES. Are the works under the Act of 1901?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so. The plans are submitted for approval by the company which was incorporated under the statute of 1901. But I understand that before the company will be allowed to proceed any further, it will require to have the consent of this House, and must come to parliament for further legislation. That was the assurance which the right hon. the Prime Minister gave the House in answer to my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why should the hon. minister expect that the money derived from this source should go to the Dominion treasury, and not to the local government? In New York it goes to the state government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a great difference between the jurisdiction of the state of New York over rivers, and that of a Dominion province. The state of New York has jurisdiction over, not only the soil, but the waters, and rivers within its territory, whereas a province of Canada has no jurisdiction over navigable waters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What jurisdiction has New York over its waters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Congress has no jurisdiction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But I understand that application was made to Congress by the state of New York for legislation in that connection.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe there has been legislation by Congress to remove any doubts, but at all events the state of New York has power to grant a charter while, in my judgment, a provincial legislature has not. For that reason I would say that the treasury of Canada is entitled to receive the revenue from this water-power, the sole jurisdiction to deal with which is vested in the Dominion parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my hon. friend say that the soil of a river is vested in the Crown in the right of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a point on which I do not care to express an opinion, nor do I think would my hon. friend. I do not think the question is settled as to where the ownership of the soil in navigable water rests. It may belong to the riparian owner, and in this case the riparian owners, I understand, are the St. Lawrence Power Company, for that company has acquired the land where these works are to be situated. That would be the law in my province. There the property in the soil, above the ebb and flow of the tide rests in the riparian owners.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not examined the question at all, and would not care to pronounce an opinion, but I understood the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Robert Smith) to say it had been settled by a decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. Mr. Stanton on behalf of the Ontario government so argued.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of any such decision. If the land had not been granted, undoubtedly it would rest in the provincial government. That was the case at Niagara Falls.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend mean the land bordering the river or covered with water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The land covered with water. In the case of the company which developed the power at Niagara Falls, my hon. friend will remember that the Niagara Park Commission are the riparian owners, and as such they gave a lease to a company which developed the water-power. That company leased the power to the Hydro-Electric Commission. But that is not the case at Long Sault. The land there has all been granted by the Ontario government, and I understand that a large portion, if not the whole of it, has been acquired by the St. Lawrence Power Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A great deal would depend on the terms of the grant. It might be made so as to convey the land as far as the middle line of the stream, or it might be made otherwise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am speaking of a grant in the ordinary terms.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister considered what would be the effect which a dam across the St. Lawrence would have on the Ashburton treaty, or whether the two governments combined have authority to close the navigation of that river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contention is that the navigation is not to be closed, but improved.

Mr. HUGHES. There can be no question that Great Britain would have to be a consenting party to any legislation providing for the building of a dam.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It might be that Great Britain should be a consenting party. At all events, there is no question that it could be done; it is a matter of detail. So far as the project itself is concerned, apart from the Bill before the House, I do not hesitate to say, speaking my own individual opinion, that, in view of the fact that an enormous water-pawer is there undeveloped, which, with development, could produce some 600,000 horse-power, the question is not one to be turned lightly aside. If that water-power can be developed at reasonable cost so that the people of Ontario can be furnished with cheap power for industrial and lighting purposes, and if navigation will not be injuriously affected, I think that the question is one that is well worthy the consideration of every one who has to do with legislation. Therefore, I am disposed to give the matter my most earnest consideration. I am disposed to look into the plans with great care. And, at the same time, as I have said, so far as I am concerned, I shall consent to no approval of the plans, to no agreement being made, to no development going on, unless there is absolutely and irrevocably secured to Canada half the developed water-power and also equal remuneration, so far as the rates are concerned, for the treasury of Canada as for the treasury of New York.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). Why the necessity of this legislation until these questions are determined? This company have come before this government already, as I understand it, and have been referred to the Waterways Commission for suggestions. It is quite apparent that the

only way that they hope to acquire power to be distributed is by means of the proposed damming of the St. Lawrence and the carrying out of this scheme. Until this is determined by both governments, why the haste to grant this legislation? Why this leap in the dark?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will answer as best I can. I do not know what is in the minds of the promoters of the Bill, but it does not occur to me that the Bill provides for great haste, because it is only to come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council will not issue that proclamation until the agreements are entered into, plans are fully considered, and it is understood that the works can be constructed in the public interest and without injury to navigation,—and, I would assume,—they would not issue the proclamation until these agreements were submitted and ratified by parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has frankly admitted that this Bill is really part of a larger scheme. There cannot be any doubt of that after the frank statement of the minister. It seems to me it might have been fairer to parliament and to the people, if some of these details could have been set before us——

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. member will pardon me: I saw it stated somewhere, that the chairman of the Conservation Commission had written a letter to the committee in which he pointed out this very fact, that they were undoubtedly connected together, referring to the fact of the incorporators being the same,—and at his suggestion all the objectionable features were struck out.

Mr. BLAIN. Not all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so. I think the Bill is as harmless as any legislation you can have. And, in any case, it is not to become law until it is approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Bill is harmless if the larger project of which it is part is harmless. I would ask the minister, if he has any objection to bringing down the plans which are under consideration. As the minister has referred to them in debate, we have the right to ask for them. But I do not put it so much on that ground as on the ground of public interest, that these plans, which have evidently been under consideration for a long time, should be disclosed to parliament in order that we may know exactly what the promoters of this scheme have in contemplation, and what the government is now considering Would there be any objection?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. Of course, they are not completed. They are not in the possession of the government at present, because they were referred to the Waterways Commission. I see no objection to producing them; I think it quite reasonable and fair and would be glad they should be produced. At the same time, I do not withdraw the statement I made, that they are not essential to the consideration of this Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That depends on whether this Bill is really a part of a larger scheme. The minister stated his opinion—and he knows more about the matter than any other hon. member—that the promoters of this Bill expect, under the provisions of this measure, to get their power from a certain source. The Bill will be useless until the larger project is carried out. So there cannot be any great haste about this Bill, as my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has observed. Speaking of the necessity of providing power for eastern Ontario, I have not heard of any great outcry from the people of that section for a further supply of power. I have been informed by hon. members from the very locality in question that there is a considerable amount of power that cannot find a market.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. member (Mr. R. L. Borden) permit me to interrupt. I have been told by an authority which I cannot ignore and which I fully believe, that more than one important industry has moved from eastern Ontario to western Ontario just in order to get close to electrical power. The people in the vicinity of Brockville are very much in earnest over this. They feel that that section of the country is suffering by reason of the western development from the benefits of which they are excluded.

Mr. BRODER. There is a power developed at Iroquois, on which 500 horse-power is already available, with 2,000 more to be developed. The representative of that concern has been running around Prescott and Brockville for three months and offering them power at very reasonable rates——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is 500 horse-power?

Mr. BRODER. He is able to offer 2,500.

Mr. PARDEE. How are they going to get it to Brockville?

Mr. BRODER. How is this company going to get from Cornwall to Brockville?

Mr. PARDEE. Over the transmission line.

Mr. BRODER. They can do it in the same way. It is 35 miles nearer. And, when we come down to that, the power right here in the vicinity of Ottawa is as near Brockville as the Cornwall power. There is no such terrible sweat over this matter. The Minister of Public Works

(Mr. Pugsley) saw fit to make the question of power paramount in this matter. I have always thought that the great navigation system of the St. Lawrence was paramount to the water-power. There is another fact that ought to stare every Canadian in the face: not a solitary American interest will suffer; every interest that runs the risk of injury is a Canadian interest, they have everything to gain and we have everything to lose. Nobody knows what effect a dam at the Long Sault will have upon the river above that point. The outlet of Lake Superior, for instance, is 600 feet higher than the level, say, at Quebec, and you are proposing to dam that river about half way down. The people living along the vicinity of that river have a right to be apprehensive as to the effect of that dam. Engineers have been known to make great mistakes before, in the Quebec bridge for instance, and the mistake they made even at Massena in putting in that enormous power. We are supposed to be governed by these scientific engineers, while the man of common sense is left out of the question altogether. These are questions that should not be dealt with in this flippant way by hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick and other places, who do not care a straw whether we are drowned out in Ontario or not. So far as I am concerned, local interests demand my attention, and as a representative of that section of that country I shall not neglect my duty.

Mr. WRIGHT. Has the Minister of Public Works submitted to the Justice Department the question as to whether this government has any control over navigable waters except for purposes of navigation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it needs one lawyer to submit to another lawyer the question whether this government has not sole jurisdiction to prevent any obstruction in a navigable river, whether by a dam or any other method. That rests entirely with this parliament, under the British North America Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman considered the effect of the treaty governing the navigation on this river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I have considered that. We recognize that this parliament could not pass any legislation which would authorize a dam to be constructed in a river without putting in a condition that it shall be subject to the approval of the executive government of the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want to emphasize the position taken by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), and to show the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) that he is mistaken in what he says with regard to the law of the state of New York. There is in the state of New York a commission which governs the rates and all charters on transmission lines. Let him look at the Consolidated Laws of New York for 1909, volume 4, and he will find on page 3395 these words:

Public Service Commissions Law. 'An Act to establish the Public Service Commissions and prescribing their powers and duties, and to provide for the regulation and control of certain public service corporations and making an appropriation therefor.' (Became a law June 6, 1907.)

In clause 4 we read:

Commissions established; appointments; removals; terms of office.

Then on page 3430 he will find article 4 reading as follows:

Provisions relating to gas and electrical corporations; regulation of price of gas and electricity. Sections regarding application of article; general powers of corporations in respect of gas and electricity; inspection of gas and electric meters; approval of incorporation and franchises; certificates; approval of issue of stock, bonds and other forms of indebtedness, approval of transfer of franchise; complaints as to quality and price of gas and electricity; investigation by commission; forms of complaints. Notice and hearing; order fixing price of gas or electricity, or requiring improvements; forfeiture for non-compliance with order; defence in case of excessive charge for gas or electricity; jurisdiction; powers of local officers.

65. Application of article. This article shall apply to the manufacture and furnishing of gas for light, heat or power, and the furnishing of natural gas for light, heat or power, and the generation, furnishing and transmission of electricity for light heat or power.

66. General powers of commissioners in respect to gas and electricity. Each commission shall, within its jurisdiction:

1. Have the general supervision of all persons and corporations having authority under any general or special law, or under any charter of franchise, to lay down, erect or maintain wires, pipes, conduits, ducts or other fixtures in, over or under the streets, highways and public places of any municipality, for the purpose of furnishing or distributing gas, or of furnishing or transmitting electricity for light, heat or power, or maintaining underground conduits or ducts for electrical conductors.

So this commission has charge in the most complete manner of the transmission of electricity and the regulation of rates.

Mr. CONMEE. That law was only passed last year. It does not affect this Bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. HUGHES. Now that promotion stuff had not better show itself too soon tonight. The Minister of Public Works has

stated that there are 500,000 or 600,000 horse-power to be developed at the Sault dam. He has given the whole case away. It seems this matter has been under the consideration of the department for a long time, the scheme has been held up his coat sleeve, it has been engineered by gentlemen interested in it, and these little accessories to the St. Lawrence dam are going to be slipped through, and later on we will be asked to confirm the construction of the dam on the pretense of this 600,000 horse-power that are going to be developed. Why, Sir, within 30 miles of the city of Ottawa there is not 600,000 horse-power lying undeveloped, but 3,000,000 horse-power available and undeveloped, and this is accessible to all those towns like Brockville and Prescott, over which the Minister of Public Works has been moaning, just as accessible to them as is the water-power from the town of Cornwall. Moreover, in the construction of the Georgian Bay canal there will be another 3,000,000 horse-power developed within short range of these very places on the St. Lawrence river. The minister, being so well informed, is possibly aware of the fact that gentlemen connected with this water-power have already been canvassing cities and towns in the state of New York and disposing of hundreds of thousands of horse-power to be derived from the construction of the dam which they have assured the people in the United States is already arranged for with the government of Canada. Might I ask the minister if he has given any guarantee to these people that the Bill will be passed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been no guarantee of any kind given, the matter is simply under consideration. No decision has been arrived at, and no assurance of any kind has been given.

Mr. HUGHES. They have had the minister's word at one time, for he has assured them that they must give at least one-half the power to Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If anything is done.

Mr. HUGHES. There is another important point. The shore on the north side of the St. Lawrence river is low; the shore on the south side is comparatively high. Under past conditions spring freshets have again and again done a great deal of damage to the immediate shores on the north side of the St. Lawrence river. If this enormous dam is constructed, raising the water to a very great height, when the spring freshets and the ice jam come along, still further damming the waters up, they may possibly overflow the whole shore of the St. Lawrence. The height of land between the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa is just a few miles from the St. Lawrence. Therefore, it is easily within the bounds of possibility that if this dam were constructed the whole eastern part of the province would be flooded by the jamming of the ice at the dam. But to my mind there is a more important element than the mere mercenary aspect of the case. The old historic river St. Lawrence is there, and we want the free navigation of that river. We do not want to go through any lock on the American side. We prefer to have it the same as it is at Sault Ste. Marie, and also the same as it is between Lakes Erie and Ontario. We want to go through canals on our own side and control them, we want free canals and the free navigation of the river, so that the products of our country may reach the ocean untrammelled by any dam. I would certainly recommend that this Bill be held over until the whole matter could be carefully looked into. I am satisfied that the minister will make as much progress with it as if he were to try to rush it through at the present time. I very much regret to see the anxiety displayed by a number of gentlemen who have no interest in the question, have never seen the river St. Lawrence or the rapids, and probably never will, to push this Bill through, though it concerns a work in which they can have no possible interest excepting an acquired interest.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think we can fairly state that this Bill came before this committee, if indeed it did not come before the House on its introduction, under false pretenses. It occurs to me that every fear I have expressed in regard to this Bill has been confirmed. I venture to say that the St. Lawrence Power Company's Bill of 1901 passed through parliament without ever a thought being given to the possibility that it contained powers that would enable the company to dam the St. Lawrence river in connection with any other company that might be incorporated under an American charter. I will go farther and say that the very promoters of that Bill in 1901 had no thought of the greater scheme which they evidently now have, or which somebody for them has, in contemplation. Apparently these gentlemen have come to the Department of Public Works and have asked for the approval of a plan. They surely would not go to the expense of procuring the necessary data to enable them to prepare the plans in the first place—even only to prepare them—without they thought that they had the power and authority from parliament to erect the works which are set forth in these plans. It must be apparent to every member of this committee that these applicants were and are under the impression that they were authorized by their own legislation to construct their dam on the St. Lawrence to the American boundary. Else why would

they prepare plans? They must, on laying their plans before the Minister of Public Works, have placed before him the authority under which they came. No man goes to the Minister of Railways and Canals seeking the approval of a route map unless he takes with him the act of this parliament authorizing the construction of the railway to be built on that route. I venture to assert that there would be no one so foolish as to go to the Minister of Public Works and ask him to approve of a plan unless he showed the minister the authority under which he wished to construct the works in accordance with those plans. Evidently they thought they had the power or the authority from this parliament. How many people in Canada thought they had it? We have read the discussions in the public newspapers in reference to this matter, we have read of the hearings that were had before the Waterways Commission; how many readers of these newspapers but were under the impression that this was preliminary to the applicants coming to parliament to seek legislation and to seek powers? No one ever dreamed that these people had these powers or thought they had the powers. It has been mentioned even by members of parliament that such a Bill would be before parliament. Evidently the applicants have no such idea, evidently they think that they have the whole matter arranged and that all they now need is the approval of plans. What is the use of submitting it to the Waterways Commission when the suggestion is made that these gentlemen have that power as far as this parliament is concerned? It has been repeatedly stated that this Bill does not authorize them to build dams. Certainly it does not. They do not seek to get such powers. Any objection which I have taken to this Bill has not been on any such ground, but it is for this reason I have stated that they had hoped to build this dam under the authority of the Act of 1901, when it was never contemplated by parliament that any such works should be so constructed, and when it is necessary that these people, who wish to work out this scheme, shall get supplementary powers, we should withhold such supplementary powers until we regulate in some way the legislation of 1901 with respect to the powers which they claim we gave them, and which perhaps we did, to enable them to construct a dam on the St. Lawrence in conjunction with American legislation. That is the objection I have to the enactment of this legislation. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has asked, and very properly asked: Is there any objection to having the plans laid before this committee before this legislation proceeds? I think that is a fair request and I think that the Minister of Public Works should accede to it because it is a fair proposition. What does this legislation mean? How many of us know? I do not. How many hon. members know what it does contemplate? It evidently means the transmission of power in connection with some scheme that is to be carried out under legislation already had from this parliament, and that legislation warranted the promoters in preparing plans for the carrying out of this scheme. What are those plans? It would give us and the country an insight into the objects and proposals of these applicants and would be only fair that every member of this committee should have the plans before him to see just what they have in mind, what they propose and desire to carry out and what they wish us to give this legislation for now in order to enable them to carry it out to its full completion, because the generation of power without the ability to distribute and utilize it would be of no advantage to them. I would suggest that the committee should rise and before we further consider the matter the plans should be before us. It is an important matter. No Bill of a private nature more far reaching in its consequence has been brought to the notice of a committee of parliament for many years. It affects not only our internal affairs, our provincial affairs, but it affects our international relations under a treaty of the empire. I submit that we should not be called on at this time to decide yea or nay with respect to this Bill, we should first have an opportunity of viewing the plans.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that the committee ought to rise at this stage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would yield at once to the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) if it were not for the fact that this Bill gives no authority whatever to construct any works on the St. Lawrence river, and for the further reason that the Prime Minister has made the statement to this House that before any authority is given to construct any dam in the St. Lawrence, the matter shall first be submitted to and approved of by this parliament. Nothing could be fairer than that. No matter what the company thinks its powers are, there is a reserve power vested in the Governor in Council, and that will not be exercised and this company allowed to go ahead until the whole matter is submitted to parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The very fact that the minister has mentioned ought to give us pause. It would seem that it is too big a question to leave in the hands of the

Governor in Council for submission to parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said it had to be submitted to parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I cannot conceive that the Minister of Public Works and the government would send the engineers of three different departments to investigate and report on it unless they were inclined to concur in the view of the St. Lawrence Power Company that authority exists at the present time. It seem a remarkable state of affairs to exist if the minister's statement is to be accepted without qualification. Here is a company which on the premises laid down by the minister has no power to build a dam on the St. Lawrence, and yet we find this government on the application of this company which has no statutory powers sending engineers of three departments to investigate. Does any one imagine that this would have been done unless there was something more in the supposed authority and power than the minister has disclosed to us? Why should the minister, at the instance of people who, according to his statement, have absolutely no power to do anything of the kind, have caused to be sent the engineers of three departments to investigate and report on these plans?

Mr. EMMERSON. Why is it left to the Waterways Commission?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes. There seems to be a great deal more at the back of this than any one suspected. I am astonished to learn that this project has gone so far without anything being known to parliament. It is not of such trivial importance as the minister suggests. At the present time a vessel can go from the ocean into the great lakes, and never leave Canadian waters. Under the proposals of the government nothing of the kind can take place because, as I said, the Minister—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The same lock will exist on the Canadian side, all vessels going up through the river pass through that lock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood from the scheme as disclosed to me by the minister that the lock would be on the American side.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be two locks, one on the American side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I am not correct in my appreciation of what the minister said, I withdraw any argument on that point, but apart from that it is a very big proposal and one which concerns the commerce of this country from end to end, concerns every part of Canada, concerns the future interests of this country in several very important respects. Inasmuch as this Bill is not to go into force until proclaimed by order in council, inasmuch as the minister himself has said that, according to his understanding, this company is to get its power from this source, why is there such tremendous haste to press this Bill? There seems to be no occasion for haste in any of the circumstances disclosed. I concur in the suggestion of my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) that the plans should be laid on the table of the House before this Bill which is only part of a greater project should be submitted to this committee.

Mr. FIELDING. In answer to the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, I am not aware that the government have made any proposals at all. This is a private Bill, and I have no desire to have it treated differently from any other private Bill. I have not followed the matter as closely as some hon. gentlemen. I am very much impressed by the fact that this Bill was examined by the Committee on Private Bills, that objection was taken, it was referred to the Conservation Commission, amendments were proposed and the committee, as I understand, unanimously reported the Bill.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. FIELDING. It was so stated in the House. At all events, the committee reported the Bill. There are occasions when members of the House who have given close personal attention to a matter feel free to go outside of the report of the committee, but the general trend of the House is that where a Bill is investigated and examined by a committee and reported, the judgment of the committee should be sustained. Speaking for myself, I see no objection to it going through. It is a private Bill, we have adopted it, and whatever the sense of the House may be, we may as well take it.

Mr. COWAN. The Minister of Public Works has announced that when this Bill is passed the government will have all the powers that are needed to enable this company to dam the St. Lawrence, and that all this company will have to do would be to submit the plans to the Department of Public Works and have them approved. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) told us there was no connection between the promoters of this Bill and the parties incorporated in the Bill in 1901 and he further said that the Act of 1901 was void. He told us also that the company incorporated in 1901 never developed power, and in that statement he was corrected by the hon. member for Stormont. But the Minister of Public Works let the feline out of the sack when he told us that this company far from being defunct had actually prepared plans and laid them before his department for approval, under, I presume, the navigable waters Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. COWAN. At any rate the plans were before the minister and the minister has been considering them, and apparently they are awaiting the approval of the government and the passage of this Bill. The Minister of Public Works has also stated that he would give authority to this company rather than to the province, because he says the province has no power to construct a dam to the boundary of the United States. But surely this parliament can invest the province with exactly the same powers that it may invest a private corporation with, and in view of the fact that the province is developing power at cost to supply the people cheaply, surely, if the minister were actuated by the proper spirit he would empower the province rather than a private corporation whose object is to make a profit. The Minister of Public Works also said that he would take the revenues to the Dominion rather than to the province, because as he understands it the ownership of the bed of the stream is in the Dominion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say so; I said it was because the jurisdiction over these water-powers rests entirely with the Dominion parliament.

Mr. COWAN. I understood the minister to say that the ownership of the foreshore, down to the water at least, did not rest with the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the land was granted I did not think it did.

Mr. COWAN. If I remember right in Caldwell vs. Hurdman it was held that the province had the right to grant these water lots on the bed and foreshore of the Ottawa river which was a navigable stream. If in that case the title rested with the province it would seem to raise some question as to whether or not the title to the bed and foreshore of the St. Lawrence is not in the province of Ontario. It seems to me that this House instead of guessing at what its rights are should defer discussion on the Bill until they are ascertained. Surely the Minister of Public Works is willing to give to the province a power which it is exercising in the public interest, surely he would prefer to give that power to the province rather than to a private corporation, surely the House would hesitate before it dams up and annihilates a portion of an international waterway established such by solemn treaty between two nations; surely the government will not attempt to rush through this legislation without considering all these questions. If that be the case, the Canadian locks will no longer serve the purposes of transportation and we will be driven to using these locks built on the American side, the title to which is to be vested in the State of New York

When the discussion began, I saw no particular reason why I should oppose the Bill, but I think abundant reasons have been developed in the course of the discussion, and no interest will suffer if the matter is allowed to remain until opportunity be given to examine the plans and to ascertain the status and rights of all parties.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I understood from the Minister of Public Works a few minutes ago that, when he was negotiating with the promoters of this scheme—the original company chartered in 1901—he declared that in case any arrangement should be agreed to, the Dominion treasury would receive as much as the state of New York. What I want to ask him is what provision he has made to protect the citizens of this country. Would this company come under the Board of Railway Commissioners which would regulate the prices the Canadian public would have to pay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The company waited upon me through its representative, was the company called the St. Lawrence Power Company, incorporated by the state of New York. They were desirous of getting the requisite authority from the Canadian government and parliament to carry out their scheme. I stated to them—and they seemed disposed to acquiesce in the view—that, so far as my department was concerned, we should insist that the power should be equally divided or rather that at least one-half should be absolutely reserved for use on the Canadian side, and also that we should receive the same revenue as that derived by the state of New York, and in addition that the rates should be under the control of the Board of the Railway Commission, so that both the public interest would be protected, and we would get our share of the revenue.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That is information which the hon. gentleman did not give us before. A moment ago when a question was put to him about the navigation of the river, he said that the locks were there, and the boats could go up as they do now. But in case this dam is built, and built at the head of the locks, and the water raised fifteen or twenty feet, how are the boats going to get up the Canadian side?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is misinformed. The plan submitted by the engineers show no such state of affairs. They refused to approve any plans which would interfere with the Canadian locks.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I know the canal and the locks, and all about it. If you build a dam to raise the water——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whatever parliament will be asked to do—if the matter ever goes that far—the plans will all be submitted

for the information of the House. I would have no objection to submitting them at any time; but before parliament will be asked to take steps, the plans will be laid on the table.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We are asked to make a very important step now, and we ought to see the plans. It is now half past one in the morning, and in view of the fact that this Bill was before the Private Bills Committee and that committee made a report by no means unanimous, several amendments having been submitted, and only voted down by a majority of two or three——

Mr. FIELDING. Was there a minority report?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. No, but the minority did not approve of the committee's action, and the majority was a very slight one. As the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) says, we have had a great deal of new light since the Private Bills Committee made its report. No one knew in that committee that this company was part of the parent company of 1901, which was given the power of damming the river. That was never mentioned then.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told it was mentioned and mentioned several times, in addition to having a letter from the chairman to that effect.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It was not admitted by the Minister of Public Works as he has admitted it to-night. Nobody knew that he had sent his engineers to look the ground over.

Mr. CONMEE. There would have been a bigger majority if that had been known.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. My hon. friend knows better. The hon. member for Westmorland has expressed a different opinion. He admits that he has been enlightened by the information we have had from the Minister of Public Works, and so has every other hon. member. I certainly think that the Bill should stand over, and the opinion of the Minister of Justice be taken on the matter. Before we pass this legislation, which will enable the company to proceed under the Act passed in 1901, giving it full powers to go on, and build dams and wings and locks and anything it likes, we should hesitate, and take time for reflection.

Mr. HUGHES. A little while ago the Minister of Public Works referred to a promise made by the Prime Minister. I have been endeavouring to find out what that promise is, but have not succeeded, and in view of the fact that this is rather an important Bill, I think the government should not press it through committee to-night. Since the Act of 1901 gives the company power to build that dam, has not the Prime Minister's promise been violated, that the company could do nothing farther without coming to parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend surely is not serious in putting that question? What the right hon. the Prime Minister said was that the matter would be laid before parliament, and parliament be asked to give its opinion upon it, but that referred to future action.

Mr. HUGHES. But the company already has the authority, and does not need to go to parliament. It is independent of the Prime Minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because it cannot do anything until it gets its plans approved, and my right hon. colleague said that it could not get permission to go ahead until its application had been submitted to parliament.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. the Minister of Finance referred to the fact that this Bill had received the sanction of the Committee on Private Bills. Is he aware that developments have taken place here to-night which he did not hear of before?

Mr. FIELDING. I was not before the Committee on Private Bills, and so did not hear anything.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the Minister of Public Works say that facts have not been developed to-night that were never heard before the Private Bills Committee?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to admit that because, from the statements made, I would conclude that the Private Bills Committee was informed of everything material.

Mr. HUGHES. Will my hon. friend not admit that he himself has made statements to-night which for the first time have been made to the country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so, because this matter has been in the press for months. A good many months ago it was reported that the engineers had considered the matter and had made a report; that that report had been referred back to them and they had made a new report which had gone to the Waterway Commission.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister has kept tab on the press.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I always read the papers.

Mr. HUGHES. Was there any system by which all this was done and yet the House and the country kept in the dark? Will the minister tell me what is to be the height of this dam?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Believing, as I did, that that had nothing to do with the Bill before

the House, I have not the information with me.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister remembers so clearly what is in the newspapers, I should think he could remember a little item like that. Has he any report of the effect the raising of this water by the dam is likely to have on the Canadian shore and upon the Canadian locks?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. HUGHES. Hon. members opposite can earn their money easier than this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My view is that the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) is not acting in a manner worthy of himself and his standing in this House in making the vile insinuation with regard to gentlemen on this side—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member should not use the expression 'vile insinuation.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. When an hon. member of this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will not argue, Mr. Chairman, but at once withdraw the expression. But I think, on reflection, my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes), even though the hour is late and he is perhaps unconscious of what he says, when he realizes the extraordinary nature of the insinuation he has made, will withdraw it.

Mr. HUGHES. If the minister will pay attention to the gentlemen behind him, many of them from other provinces and who never saw the St. Lawrence rapids, and will try to keep them in order, I shall be glad. But I deny his right to lecture me in this House. I was asking, when I was interrupted by the unseemly conduct of gentlemen behind the minister——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman must withdraw that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should not use that expression.

Mr. HUGHES. I will retract that, if you say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No conditions.

Mr. HUGHES. I will withdraw it unconditionally. The conduct struck me as unseemly, but I will not use the expression. Now, will the minister tell me the effect of this dam on the Canadian shore between Cornwall and the Galops rapids?

Mr PUGSLEY. I regret that I cannot give the information. These matters will be very carefully considered before the government takes action.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am surprised the minister wants to leave this question to be decided by his engineers. If we consider how the engineers, not only in his, but in other departments, have given decisions for some little time, I think it will be safer to leave the matter in the hands of hon. members of this House. In his own department, we have seen an engineer put an upset price of 20 cents a yard on dredging and that dredging afterwards said to be done at a reasonable price at 90 cents a yard. And we have investigations going on in the Public Accounts Committee in regard to the decisions of engineers on the Transcontinental, and the people have no great confidence so far as their workings are concerned. Now, here is a great work which the government is going to grant power to undertake—for, I take it from what the minister has stated, that it is the intention of the government to grant this franchise to dam the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not given any intimation of that kind. The government has not decided the matter.

Mr. J. D. REID. They could not get through first a Bill giving power to dam the St. Lawrence. That Bill will come after. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) tells us that this company had practically deceived us in bringing the matter before the committee. Let me tell the minister what the company did do. The promoters of this Bill went into every town, beginning at Prescott, and told the people they could not give them power unless the dam was put across the St. Lawrence. They took people down to Cornwall, paying all their expenses and entertained them. They have men employed in every town from Cornwall to Brockville to promote this scheme. They have newspapers subsidized throughout the Dominion to influence the public in favour of this work. I have heard on good authority that they have placed $2,000,000 simply to pay out for this great scheme. And let me tell the minister that the company behind this scheme is greater than all the railways and the Standard Oil Company put together. Here is an article in a magazine that explains what this trust is. I will read a little of it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it all.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, perhaps I will. I think it will be interesting to gentlemen on the other side. For I have confidence in hon. members opposite that, if they knew what this scheme was, they would not go into it so lightly. I believe they want to know the facts and to do what is fair. There are many members opposite who do not know anything about this matter. But we who live along the St. Lawrence river know the conditions, and we want the com-

mittee to treat us justly. Let me read part of a magazine article that will be interesting. It is headed: 'A gigantic new trust in sight':

It is found in the great water-powers of the country. And those are to-day well on the way to control by a trust bigger than any that has ever been dreamed of; a trust that, if it shall be able to carry out the systematic plan now in hand will be as wealthy as if it owned all the railroads of the nation, with standard oil and United States steel on top. Then a few score of the minor trusts tossed in for good measure.

This is the water-power trust. Its existence was first suspected by government officials five years ago. Since then it has been gathering in the best power sights in every part of the country. It has subsidiaries that operate in Canada. It has grown to such proportions, and its purpose to monopolize the water-power of a continent that has become so plainly apparent, that President Roosevelt thus referred to it not long ago in his veto of the James River Dam Bill:

The people of the country are threatened by a monopoly far more powerful because in far closer touch with their domestic and industrial life, than anything known to our experience. A single generation will see the exhaustion of our natural resources of oil and gas and such a rise in the price of coal as will make the prices of electrically transmitted water-power a controlling factor in transportation, in manufacturing, and in household lighting and heating.

President Roosevelt told congress that thirteen corporations or interests, centering in the General Electric and the Westinghouse Electric, now controlled one-third of the developed water-power of the country, and added:

This astonishing consolidation has taken place practically within the last five years. The movement is still in its infancy, and unless it is controlled the history of the oil industry will be repeated in the hydro-electric power industry, with results far more oppressive and disastrous to the people. It is true that the great bulk of our potential water-power is as yet undeveloped, but the sites which are now controlled by combinations are those which offer the greatest advantages and therefore hold a strategic position.

That message said President Roosevelt, a few days after it had been delivered, was one of the most important in my whole administration. This proposal, now far under way to accomplishment, of monopolizing the nations water-power, has a significance which ought to be made clear to the people.

Up at the top of this scheme stand the General Electric Company, with $65,000,000 capital and $15,000,000 funded debt, and the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company with $28,000,000 stock and $29,000,000 funded debt. The General Electric owns all the shares of the Edison and Thompson-Houston Company and the British Thompson-Houston; the Sprague Electric Company, the Stanley Electric Manufacturing Company, and the Electric Bond and Share Company are controlled; and the company is identified in various ways with many other corporations.

Relations between the General Electric and Westinghouse are indicated by the fact that since 1896 their patents have been pooled. The Westinghouse Company controls the stock of British, Canadian and French Westinghouse Companies, both General Electric and Westinghouse interests appear in the officiary or directorates of the numerous corporations that are broadly denominated as related to the water-power trust. The investigations by the government have caused the following companies to be classified as of general electric affiliation:

United Electric Securities, Electrical Securities Corporation, Electric Bond and Share Company, Schenectady Power Company, Caroline Power and Light Company, Rockingham (North Carolina) Power Company, Animas Power and Water Company (Colorado), Central Colorado Power Company, Montgomery (Alabama) Light and Water Power Company, Summit County Power Company (Colorado), Butte Electric and Power Company (Montana), Montana Power Transmission Company, Madison River Power Company (Montana), Billings and Eastern Montana Power Company, Washington Water Power Company (Washington and Idaho), Great Western Power Company (California); besides a number of others whose connection with general electric is indicated.

The Westinghouse group, as classified by the government investigators, includes the Security Investment Company (New York), The Electric Properties Company (New York), the 'Smith interests,' the Atlantic Water and Electric Power Company, Ontario Power Company (Canadian), Niagara, Lockport and Ontario Power Company (New York), Electric Power Securities Company (New York).

There are a great many more that I will not read. Also the power at Massena on the American side is owned by this same combination. The Minister of Public Works, if he will tell what he knows, will stand up here and tell us that the St. Lawrence Power Company is in this same power trust.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, he can find out if he inquires. Let us go into the history of this St. Lawrence Power Company. Four or five years ago this company could have been taken over by the government for about $300,000. In a report in the Department of Railways and Canals, he will find that the question came up as to the lighting of the Cornwall canal. And by the way, that has been referred to as a contract given by the Conservative party and which his government has to carry out. Let me tell the minister about that contract. That contract was given in June, 1896, just before the Conservative party went out of power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What do you suppose it was given them for?

Mr. J. D. REID. I have no idea what it was given for. The minister hints that

perhaps it was given for some wrong purpose. The minute the Liberal party came into power they cancelled several contracts on the canal that were given in June. There were contracts let a few days before the government went out of power for the building of canals which this government promptly cancelled. They did not cancel this contract but about four weeks before the next election an order in council was asked for by the then Minister of Railways and Canals providing that permission be given him to bring into force a contract to pay the St. Lawrence Power Company $50,000 yearly for lighting the Cornwall canal. After they had given the minister power to pay $50,000 a year, two or three weeks before the election, the contract was changed from 21 years to 84 years. Will the Minister of Public Works tell me why that was done prior to the election of 1900?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I really cannot.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not exactly. He would have a better idea than I why these things were done because he has been a minister not only here, but in the New Brunswick government and similar things have taken place under his own administration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is a past master.

Mr. J. D. REID. No. I have not had the experience that the minister has. This combination on the other side want to dam the St. Lawrence river. They knew that if they came to this parliament to get permission to do it they could not obtain it with the St. Lawrence power company in existence. M. P. Davis had his water-power there. He would immediately raise the question that this was going to interfere with his rights, and the result as that this combination had to give M. P. Davis, some say $750,000 and others say $1,000,000, simply for this power that he had in order to get his franchise and thus prevent any opposition from that source. When the Railway Commission come to deal with this matter the owners of the St. Lawrence Power will say that they have been obliged to pay $1,000,000 for it, that they have their money invested in it, that they have to get a certain revenue and, therefore, the commission should fix a price on what it cost them to purchase the power from M. P. Davis. The result would be that the people of eastern Ontario would be subject to this great monopoly. As far as the transmission line is concerned, why did they not tell the people in Prescott and Brockville what they told the committee? They went to Prescott and Brockville and told the people that they had not any power to sell at Cornwall, that power must be developed and that it was absolutely necessary to dam the St. Lawrence. In the committee the other day they said that they had plenty of power now developed at Cornwall under the present franchise. Ever since that power has been developed at Cornwall we have wanted them to run a transmission line to Prescott and Brockville, but they never would do so. M. P. Davis and others said there was not sufficient power required to pay for running the transmission line up there. They never thought it necessary to run a transmission line up there until this scheme of damming the St. Lawrence was brought to the front and they thought that such an agitation would take place amongst the people of the St. Lawrence counties that the members of this House would grant them the right to dam the river. On the other side of the river at Massena they have an immense water-power that they are using at the present time. The minister knows that locality well. There is what is called the South Sault on the American side. It could be dammed and not hurt navigation at all and then it would probably develop 200,000 or 300,000 horse-power. I think the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. R. Smith) knows where I mean.

Mr. R. SMITH. I would not endorse the hon. gentleman's statement that you could develop 200,000 or 300,000 horse-power. It is estimated, I believe, that you could develop 65,000 horse-power and that would be conditional upon the building of a wing dam.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well it may be that you could only develop 65,000 horse-power at the South Sault.

Mr. R. SMITH. That is if the big dam is continued across. It will be about 30,000 with a dam only at the South Sault.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, I do not know, but it would not hurt navigation at all. If this company are willing to take the power and bring it along the river front they have, according to their statement in the Private Bills Committee, sufficient power at Cornwall at present to supply all the river front and they have the power at Massena as well. But this whole thing is part of a great scheme. According to the papers right here in Ottawa there is a company being formed. I have only read it in the newspapers, but I know from the gentlemen who are connected with it that it is true. Senator Edwards and a number of other gentlemen are organizing a company that will develop 500,000 horse-power along the Ottawa river. From Ottawa to Prescott it is 52 miles. From Prescott to Cornwall it is 60 miles.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where are they to get 500,000 horse-power near Ottawa?

Mr. J. D. REID. I saw a fair estimate and the statement gave the falls and so on. I asked Senator Edwards the other day if he intended doing it, and he said certainly, and that he expected in about a year to have this power supply ready. I suggested in the Private Bills Committee that the St. Lawrence Power Company are the ones who are going to furnish this power. They admitted in the Private Bills Committee that they were going to do it through the company at Cornwall, and I asked them why not bring in a Bill to amend clause 11 in their charter. Clause 11 gives them power to run a transmission line about 12 miles west and down to Soulanges. Why not bring in a Bill to have that amended so that they could extend their transmission line to Brockville and Kingston? But that would not answer their purpose. I wonder if the minister saw the first Bill. This Bill is not like the first one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This Bill is perfectly harmless.

Mr. J. D. REID. About as harmless as the minister. They would not do that, and that showed that there is a scheme behind it. The minister has let the cat out of the bag. I cannot understand why the minister wants to force this Bill through without giving the members an opportunity of seeing the plans.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister is not forcing the Bill through, he has nothing to do with it except as a member of the committee.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows that if he asked to have the committee rise it would rise at once.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not for me to say if the committee shall rise or not.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the Minister of Finance should give us an opportunity of looking into this scheme, and should not try to press us too hard to-night.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not pressing the Bill one way or the other, but I would like to see some progress. There has been a very fair discussion, and my own judgment is that the House should divide. The Bill need not go to a third reading to-night, it could stand until another day, and there would be ample opportunity to discuss the matter further.

Mr. J. D. REID. We should have an opportunity of looking at the plans and seeing the general position.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. Has the hon. gentleman never seen the plans?

Mr. J. D. REID. I never saw them.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. They have been published in many newspapers in the last two years, and the promoters have explained them in the hon. gentleman's own town before the International Waterways Commission.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have not seen the plans, and the promoters knew I was opposed to the scheme and I suppose would not show them to me. As to the newspaper plans, no newspaper would publish the large plans that would come before the government.

Mr. BLAIN. If the plans were published in the newspapers it would be under the authority of the Minister of Public Works. I am surprised they should be so published before being submitted to the House. In what newspapers were they published.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend would like to find out also whether they were published in Conservative newspapers as well.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is very suspicious on a point on which he is very guilty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not know they were published and I have not seen them in the newspapers. In connection with this Bill we have nothing to do with them as this is merely a transmission line.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister considered that the tourist passenger traffic going down the St. Lawrence will be interfered with, and also the large rafts of timber? Does he remember that the International Waterways Commission feared an ice jam if a dam were erected in Niagara river near Fort Erie, and would there not be a similar danger of damage to property on the St. Lawrence river if this dam were erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not introduce the Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister is largely responsible for its introduction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. If the question of approving of works in the St. Lawrence should come before me as minister I shall feel it my duty to give all these matters my most careful consideration. The Bill gives no power to dam the St. Lawrence, or to place any kind of obstruction in that river.

Mr. EMMERSON. I suggested some time ago that the plans setting out this scheme should be laid before us before we are compelled to reach a decision on this Bill. The Minister of Finance who is leading the House said he had no objection personally to that suggestion.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a fair request and if the Bill is allowed to stand for the present no harm can be done. The Senate adjourns on Wednesday next until the 6th of April, and consequently there will be no delay in the final passage of the measure. It seems to me that too much of a party tinge has been given to this question. I did not consider it a party matter at all and before I knew the opinion of other members I formed my own judgment. I am honest and sincere in desiring to see these plans before the Bill is passed. I would go home, but I do not want to run away from my convictions. If the committee should now rise it would add to our good health and good humour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are all good humoured.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are trying to be, but we are not any more than we can help.

Mr. BLACK. The procedure to-night is a repetition of the procedure before the Private Bills Committee. We considered it for a whole month there and there was a certain group of members who were bound to block the Bill, one member going so far as to say that he was there specially for that purpose. I have listened attentively to every speech delivered to-night and there has not been one single argument or idea advanced that was not advanced before the committee and fully considered. I can tell these hon. gentlemen that those of us who are in favour of the Bill will stay here until Saturday night if necessary.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Black) was elected to preside over the Private Bills Committee in the absence of the regular chairman and before the preamble had been fully discussed he insisted on taking the vote of the committee.

Mr. BLACK. The preamble was not discussed until all the other clauses were discussed.

Mr. S. SHARPE. When the hon. gentleman could not get a vote on the preamble he said they would dispense with the passing of the preamble and discuss the clauses one by one. I do not know what the hon. gentleman's interest in the Bill is, but he displayed the same anxiety about it in the Private Bills Committee that he does here. There must be some overwhelming, compelling interest in this Bill; there seems to be some personal canvass and some personal interest in it, because we have here this morning five cabinet ministers and more members than there have been in the House for a long time.

An hon. MEMBER. What about your side?

Mr. S. SHARPE. We are protecting the public interest. No private Bill in my experience has received such favourable attention at the hands of the government since the Canada Life Bill which was an attack on the rights of certain policy-holders. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when these plans were first submitted to him and how long he has had 'them' under his consideration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The first plans were submitted, I should think, nearly two years ago. Then there were amended plans which must have been submitted six months ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When were the engineers sent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should think eight or ten months ago.

Mr. S. SHARPE. That should excite the suspicion of the House more than ever. The fact that the Minister of Public Works has had the plans under consideration two years, that the engineers have reported some eight months ago, and that this House has not received any information concerning these plans or reports, is certainly very extraordinary. Surely it is important that we should have all that information which has been so long before the minister. Why not allow this matter to stand over until the House has been given possession of it? We have had the whole day taken up with this private Bill, when there are public Bills in the names of private members which are kept back on that account. The plans, which the minister has had so long, were never submitted to the Private Bills Committee. Surely that committee should have been put in possession of them before making its report. You cannot sever the two companies. The promoters are the same in each, and the names are almost identical. One of the great objections I have to the Bill is the large power of expropriation which it gives and then the Railway Act is made applicable to the company wherever possible. In section 151 of that Act there are 17 subsections. Subsection C allows the company to expropriate any property whatever for its purposes. Subsection L allows it to divert or alter the course of any river, stream, or watercourse, or highway, for certain purposes. All these powers are given to this company under the terms of this Bill. Judging by the interest taken in it by the cabinet ministers, this measure has the endorsation of the government, and the government is determined to press it through at all hazards. But surely, in the public interest, it ought to be allowed to stand over and hon. members given an opportunity to inspect the plans.

Mr. SEELEY. I have no disposition to prevent discussion, and so long as any member has anything advantageous to

place before the House we should remain. I think, so far as I can understand the situation, this is a Bill for a transmission line only and although I am not familiar with the particular section of the country it covers, judging by our experience in the vicinity of the Niagara peninsula, the more transmission lines we have in operation the better for the community. Take the cities of Hamilton and Dundas, perhaps the only two towns in Canada where we have electric competition, they are the two that have the cheapest electric energy. And I am glad to say that they are the two chief localities sought after by manufacturing and other interests, as a location for their establishments. What is good for our locality ought to be good for others. We are all pleased with the introduction of hydro-electric power into our vicinity. It has created competition, and we have the benefit of that competition. The only objection that can be urged against the Hydro-Electric Commission is their method of obtaining right of way and the unfair prices they pay the farmers. I can see no reason why the company under discussion should not have a transmission line in the vicinity of the St. Lawrence river and the Hydro-Electric Commission as well. The two lines should give better results than one; and while the Hydro-Electric Commission do not propose to make any profit, but deliver the energy to the consumer at actual cost, there is a good deal of difference of opinion as to whether that is the cheapest method. In Hamilton, for instance, the Cataract Power Company offer freely to give power to the consumer at 10 per cent less than the lowest hydro-electric cost. A week ago Saturday I passed some construction work of the hydro-electric and I am satisfied that the footings they were putting in cost three times more than private corporations would pay or than it would have cost the hydro-electric had they done the work as they did some other work last year. All this extra expenditure on construction is added to the cost, and that no doubt accounts for private corporations being able to deliver power 10 per cent cheaper and still have a profit. But be that as it may, I think that competition is a splendid thing. Let us have the hydro-electric, and this transmission line, and a hundred others if possible As to the amount of revenue the government should get out of the St. Lawrence powers, if one half goes to Canada, that is perhaps all we are entitled to. But I do not think the government should pride themselves about getting a very large toll. I think that the amount of revenue would be better applied to the cheapening of power to the consumer through the Dominion Railway Commission. For these reasons, if this company is entirely on its own account, as the Bill before the House shows, and is a transmission line, it certainly cannot do any harm to give it opportunity to construct a transmission line and let the trials of strength be between their transmission lines rather than between the two sides of this House. If the Hydro-Electric Commission should have to come to this House for authority to build a line along side it, and in competition with it, I would be delighted to give them that privilege, and see the two companies and as many more as can be had, to build transmission lines and give competition and increased accommodation and energy, which would be for the advantage of this country and stimulate our industrial development.

Mr. HUGHES. I would urge upon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), if the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will permit him, to adjourn the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So early?

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) see if he can get the minister's (Mr. Pugsley) consent?

Mr. HUGHES. I know that the smile of the Minister of Finance is very influential, but when the Minister of Public Works frowns and curls his brow, even the Minister of Finance must sit up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) would do a little more work and a little less talk, he would get through.

Mr. HUGHES. But I have data here that, I am sure, will be of interest to the members of the House. Now, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), one of the quiet, modest, unassuming ministers, is possibly doing more to benefit this country than is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). The Minister of Public Works we find connected with sawdust wharfs, electrical development, the damming of the St. Lawrence—everything where you find the promoter and the man behind the machine. But the Minister of Inland Revenue is quietly developing the peat industry. Water-power is not our only source of energy. It is true that, with the power that can be developed by the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, we shall have 6,000,000 horse-power capable of development.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Half an hour ago, it was 3,000,000.

Mr. HUGHES. I said 3,000,000 within thirty miles of the city. I really must repeat my statements, if the minister pays so little attention to them as he has evidently done to this one. I said 3,000,000 horse-power already available; 3,000,000 more through the construction of the Georgian Bay canal—and three and three are

six. I was about to point out that there are also thousands of acres of peat in the eastern part of Ontario and in the adjoining province of Quebec. The Minister of Inland Revenue, with commendable honesty and energy, is assisting in the development of the peat industry. There is every hope that the time is near at hand when, with the producer gas from peat, we shall be able to produce energy at one-half the cost of producing it by water-power. Why, then, this mad haste to dam the St. Lawrence? It must not be forgotten also that other sources of energy are opening to us. Radium, which is now being produced on a commercial scale, opens wonderful possibilities for the future. Scientific journals of this week tell us that a pinch of radium, such as will lie on the thumbnail, will drive a 15,000-ton ship at fifteen knots an hour for 6,000 miles continuously. But science is still advancing, and another material, called, I believe, polonium, has been discovered which is one thousand times more powerful than is radium. With all these opportunities opening before us, why destroy the navigation of the St. Lawrence for the sake of a power scheme? Why court international complications with the United States in this project of damming the St. Lawrence?

Reference has been made to this Bill when it was before the Committee on Private Bills. I have distinct recollection, when in the Railway Committee, of seeing gentlemen rush into that committee and hustle the fellows out to the Private Bills Committee, and there, without having the slightest knowledge of what they were voting on, they would put through a Bill or vote down a motion for amendment. That was what at first excited the suspicion of members of this House—the fact that these gentlemen, led by some of the ministers, who threw their whole soul into it—the Minister of Public Works or, if not he, the horny-handed son of toil, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who would be looking after it, voted in this way. I say this first excited the suspicion of honest men. It appears from this discussion to-night that the Minister of Public Works has had this matter of damming the St. Lawrence at his finger ends for two years, yet has never taken the House of Commons into his confidence. This justifies the conduct of members of the opposition in fighting this Bill. And I can give the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) my word that he will find that, from one end of this country to the other, more than the Liberal-Conservatives are a little surprised as to developments that have taken place in this matter.

Now I asked the minister if he could give me some elevations, and he could not. I will be pleased to give him some knowledge. The elevation of the River St. Lawrence at Cornwall is 155 feet at the site where the dam is. The elevation of the Grand Trunk station at Cornwall is 191 feet; the elevation at Mille Roches is 225 feet, at Morrisburg 268 feet, at Iroquois 242 feet, at Prescott 247 feet. The great rise in the stream occurs in the first eight or ten miles above Cornwall. Now I am satisfied that, from the elevation of the country, from the lowness of the banks on the Canadian side, if this dam is erected and if an ice jam occurs, there is no telling how many miles the whole country between the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa rivers may be flooded.

Mr. NEELY. I rise to a point of order. The Bill under discussion has nothing to do with elevations or with building dams. The hon. member is discussing matters wholly foreign to the Bill before the House, and I ask your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion has certainly taken a very wide range. The item that has been called is section 1, and there is also a motion that the committee rise and report progress. It appears to me that arguments have been brought to bear on this particular question referring to improvements on the St. Lawrence, that were not very relevant, and yet they appeared sufficiently relevant to be allowed. While I regret the width and range of the debate, yet I do not feel at liberty to rule it out of order.

Mr. HUGHES. I had nearly completed the elevation idea in the absence of a profile. But there is another aspect. War might possibly occur between Canada and the United States, and it might be necessary, in the interest of Canada, that the free navigation of that river should be maintained. It would be a standing menace to peace between these two countries if that river was dammed. In case of war Canada should have free control of the St. Lawrence. It is impossible to-day for any enemy to cross the river for a number of miles above Cornwall. We have an impassable barrier in the Long Sault rapids. Our frontier is much more easily defended by having the St. Lawrence unimpeded by dams than it would be if a dam were constructed there and a lake created which could be easily crossed in boats instead of the rapids which now exist. The shipment of the produce of our country is carried on to a greater extent in boats than it formerly was, and the waterways will become the great highways of commerce in the future. Therefore, we must preserve the River St. Lawrence unimpeded in the interest of transportation. To-day freighters laden with grain go through the Long Sault rapids in the time that they would be getting through the first lock of the canal if they had to go down through the canal system.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of a boat laden with grain going through these rapids?

Mr. HUGHES. I have been on freighters when they went through the rapids, Freighters go through these rapids every week in the summer time.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. Grain freighters do not.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman will not deny that freighters go through these rapids in summer time?

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. If they only drew six or seven feet of water they might go through.

Mr. J. D. REID. Nine feet.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. No, not nine feet.

Mr. HUGHES. There are only two points in the rapids where there is any possibility of hitting at less than nine feet. A few charges of dynamite will clear the channel, and permit vessels drawing from twelve to fifteen feet to pass down. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the Long Sault Rapids have fifty feet of water throughout the greater part of them? Therefore, I maintain that in the interest of honest government we should stop this charter hunting, this charter-mongering, this handing over, without any plausible excuse, of the rights and interests of this country to men who have never contributed one dollar to its upbuilding. The Minister of Public Works, if he were true to the interests of Canada, instead of sitting here to-night engineering this scheme through, would stand up and fight these people, and compel them to come here and show what they are going to do. If he had the interests of the country at heart would he be here to-night engineering this scheme to dam this river to the detriment of the Dominion government and in the interests of a foreign corporation? No, he would stand shoulder to shoulder with the opposition in fighting this company and insisting that these men should not be granted the corporate powers which they are now seeking. That is where the Minister of Public Works should be if he were a true patriot, instead of the true friend of charter hunters.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked the Minister of Public Works what newspapers these plans were published in in Ontario, and he was good enough to make the answer that he knew nothing about the publication of the plans in any newspapers. I would like to ask the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Robert Smith) in what newspapers these plans were published. I would like my hon. friend to state in what newspapers these plans were published so that we could send to the library and have them here because it is almost impossible to arrive at any sound conclusion in the absence of the plans.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. The particular publication that I saw myself was in the Cornwall 'Standard' but I was informed by others that they had seen them in certain Toronto papers. When the promoters applied to the International Waterways Commission, first at Buffalo, and then at Toronto, these plans were produced, and the newspapers as a matter of news, and of enterprise copied them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What date?

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. Hon. gentlemen will remember the sitting of the International Waterways Commission some weeks ago. There is to be another sitting to take further evidence in Montreal in a few days.

Mr. BLAIN. Surely the hon. gentleman who suggested that there was unreasonable opposition on this side of the House was not serious? The strongest language and the most vigorous opposition to this Bill have come from the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) a member of the Private Bills Committee who said that the new points which have come up for discussion to-night are a great surprise to him and the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) who stated that the Bill was introduced under false pretenses. I appeal again to the Minister of Finance to grant the request not only of this side of the House, but of the ex-Minister of Railways.

Mr. FIELDING. If this were the final stage I could understand the objections, but the Bill was discussed at length before the Private Bills Committee and has been discussed the greater part of to-day. No one can say there has been any lack of the fullest opportunity for discussion and I cannot see what the plans have to do with this Bill. I think we ought to divide, that we ought to dispose of the matter at this stage. The Bill need not then go to the third reading at once and there would be ample opportunity for hon. gentlemen to place themselves on record on the third reading.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the minister think we are going to pass all the clauses of this Bill to-night?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know why we should not.

Mr. HUGHES. Not on your life.

Mr. BLAIN. I would call the minister's attention to the objections of his political friends which I cited.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know of any sides in this matter. This is not a party

matter. If these hon. members had not heard of these important points earlier they have had no lack of information on them during the last two hours.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Public Works has admitted that there is a scheme to dam the St. Lawrence, and that this Bill is part of the scheme.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. When we have these plans they will show whether it is part of the scheme or not. There must be some object in trying to shove this Bill through without the members understanding it.

Mr. FIELDING. No private Bill of the present session has received so much discussion.

Mr. HUGHES. Or needed it so much.

Mr. FIELDING. That may be so, but at all events it certainly is time now to endeavour to get on with the public business.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is all very well to talk about reserving half of the power for Canada, but Canada does not need half of this 30,000 horse-power now, and it will be exported to the United States, and vested rights would intervene and we will never be able to get that power back. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) said he was prepared to sit here until Saturday night. Well, we on this side are prepared to do the same. I know that the government are anxious to get on with some government business, but this will not help them. It is now a quarter past three in the morning and we have to meet at three p.m. If the suggestion I have made be accepted, this Bill will go through in much less time on Monday than it possibly can now. Let the committee rise and the plans be brought down and laid on the table, and let the Minister of Public Works consult with the Department of Justice before proceeding further with the measure; and on Monday next the Bill will go through in less time than it has the slightest chance of doing now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am always glad to meet an offer of compromise, but you can never compromise if one side insists on having everything its own way. Our hon. friend wants something unreasonable. He wants us to bring down plans which might relate to some other Bill. There are none in connection with this Bill.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has admitted himself that this Bill and the other one were practically the same Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend ought to be ingenuous enough to suggest some other way out of the difficulty. I have always said that before any work will be

commenced on the St. Lawrence, the company will have to come here and get legislative authority.

Mr. HUGHES. But the minister's word is not statute law.

Mr. TURRIFF. Early in the discussion I said that in my opinion it would be advisable for the Bill to stand over in order that we might ascertain if the statements made by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) were well founded. I am still of the opinion, and am prepared to vote that way. At the same time I am not prepared to sit here all night and day simply for the purpose of obstructing. I want to vote for what I really think is right. This is a private Bill, and I do not consider that in voting against the majority on this side, I am voting in any way against the government or Liberal party. But I might say to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) that if a member on this side happens to vote with him on any subject, it does not help that member to pat him on the back. It only makes it a little more difficult for the man who wants to take an independent position. If hon. members opposite do not wish to take a vote, I would suggest as a compromise that we pass the preamble of the Bill, and that the committee should then rise.

Mr. BRODER. There are one or two clauses that require to be amended. Suppose we should allow the preamble to pass and put the Bill through the other stages later on, I would want it understood that the proposed amendments may be moved.

Mr. FIELDING. Undoubtedly my hon. friend would have to give notice. The Bill would then be referred back and he would be at liberty to do that at any stage. I would undertake to say the third reading would not be pressed until the hon. gentleman gave his notice. Let me suggest that if there be any particular clause specially objectionable, let the clause be held over and let the committee make progress with the rest of the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES. We would then be debarred from discussing the general features of the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman would be debarred from discussing the clauses already passed, but not the clauses he wishes to hold over.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As I understand, by reference to some of the papers, in the month of February when the commission met in Toronto, they made a report. Did the Minister of Public Works have that report sent to them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The commissioners did not make any report.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would it not be wise to investigate some of the statements made by the commissioners. In taking up the Cornwall 'Standard' of Friday, February 25, I find that, during the discussion, chairman Gibbons explained the Act introduced in the United States congress to authorize the construction of this work said it was subject to a special provision by which the powers of the company could be taken away at any time if they interfered with national interests. There is certainly no such provision in this Bill:

> And that the commencement of this work was subject to the consent of the Canadian government, he thought, and if the commission came to the conclusion that the scheme was practicable and feasible, and would not interfere with the interests of navigation, that we might assume that the Canadian government would be as astute as the United States government in protecting the interests of our country.

The Minister of Public Works knows that when the commission met in Toronto, the strongest objection was raised along different lines. As far as the commission are concerned, I think they should be made aware of these different statements. I have just picked up a few and judging from what I have read, the Montreal Harbour Commission is strongly opposed to this Bill going through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He does not mean this Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Am I to understand that several members from Montreal tonight were quite willing to get up and do their utmost to stop the passage of this measure? One of them made that statement on a front bench. If that is the position we are in, that several Quebec members are strongly opposed to this measure, and have not the liberty to speak on it, and the Montreal Harbour Commission, and the Light, Heat and Power Company are opposed to it—

Mr. CONMEE. Quite naturally.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We have heard nothing about these objections. Has the commission had placed before it the fact that this scheme will lower the water in the St. Lawrence? Of course that may not seem, to some hon. gentlemen, of great importance. It is of great importance, and, in addition, some of the navigation companies have been sending in the strongest kind of condemnation of this Bill. So, it is not an unreasonable request that this Bill should be allowed to remain over, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will see the justice of that request and accede to it.

Mr. CONMEE. I think that hon. gentlemen ought to consider that this matter has been before the House for a couple of months. It has been fully discussed before the Private Bills Committee. This is not a question of the navigation of the St. Lawrence or the building of a dam. The discussion to-night has been entirely wide of the Bill. It is the suspicion that this Bill may involve questions of navigation and the constructing of a dam across the river that causes this discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. Did not the commission take all these matters into consideration?

Mr. CONMEE. What the commission had before them was the building of a dam and not this Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they not so connected as to be inseparable??

Mr. CONMEE. I do not think so. No doubt, as the minister has said, there may be in view the obtaining of power from its development at the Long Sault rapids. But even so, we have the word of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) that before anything is done, everything will be brought before this parliament. The company will have to get a Bill under these circumstances.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Under the Act of 1901 have not they got the authority to dam the St. Lawrence?

Mr. CONMEE. The American Bill provides that the consent of the Canadian parliament must be had.

Mr. S. SHARPE. They have already got our consent.

Mr. CONMEE. No, they have no ratification of plans; they cannot build a dam.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I cannot understand why there is such persistent opposition to allowing this Bill to go over. It cannot be because the company want to make use of this lifeless transmission line, because they cannot make use of it until the plans are approved by the Minister of Public Works and the government. But I believe the reason the government are pushing this Bill so strongly is apparent. If the company had the power under the Act of 1901, the power they are now asking, they would not be here. That law does not give them the power to build transmission lines within a municipality, except by that municipality's consent. This Bill proposes to give them that power subject to the usual expropriation powers of the Railway Act. It is only by expropriation powers that they can force their transmission lines through the municipalities. They have the horse in the shape of the St. Lawrence power; they want us to give them the harness to put on that horse. And then they will have

everything they require as completely as though they had had it given them under a special Bill. But if they were to come now asking for these combined powers, in our present knowledge of what is involved and with our present judgment, would we give them these powers? I say we would not. We have no right to give them these powers, then, under the plea of a mere supplementary Bill. What is the position of the two parties? It is said this is not a party question. I cannot understand then why members of the cabinet will remain here until a quarter to four in the morning to do—what? To give private individuals the power to make money out of a public asset of this country as against the Hydro-Electric Commission, which proposes to utilize these powers for the benefit of the public. No municipality has asked the government to pass this Bill. The 'Globe' newspaper, the representative of the Liberal party, has protested in the most strenuous terms against the passing of the Bill. Can any member of this House on the other side say that his position is in the interests of the public, standing as he does against the Hydro-Electric Commission, a body which was incorporated for the very purpose of conserving these water-powers and giving power to the public at cost, without the intervention of the middleman? It is idle for my hon. friends opposite to say that we are here for the purpose of obstruction only. We are trying to further the policy inaugurated by the Whitney government which has been supported, not only by a vote of 65 to 17 in the legislature, but by a popular majority of 100,000 in the province.

Mr. CARVELL. That is honest.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Quite as honest as the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) being here in the interest of the middlemen. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when he conceived the idea that this company was going to pay as much for power as the state of New York is charging the company on the other side of the line? I assume that policy was conceived after the statements made by the member for Westmorland whereby it was proved that the state of New York were charging the companies over there not only a lump sum but paying a horse-power rate therefor. On the other side of the line they charge a large annual sum for the use of natural resources: on this side we get the benefit of the utilization of those powers, and the people get an annual sum in the shape of cheaper electricity as it is administered by the Hydro-Electric Commission.

Mr. HUGHES. A little time ago the Minister of Public Works made the statement that this was not a government measure but a private Bill. I would like the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Finance to point out in the history of the parliament of Canada where five ministers of the Crown sat up all night fighting in the interests of a private Bill. I tell the Minister of Public Works that this is a government measure. He has confessed that for two years he has been carrying on secret negotiations with gentlemen who are behind the power scheme to dam the St. Lawrence, and he has never once given the people of Canada that knowledge which we squeezed out of him to-night. In the title attributed to the Sovereign of England are to be found the words 'Defender of the Faith'. The Minister of Public Works, I am afraid, will go down to history with the label plastered over his crest: 'Defender of United States trusts'. He will go down to history as the man who sat up all night in order to betray, by his actions, the rights of the people of Canada in the waterway of the St. Lawrence river. He will go down as the man who engineered the closing of the St. Lawrence to the people of Canada in the interests of United States corporations and trusts and not as the man who stood up to defend the rights of the people of this country. He will go down as the man who increased the freight rates on the produce of the farmers, increased the passenger rates on the farmers, and closed up that magnificent river which has been the delight of tourists in all periods of the nation's history. He will go down as the man who increased the cost of electric power by handing it over to a gigantic monopoly. He will be known as the man who stood cheek by jowl with the corporate interests and trusts of the United States. He will go down in history, not as a traitor in war, not as a man who would serve his country in time of war, but as the man who in time of peace, gave to the United States the enormous advantage which would accrue to them if war should ever occur between the two nations. We wondered why the Liberal members were so active on that committee. We thought it was an ordinary transmission Bill, until we saw the canvassing and the drumming up of members to come down and vote, then our suspicions were aroused, and our curiosity was excited in this matter. Five ministers of the Crown were found sitting here at four o'clock in the morning fighting for what they term a private Bill, and yet we are told that it has all been talked over by the government for two years, and although they are quite familiar with all the details, they refuse to bring them down for our information. I want to know why it is that they are giving over to a gigantic corporation the control of the River St.

Lawrence, to the detriment of the people of this country? Why are these people favoured by a Minister of the Crown, and why has he promised to jam through this Bill? This Bill is necessary to make the other Bill effective and the two Bills taken together are necessary to make the whole conspiracy complete and take from the Dominion the control of its waterways. I do not blame the promoters. Grafters come around at all times and on all sides, but I blame the men who are here as trustees of the company for neglecting the interests of the people. Before I proceed further I would ask the Minister of Finance——

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is doing well, and I do not complain.

Mr. HUGHES. I am ready; I am in good trim. But I really would insist that the minister should get home to bed.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see why my hon. friend should be so unkind.

Mr. HUGHES. It is the reverse. I have a warm feeling for the minister. In the vicinity of Ottawa we can develop 6,000,000 horse-power from water, and in the eastern part of Ontario, we can develop, under the plans that are being carried out by the Minister of Inland Revenue another 6,000,000, and possibly 10,000,000 more. Therefore, we can produce in this locality by water and peat alone nearly one-third of the power consumed on the continent of North America. With the data before us why in the name of all that is decent should these sworn ministers of the Crown be parties to engineering through this House any such Bill as this. It behooves us as trustees of the people to see that the water-powers of the St. Lawrence are not handed over one hour before it is necessary to hand them over, and then we must harness them with such safeguards in the interest of the people as will prevent any great monopoly from controlling them. President Roosevelt in the United States sought to save the people's water-powers. The Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance, and a couple of other ministers with the whole party behind them are working to take away the people's water-powers. The interests in the gigantic power trust are said to be greater than the combined railway, Standard Oil, and Steel Corporation interests of the United States of America. In the minister's meetings with these gentlemen promoting this project, has he obtained any idea whether or not they are in this gigantic water-power trust.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret I am unable to give my hon. friend the information.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister is aware that they are in a very good trust of their own.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. After listening to the splendid address just delivered by my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) I am sure that the government must feel that this measure is worthy of much more consideration than it has received in the past. In following out the line of argument taken by my hon. friend I wish to read for the benefit of the Minister of Finance an article from the Daily 'Star' of February 28. (The hon. member reads the article). In the face of that very strong article, which appears on the editorial page of the Montreal 'Star,' I cannot but feel that the Minister of Finance would be acting in accordance with the interests of the country if he would allow this Bill to stand over until we have an opportunity to investigate it thoroughly. I have another article here from the Montreal 'Star' of February 25, headed, 'Must keep control of waterways.' It gives a strong resolution passed by the Montreal executive of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association opposing this measure. Thus we have not only the Conservation Commission, speaking by its chairman——

Mr. PARDEE. The chairman is not against it. Read his leter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. He practically condemned it, there is no question about that. We have not only the Conservation Commission, but also the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario, which is developing water-powers and furnishing electrical energy at the lowest possible cost, having contracts with the Niagara Power Company——

Mr. PARDEE. Does the hon. member expect that the Hydro-Electric Commission is going to transmit Niagara power to Eastern Ontario?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They will not undertake such a proposition. But here the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) proposes to give away one of the most valuable water-powers in the country for private interests and for nothing. And here we have a strong resolution of the Manufacturers' Association in Montreal in condemnation of the proposition. I am sure that if we had time to look up others, we could find many of them. And we may be sure that, when private capital controls these privileges, they will charge high rates and then they will pump enough water into the proposition to make those rates seem necessary.

Mr. TOBIN. Their rates are subject to the Railway Commission.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. member suppose that the towns to be supplied

will be in the same position as if the Hydro-Electric Commission had the control of affairs?

Mr. PARDEE. Much better.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. member (Mr. Pardee) knows full well that he dare not go into western Ontario and take that position.

Mr. PARDEE. Yes, he dare.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No man from Ontario dare go to the western part of the province and take the position that the Hydro-Electric Commission are not giving the people of Ontario power at the minimum cost.

Mr. SHARPE. He dare not say it here.

Mr. PARDEE. Yes, he dare say it here or anywhere. I say that the Hydro-Electric Commission are not furnishing power at many points in Ontario at the prices they promise.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is a very mild way of putting it. It is open to two meanings. 'Not furnish power at the prices they promised.' They may have furnished it at lower prices.

Mr. PARDEE. I mean higher.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the hon. member name a few places of which that is true?

Mr. PARDEE. I will not interrupt the discussion. Let the hon. member go on.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. member's argument against the Hydro-Electric Commission is a very weak one. Now, this resolution of the Manufacturers' Association was passed unanimously. It is another evidence of the feeling against this Bill. I sincerely hope the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will see the justice of our case and not keep us here any longer. It is a quarter to five in the morning.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member (Mr. Armstrong) is keeping himself. I would not keep him for a moment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But I should not be serving the interest of the people I represent, and of the province from which I come if I did not resist the attempt to force down our throats this most unjust measure. Now, I have another article here from the Montreal 'Star,' February 21st, under the heading, 'Long Sault Dam':

Mr. FIELDING. It may be well for me to say once in every two hours, so that there may be a record of it, that there is no foundation for the talk of hon. gentlemen opposite about this Bill being forced through to-night. Several hours ago I said that if hon. gentlemen would indicate the particular clauses they would like to hold over we would let them stand over and not take the Bill out of the committee stage. Therefore, any statement that we are trying to force this Bill through to-night is not according to the record.

Mr. SMYTH. The Minister of Finance is undertaking to give us a lecture.

Mr. FIELDING. I thought I should mention that point just once every two hours.

Mr. SMYTH. The responsibility for what has occurred to-night rests on the ministers. It is not often in a British parliament that you see the majority holding up the public business for the sake of a private Bill. It leads us to think that there must be something behind this. I notice a significant absence of the Ontario members here to-night, and I know that not one of the Ontario members except our friend from Rainy River, who has something coming afterwards that he wants put through, would have the hardy hardihood to stand up here and say anything against the power policy of the Ontario government. We have the member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) taking an active part in favour of this measure, and we always look with a little suspicion on a measure that he advocates. We also view with suspicion the Minister of Finance taking an active part in a private Bill, or in fact any public Bill that he is mixed up with. I am not here to block the public business, but I am here to see the rights of the people of the province of Ontario safeguarded. The Hydro-Electric Commission has done noble work in Ontario, and the people of the province endorsed the government by an immense majority last election, and the Liberals in the Ontario house are taking a manly stand in favour of the policy of the government in this regard. For some reason which I do not understand, but which I may refer to later on, we have the ministers and the members from Quebec and Manitoba and New Brunswick, especially New brunswick, endeavouring to foist on the people of Ontario something they detest. We are to-night fighting for the interests of the people of Ontario, and gentlemen on the other side can make up their minds that we will stay here till Sunday morning if need be.

Mr. J. D. REID. Everything to-night indicates that the government are behind this private Bill, and I would ask them to listen to what the Toronto 'Globe' of February the 9th says about it. If this Bill goes through, the government will have power to grant the privilege of damming the St. Lawrence without coming to this House at all. I have that information from a gentleman in this concern.

Mr. CONMEE. It has already been pointed out that the premier stated that the

scheme would first be brought before parliament and submitted to our consideration; and the Minister of Public Works on two other occasions this evening made the same statement, that the matter would not be dealt with until it was ratified by this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton put a question earlier in the session to the Prime Minister as to whether the government would consent to the damming of the St. Lawrence river at the Long Sault without the matter first coming to parliament, and the Prime Minister stated in the most equivocal language that it would not. The government has power to approve the plans or otherwise, and he stated distinctly that the government would take no action until the matter had first been approved by parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Public Works also states that if this dam is granted the government will see that we get the same rates for power that they do on the American side.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Provided it is granted by parliament. The government is not going to grant it, parliament will have to deal with it first.

Mr. J. D. REID. Let me ask the minister: What does the government charge per horse-power along the canals or anywhere else?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The charge varies according to the location and value of the power.

Mr. J. D. REID. They already charged a nominal rate of $2 per horse-power, and a few years ago they raised the rate to $4 per power. They state that they will develop, I think, 800,000 horse-power, of which we will get 400,000. Now, if we take it at the lowest rate, the people of this country will receive $800,000 per annum.

Mr. CONMEE. If they build this dam they will have to construct not only the dam but the conduits, the head gates, the pen stocks, and all that sort of thing. That is all done in the case of canals; therefore we cannot expect to get the same revenue out of these that we could from a lock.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the hon. gentleman would take a trip along the St. Lawrence canal he would recognize that his statements are not borne out by the facts. Take Iroquois. The gentleman who has the power there is trying to sell it in these towns. He had to dig a place away from the canal, then he had to build his dams, and realize before he put in his power at all.

Mr. ROBT. SMITH. Will the hon. gentleman say that that gentleman who is developing power on the Iroquois canal is not using much of the canal built by the government for the purpose of getting water from the head of the rapids? Is he taking water out of the government canal into the river?

Mr. J. D. REID. If these people build the dam across the St. Lawrence they will be emptying the water, and I cannot see what difference that makes at all.

Mr. CONMEE. At Lachine and Cornwall, and places on the Welland and other places where power is being used, the power is already created, so far as hydraulic pressure is concerned, by the works of the government.

Mr. J. D. REID. But I am satisfied that the development of power under this proposed power scheme Bill will not cost so much per horse-power as the development of power from the Cornwall canal. Yet the government charges $4 per horse power in that case. If the government were to make the same charge in this case, the revenue to the public would be $1,600,000 per annum. I suppose not more than five or ten per cent of the possible power can be used in Canada at the present time. We could not expect them to spend the money for development and not use the power developed. So, they would have to export the power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not allow them.

Mr. J. D. REID. Would not allow them to export?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. It has been allowed in other cases.

Mr. PARDEE. There is a provision against it in this Bill.

Mr. J. D. REID. But did not the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) propose that it should be allowed?

Mr. PARDEE. Almost as soon as we took the matter up in the committee, the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) said that the great objection was to the export of power, and it was agreed that the right to export power should be cut out.

Mr. S. SHARPE. But when it was suggested that an audit should be made under which the power should not be sold to any company that had the right to export it, the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) refused that.

Mr. PARDEE. That is right.

Mr. J. D. REID. So, this power would go to build up industries in the United States.

Mr. PARDEE. No, under the hon. gentleman's own scheme, which he has been talking about all night, there would be as much power sent to the other side of the line as under ours. This is to build up industries here.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why, they intend to take it from Massena and for a hundred miles on the other side and there are large cities there calling for a great deal of power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We would not let them take it. We could insist on half of it being kept in Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. But another company may be formed with the right to export power, and that is the way of getting round it. And vested rights will be formed, and once they are formed the United States would not allow us to interfere with those vested rights on their side. The minister knows that 95 per cent of the water is on the American side.

Mr. CONMEE. That would not be the case after the dam was built. The object of the dam would be to equalize and control the flow. It will cost a little money, but it can be done.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not in that locality, on account of the way the river runs and the way the islands are situated. And the Americans will claim more than half the power, and the government is not going to war about it.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the Minister of Public Works told us that this scheme was coupled up with the other scheme.

Mr. BLAIN. In answer to a question of mine the Minister of Public Works stated that the power would come from a dam on the St. Lawrence

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said I had no knowledge whatever about the matter, but I surmised that if the power were developed on the St. Lawrence they would use it. There is nothing in the Bill to prevent them getting power anywhere else.

Mr. BLAIN. That was quite sufficient to give the members of the committee to understand that this transmission company would get their power generated by the other company. I ask the Minister of Finance what objection he has to this amendment to the Bill which was moved in the committee and voted down by his supporters:—

Nothing in this act contained shall be construed to authorize the company to enter on, take or use any land or water, the property of any province without having first obtained by order in council of the lieutenant governor of the consent of the province to such entry taking or user.

Mr. J. D. REID.

Surely that is a fair proposition.

Mr. FIELDING. There must have been some good reasons advanced in support of voting down that resolution. I take it for granted that my hon. friend thinks that this company will in some way or other be brought into conflict with the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission. I have no quarrel with the Ontario government on that, but I have always understood that what they desired was not a monopoly but competition. If that be so they cannot object to some other corporation entering the field. If this corporation cannot supply power cheaper than the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission then they will get no customers. However, I have not studied the question sufficiently to deliver a judgment off-hand on the resolution read by my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has fairly stated that the policy of the Ontario government is to create competition so as to cheapen power. But when the Ontario government has expended a large amount of money in pursuance of that policy, this government is not justified in taking away their rights.

Mr. RANKIN. What money did the Ontario government expend?

Mr. BLAIN. The credit of the province for some millions.

Mr. RANKIN. The Ontario government finances that, but the municipalities pay the whole burden.

Mr. PARDEE. And it does not apply to anything east of Toronto.

Mr. BLAIN. The province of Ontario have not been able to cover the whole province as yet, but it is their intention to supply power to the very municipalities that this Bill proposes to supply power to. What objection has the Minister of Public Works to the resolution I read?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we get down to business and come to a section in connection with which that resolution might be moved, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the committee will give it fair consideration. Let us get down to business and not act like children.

Mr. PRICE. It seems to me it is the Minister of Public Works and his supporters who are acting like children. This is a very serious Bill, there is an important principle involved in it and we are perfectly justified in fighting it.

Mr. TURCOT. What is the principle?

Mr. PRICE. It is the principle of provincial rights. Why did not the minister accept a fair sugegstion and postpone this Bill until the plans were here, so that we

might consider the matter from a business point of view.

Mr. CARVELL. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the plans have nothing to do with this Bill and that they are plans which are before the Waterways Commission in connection with another matter.

Mr. PRICE. I know all about that; I know it is not only this Bill we are considering but the whole scheme connected with it. Personally I am opposed to obstruction and in favour of expediting business.

An hon. MEMBER. Then expedite business.

Mr. PRICE. We will not be bluffed by the other side of the House. We have as much good stuff on our side as you have on yours.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans were not asked for until twelve o'clock last night and they could not be brought here. Ordinarily my hon. friend (Mr. Price) is a sensible business man.

Mr. PRICE. Thank you.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And the hon. gentleman is ashamed of the way the business has been conducted here to-night. Hon. gentlemen opposite must recognize that the majority must rule. If the preamble of this Bill and some non-contentious clauses are passed I will send to the chairman of the International Waterways Commission and have the plans sent here if possible. I am prepared to do anything to prevent the unseemly spectacle we have had here all night.

Mr. PRICE. I know that the majority must rule, but at the same time the minority have rights which it is their duty to fight for. I am not a lawyer but a business man, and I want to see the business of the House expedited.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why not pass the preamble then.

Mr. PRICE. I do not think the proposition is reasonable.

Mr. TOBIN. What do you see in the present Bill that you object to.

Mr. PRICE. I do not know much about the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PRICE. I know enough to know that it affects the rights of the city of Montreal and that the rights of that city should be respected.

Mr. CARVELL. The Bill does no touch the city of Montreal.

Mr. PRICE. I believe it does.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, I beg your pardon it does include the city of Montreal.

Mr. PRICE. I honestly stated that I know very little about the Bill but notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman has been with the Bill throughout the committee stage I seem to know more about it than he does. I think the hon. gentleman should not be so ready to correct without reason a novice such as I am.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The Minister of Public Works said a moment ago that we are acting childishly. I would like to know from him who are the parties that are acting childishly. He says the majority must rule. Who are the majority in this case? It is not a government Bill, it is a private Bill, and one man has just as much right in this House as another on a private Bill. If it were a government Bill, I would yield immediately.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I meant was this, that instead of wasting the time by unnecessary talk at this late hour in the morning, let us take a vote and then we will know where the majority is.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I have been in this House for 28 years, and this is the first time that I ever saw the time of the House wasted in this manner on a private Bill. Now, if that dam is erected, I want to ask how boats can go up and down the river and through that canal.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. Under the propoed plan the Cornwall canal will not be interfered with in any way, and there will be no more to prevent boats going up and down than there is to-day.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Is the water not to be raised by the dam?

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. The water is not to be raised at the head of the Cornwall canal. They are not going to raise the water so high as to be above the head of the canal.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The dam will be practically at the head of the canal.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. The dam is not to be at the head of the canal. It will not be sufficiently high to raise the water as high as the head of the Cornwall canal. The proposed dam is some five miles below the head of the Cornwall canal; there is a large descent in the river at that distance, and it is not proposed to raise the water as high as the head of the Cornwall canal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Question.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. It is now a quarter to seven o'clock. The Minister of Public Works said we were childish, because the majority must rule.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say the hon. gentlemen were childish. I said we should

get to work instead of staying here and wasting the time of the committee and wasting the money of the public by useless discussion.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The government is responsible in fathering a private Bill in which they have no interest unless they are backing up a monopoly, and it is the duty of the opposition to prevent the country being looted, and if necessary to do that we will remain here until Satutrday night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let us take a vote, and we will see where the majority is.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The vote is not going to be taken. When the minister says that he is not speaking for the government, when he says that the government make this Bill their Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said nothing of the kind. I did not intend any such reference to be drawn from my remarks. There would be no truth whatever in such a remark. I said let us take a vote and then we will see where the majority is. The majority may be on one side or the other

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. The Cornwall canal leaves the river at the east end of the town of Cornwall; it runs along the shore of the river, passing through a number of locks. On the Canadian side the distance from the head of the canal down to the dam is probably eight miles. There are islands intervening between the two channels. On Sheik's island, on the Canadian side, there is a drop of about thirty feet and the proposed dam is considerably further down.

Mr. PRICE. As I understand the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Robert Smith) the dam across the river will raise the water probably thirty feet, but it will have no effect upon the lock. Consequently the Cornwall canal will not be affected. Of course, the hon. gentleman, I understand, is thoroughly convinced that the dam will cross at this place.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. I speak of what the plans propose.

Mr. PRICE. But I asked for information, and now the hon. member seems to be in doubt about it.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH. I say that that is the proposition the company is making to the government.

Mr. PRICE. Then the plans have been submitted to the Department of Public Works. I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) if he quite agrees with the hon. member for Stormont. He has seen the plans and knows about them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not think then, and do not think now, that the plans of the contemplated works in the St. Law-

Mr. PUGSLEY.

rence had anything to do with this Bill, and I am not prepared to give the information he is asking for. But the plans were submitted to the government and are now before the International Waterways Commission. As I recollect them, they show the dam a considerable distance below the locks of the Cornwall canal, and I believe the engineer stated that these construction works would not affect the Cornwall canal. But all this will be considered when the matter comes up for determination.

Mr. PRICE. Now, we have taken up a great deal of time, and I would draw the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the situation. I think this is about the first time I have had the honour of addressing him. I feel a little diffident about it. At the same time, no one more thoroughly appreciates his bonhomie and good humor than I do. Now it seems to me we have been wasting a good deal of time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PRICE. But whose fault is it? It is now a little after seven o'clock. I can say to the minister that if he wishes to go on, we can go on in this way until Saturday evening. But there is no sense in this sort of thing. We should act like business men and like representatives of the Canadian people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then, why not do so?

Mr. PRICE. Quite right. That is what we want to do. We have strong objections to this Bill—not so much to the Bill, perhaps, as to what goes with it. It seems to me it would be better in the interest of both sides, if you put this off until the next day for private Bills, and, in the meantime, let the information be laid before the House. We are prepared to take a proper view of the subject, and if we are to be defeated, as we believe we are, why, we shall be defeated. But would it not be better to make some arrangement and facilitate business? Of course, if the minister does not want to do that, we are ready to fight.

Mr. HUGHES. There has been some discussion of the position of the locks. Would the hon. member for Stormont tell us where these dams are to be placed?

Mr. R. SMITH. The first proposed dam on the American side is from the foot of Long Sault island to the American side, and there they propose to put in a lock. The next is from the foot of Long Sault island to Barnhardt's island, and the last dam goes from the foot of Barnhardt's to the bank of the Cornwall canal, about eight miles below the head of the canal and four miles out from the foot.

Mr. COWAN. I object to this secondary evidence concerning documents that are in existence and that could be produced in short order. In no court of justice would that kind of evidence be listened to for a moment. One member says the dam is at one place and another member says the dam is another place and we cannot tell where the dam is. The Minister of Public Works, says that the dam may be below Montreal or above Montreal but he says that no matter where the dam is, it will not affect the Cornwall canal. If the plans were here we would know where the dam is and we would know whether it would affect the canal or not, and so we have spent the whole night here because the Minister of Public Works has forgotten where the dam is. The Minister of Public Works has told us that the majority must rule, yes, but the majority must rule according to justice, and if there is nothing to hide bring forth your plans and then, if everything is satisfactory, we will pass your government measure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is unnecessary for me to state again that this is not a government measure and that the government is not behind it. Any member of the government or any supporter of the government can vote on it just as he pleases.

Mr. COWAN. Let the minister not pretend that he has not made this a party measure; he knows it is a party measure and that every man on that side of the House is at his back. I tell the minister and the party behind him that the moment they attempt to divert the public resources of Canada from the use of the people into the coffers of a private corporation, the party on this side of the House will oppose that. Does the member for West Lambton pretend to say that this company will not get its power from the St. Lawrence Power Company.

Mr. PARDEE. I do not know, and the Bill does not say anything about it.

Mr. COWAN. Then if the hon. member does not know, in all justice postpone the consideration of the Bill until he ascertains the fact that this company will get its power from the St. Lawrence Power Company which in conjunction with an American company intends to dam the St. Lawrence. Let any member on the other side of the House stand up and tell me that this company will not get its power from the St. Lawrence Power Company; let them stand up individually because I want to get them on record. I cannot understand how men become so tied up to private corporations as to become blind to the public interest.

Mr. TOBIN. Does the hon. member say we are tied up to private corporations.

Mr. COWAN. As far as I can judge the hon. member for Wolfe and Richmond and all of his ilk to-night are tied up body and soul to the passage of this Bill.

Mr. TOBIN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member (Mr. Cowan) has made the statement that the member for Richmond and Wolfe and all his ilk are tied up to private corporations. I ask Mr. Chairman, that you compel him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not understand the member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) to use exactly the words the hon. gentleman has indicated. I will let the hon. member state himself the exact words he used.

Mr. COWAN. I say that I understand that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe and gentlemen on his side of the House are tied up body and soul, using it figuratively, to the passage of this Bill.

Mr. CARVELL. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe rose to a point of order and quoted words which he understood to be used by the member for Vancouver. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tobin) quoted them exactly; I think the statement made by the member for Vancouver represents the words he used and while the language is very strong I know of no rule that he has actually violated.

Mr. COWAN. I have no desire to charge gentlemen on the other side with the intention to make this Bill law. If any gentleman on the other side is against this Bill I shall be glad to let him say so. I notice the peculiar reiteration with which the Minister of Public Works has said that it would be better to let us have a vote and get this thing through. You will notice the peculiar lack of principle in that suggestion; not a lack of cunning, not a lack of art in the railroading of a Bill through the House, but a peculiar lack of principle. Am I to understand that the minister is opposed to any further powers being given under the Act of 1901?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated that no decision had been come to by the government in the matter.

Mr. COWAN. But the plan has been laid before the government, these plans are for the minister's eye and not for the members of this committee, and yet the whole case is based upon these plans, which are hidden from us, which are concealed from us, which are withheld from us, which are pigeon-holed in the minister's department and which he dare not lay on the table.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated already that they were before the International Waterways Comssimion.

Mr. COWAN. I am ready to take my seat if any man will be good enough to suggest the remotest semblance of a ghost of a reason for withholding the plans from this House. I get no reply. Am I to assume that their ingenuity is exhausted? Am I to assume that silence is their only recourse? Am I to assume that this Minister of Public Works and his party behind him are so absolutely run to earth that they have not one word to say why they are withholding these plans from this House? It has been suggested that they are asleep, Mr. Chairman. I have visual proof that they are not asleep, and I believe if they were asleep that nature, who has that happy faculty of revealing the truth at unexpected times, would reveal to this House the location of those plans and their nature. No, Mr. Chairman, it is not a sufficient answer to say that the minister and his followers are asleep, because I know that if that were the case the truth would out. Is the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) in favour of diverting this water-power belonging to the public into the possession of a private corporation of the United States?

Mr. NEELY. That is not the question before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is growing up a habit of hon. members addressing each other across the floor, while still keeping their seats. The hon. member who is addressing the House should be allowed to do so.

Mr. COWAN. Listening to the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) I am particularly anxious to get the measure of his ideas. Before I leave for breakfast I would like to ascertain where the hon. member thinks this company will get the power it is to transmit. The hon. gentleman does not reply, and my curiosity is unsatisfied. Mr. Speaker, I desire to treat this thing seriously, but it is hard to do so in view of the absurdity of basing the whole case upon plans seen with eyes of one colour by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Robert Smith) and seen as through a glass darkly by the Minister of Public Works. And these gentlemen who have seen these plans come and tell us their forgettings about them, and, in the end, we know nothing either about the plans or about the dam.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. member for Vancouver has told us that he intends to go home and get breakfast. I have known people to talk strangely because of something in their stomachs, but I have never heard one talk so strangely as the hon. gentleman because of nothing in his stomach. I am sorry that he has seen fit to mar this pleasant evening. For, while this has been obstruction pure and simple, it has, on the whole, been carried on in a very pleasant manner. The speech of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) was a jewel. He did not say anything unpleasant; in fact, he did not say anything at all. He said nothing but what others said for him, so he was not called upon to draw on his mental resources or even greatly on his physical resources. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) obstructed in a thoroughly gentlemanly manner. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. George Taylor) wants to get home, but did not say anything unpleasant. But as to the hon. member for Vancouver, I would remind him that this Bill is for the purpose of incorporating certain gentlemen as a company for the transmission of electrical energy.

Mr. COWAN. What electrical energy?

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. member does not know what electrical energy is, it would be hardly worth while for me to explain.

Mr. COWAN. I know about electrical energy and could give an instructive lecture upon it. But whence is it to come in this case?

Mr. CARVELL. From water-power.

Mr. COWAN. From what water-power?

Mr. CARVELL. From somewhere along the St. Lawrence river—I do not know where. Nor do I care. And I think the people along the St. Lawrence will not care very much either. If hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), think they are making political capital out of this, they are welcome to all they can get out of it. There are other places in the Dominion than the province of Ontario, and we are not all bound to the chariot wheels of the Hydro-Electric Commission, though the hon. member for Vancouver may be.

Mr. COWAN. Or to the public interest.

Mr. CARVELL. I feel bound by the public interest and consider the course I am taking in the public interest. The hon. member did me the honour to intimate that I had some object in trying to force this Bill through. I have no interest at all. I am not a member of the Private Bills Committee. I advocate the Bill because I believe it to be in the public interest. I have stated before that I did not care how many transmission companies or other public utilities came into my constituency—the more the better. The hon. member for Vancouver, though he has spent an hour and a half in opposing this Bill had no qualms of conscience in putting through this House Bill (No. 118) to give his friends

in British Columbia the very rights he wishes to deny to others.

Mr. CONMEE. And over the head of the province.

Mr. COWAN. What Bill—what is the title?

Mr. CARVELL. Bill 118. The hon. member knows what it is. He is not so innocent as he looks. Only two weeks ago he put this Bill through the House giving to his friends powers he now would deny to others. And he deliberately insinuates that the Minister of Public Works is hiding the facts, withholding the plans——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is only just to the member for Vancouver to say that he withdrew that.

Mr. CARVELL. But he repeated his statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think not.

Mr. CARVELL. I must bow to your ruling, but the hon. member did not withdraw it until he was forced by the chair to do so. He knows that the St. Lawrence Power Company's Bill, passed in 1901, is not now under discussion. If that company be alive to-day and have carried out the terms of its charter, it has the right to build these transmission lines without reference to this Bill. If that be so, what becomes of the argument that this company is only a subsidiary company?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It does not give them power of expropriation.

Mr. CARVELL. It does. Section 14 gives them that power.

Mr. S. SHARPE. It does not give them power to enter a municipality without that municipality's consent.

Mr. CARVELL. No. But what has that Bill to do with the Bill now under discussion?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It is the same people.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Geo. Taylor) want to prevent the distribution of electrical energy in his county?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Certainly, if it means the destruction of the navigation of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. CARVELL. For three or four hours this Bill was opposed because it would interfere with the plans of the Hydro-Electric Commission. Now, we have an entirely new reason—the navigation of the St Lawrence. Does not the hon. member know that the plans must be approved by the Governor in Council? And has he not heard the Minister of Public Works say that when the plans are submitted to him they were handed over to the Waterways Commission for investigation and that that body has not yet reported? Is it reasonable to hold up a Bill for an electric transmission company because it may theoretically have some effect upon matters of navigation which are in the hands of the Waterways Commission? If hon. members say: We do not want this Bill to go through and we have the physical power to sit here until Saturday night and commence again next Monday and sit until next Saturday night, of course, they are within their legal rights. But I think it would be much better if they take the ground that they are opposing this Bill because it interferes with the schemes of the Ontario government. It would be better for our hon. friends opposite to come out and frankly admit that they are opposing this Bill at the behest and by the orders of the province of Ontario. If they do that, we will know exactly what we have to face. But I pray my hon. friends not to take shelter behind this childish proposition that in some way or other they want the Minister of Public Works to bring down plans of a scheme which is on foot to dam the River St. Lawrence, and which has nothing whatever to do with the Bill under discussion, and which is entirely safe in the hands of the Waterways Commission and the government.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I would like to submit to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Carvell) whether this discussion does not go deeper than the mere passage of this particular Bill. I think there is a question which goes deeper than any mere opposition, and deeper than the principle contained even in this measure. The question is, when a private member proposes a Bill and the leader of the opposition asks that the Bill may stand over until certain papers are produced, whether the Bill should not be laid over for further discussion. The leader of the opposition asks that further information be furnished, and surely as a mere matter of courtesy, if not of right, that request should be granted. The public have been led to believe that they would have access to these plans. We have Chairman Gibbons of the International Waterways Committee, stating at Toronto that the government and the commission have the plans, but they are withheld from the representatives of the Ontario government. Surely it is an extraordinary thing that where such vital interests are concerned, the representatives of the province of Ontario has not had an opportunity to see the plans upon which the committee are supposed to act. It is, I think, a grave discourtesy that one side if given information which is withheld from the other side. The representatives of the province of Ontario, of the great interests that are oppos-

ing this proposition, are not allowed to see the plans, while those in favour of the proposition are allowed to see them.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In glancing over the hon. members sitting on the government side of the House, I find there are 26, and only four of them come from the province of Ontario. One is the promoter of this Bill, the other is the redoutable member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), who always looks after the interests of the people of Ontario, one is asleep, and the other has not so far been heard from. So I think that if the interests of the province of Ontario are to be left in the hands of members from that province on the government side of the House, they are sadly neglected indeed. Now, reference has been made to the Bill passed the other day by the Railway Committee in reference to the Burrard channel. As I pointed out before, although the government did give that company the powers of expropriation, they were given to a company which produced documentary evidence showing that it was acting as trustee for five or six municipalities in the province of British Columbia, which municipalities contained one-half the population of the province. When we asked them if they were willing to carry on their undertaking without making any charges, they replied they were. Therefore that cannot be said to be a company incorporated for any other interest than the public interest of British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If they said that, why was not that provision put in the Bill?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Because the Minister of Railways himself said it was not a reasonable proposition, and it was at the suggestion of the Minister of Railways himself that a clause was inserted giving them power to charge a toll. But the proceeds of that toll came to the people of British Columbia, because it was a public undertaking and represented half the people of the province. But let us consider the consistency of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). He spent hours in this House arguing for the incorporation of the Nelson River Railway Company, basing his plea on the fact that the Bill gave no power to expropriate water-powers. But now he argues that we should not oppose this transmission Bill although it gives powers of expropriation. In the Bill of 1901, we expressly provided that the company should not enter any municipality without the consent of that municipality. But the present Bill seeks to enlarge such powers and to give this transmission company entrance to a municipality regardless of the will of its people. In Bills that we have passed this session, we have specially inserted provisions denying the right of expropriation of water powers. In the Nelson River Bill, in the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company and in others.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order. There is no minister of the Crown in the House. The debate should end.

Mr. CARVELL. This is a private Bill, and the presence of a minister is not necessary.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rivet). I do not think the point is well taken.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I ask the hon. member for Carleton where is his consistency in view of the facts I have submitted?

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. member wants an answer, I would say that, so far as the Ontario and Michigan Power Company is concerned, it was fought about as viciously as this Bill has been, and the promoter, to get it through, was willing to accept almost anything. But since 1901, the Railway Commission has been created and under section 247 of the Railway Act, which creates that commission, it is provided that if such a company as the one provided for in the Bill under discussion cannot get the consent of a municipality to establish works within it, it must get the consent of the Railway Board. I think that, for the purposes of uniformity, all our Bills should be passed subject to that provision.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. gentleman did not use that argument in support of the Nelson River Bill.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think I opened my lips on that Bill.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Certainly. Last night, when he was——

Mr. CARVELL. That is right. I thought the hon. gentleman was referring to the Vancouver Bill.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. member last night said we should pass the Nelson River Bill because it had no expropriation powers; now he says we should pass this with expropriation powers.

Mr. CARVELL. I am talking of transmission lines going through a municipality.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But we are granting exporpriation powers against private property.

Mr. CARVELL. A public utility Bill would be unworkable without it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) does not agree with the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Graham) who announced as the settled policy of the government that every Railway Bill should contain a clause denying the power to transmit electricity save by the consent of the parties interested.

Mr. CARVEL. Then I certainly differ with him.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If we strike out the powers of expropriation, the municipality that desires to have the service of the Hydro-electric Commission can have it. But if you give this company powers of expropriation under the Railway Act you open the way for the middleman.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. member says the municipality should be free to choose the Hydro-Electric. But we on this side say that there should be the Hydro-Electric and as many others as want to come in. Let the competition be as free as possible. The Hydro-Electric Commission want a monopoly.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. For the benefit of the people.

Mr. CARVELL. I hope this parliament will never grant a monopoly to the Hydro-Electric Commission or any other body. Does the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) mean to say that if this Bill becomes law and this company erect their transmission line to Brockville that will prevent, legally or otherwise, the Hydro-Electric Commission from entering Brockville?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It will mean that the poles will be erected, the wires strung, the houses wired and the connections made, and the Hydro-Electric Commission will be practically prevented from coming in.

Mr. CARVELL. Legally or from a business standpoint?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The other company would be installed, as the Bell Telephone Company is to-day so that nobody else can get in.

Mr. CARVELL. The logical conclusion of the hon. member's argument is that if the Hydro-Electric Commission get into a municipality they would be able to charge the rates they want and make the people pay those rates even though they would be higher than if there was competition.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) seems to constitute himself an advisory board of one to tell the opposition how to argue their case.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) asked my opinion.

Mr. BRODER. I am surprised at the hon. member, the watchdog of the public interest allowed such a notorious Bill as he describes that of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) to have been to pass the House.

Mr. CARVELL. I did not characterize it as notorious. I say it is a proper Bill.

Mr. BRODER. Talking of monopoly, if you leave it to the people in the section affected by the Bill now under discussion, whether they will have electrical energy furnished by this company or by the Hydro-Electric Commission, the people will soon decide irrespective of politics.

Mr. CARVELL. Then why not have both?

Mr. BRODER. Because the Hydro-Electric Commission propose to give power to the municipalities at cost, and the smaller number that take it from them, the higher the cost will be to those who do take it.

Mr. NEELY. If the Hydro-Electric Commission give the power at cost, surely there is no danger in incorporating this company, because, according to the hon. gentleman's argument, it will not be able to do any business.

Mr. BRODER. The charges of the municipalities vary according to the cost of transmission, and my argument is that the fewer the municipalities that take the power, the higher the overhead charges will be, and consequently the higher cost of the power. But a stronger reason for my opposing this Bill is that it is simply a stepping-stone to the greater Bill which is to come later to give a private company the control of the water-power on the St. Lawrence river. What will happen if we slow the current by the proposed dam?

Mr. CARVELL. You will have dead water.

Mr. BRODER. Anchor ice will form and will cause the water to overflow the land.

Mr. CARVELL. Anchor ice only forms in running water. The dead water will freeze over.

Mr. BRODER. Even if the water freezes over, the current from the river above will overflow it at the rate of several miles an hour. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Smith) evaded the question of the height of the proposed dam. It was first proposed to be 54 feet. Now it is lessoned to 42 or 45 feet. The Cornwall canal is eleven miles long, and has a fall of 48 feet, with six locks. The hon. gentleman said that the proposed dam would be five miles from the head of the canal, so that it would be upwards of 40 feet high at six miles from the lower end of the canal. Involved in this question are the interests of the navigation of the St. Lawrence and the interests of the people in that whole section of country. The American people are at present dependent upon our canals to get up the St. Lawrence river. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) is evidently willing that they should have a canal on the American side of the river. I am not willing to give them that privilege upon the St. Lawrence river, which is a great asset of this country.

Mr. CARVELL. The question of damming the St. Lawrence is not involved in

this Bill. Moreover, the Minister of Public Works states that the proposition of this company is to build a dam that will not affect the intake of the Cornwall canal. The hon. member for Dundas is wrong in his figures. If the dam is to be built seven or eight miles below the mouth of the canal, that will create a tract of level water eight or nine miles long, forming a lake, which will freeze over in the winter time, and be free of anchor ice. The only issue is whether this committee will give the company a right to build transmission lines to various points of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. MAGRATH. I regard it as an outrage that the members of this House should be kept here all night for the sake of private interests. It is all very well to say that this is only a transmission company, but it must obtain its power from somewhere, and, in view of the public interests in Montreal and along the St. Lawrence river opposed to this project, I think this Bill should be held over until the question of damming the St. Lawrence is before us, so that the two questions, which are involved in each other, can be taken up together.

Mr. GOODEVE. We are not asking that this Bill should be destroyed. We are only asking that due consideration be given to the various questions that have arisen in connection with it. I think a feeling is growing in the minds of members on both sides of the House that we should begin more carefully to conserve our great natural resources such as are affected by this Bill. It has been admitted that the Bill is now before the Waterways Commission and all we ask is that it be set aside until we have received the report of the Waterways Commission. This is not a government Bill, it is purely a private Bill in the interests of private parties, who are asking for large powers. And it is our duty to demand that we be furnished with all the information that is available before we consent to the passage of this measure. It has been said by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) that what he stood for was the principle of open competition. I think he is aware that while there may be no actual legal opposition to two companies operating in a municipality for the production of power, yet it is well known that here are means of preventing an opposition company from coming into a municipality where another company is already installed. In our own western country when the telephone first came in, we were given a certain rate, afterwards another company came in and amalgamated with it, and immediately we were served with notices that the price was doubled for every telephone in the city. In regard to water-power we are paying many times the price that our neighbours are paying in districts surrounding us, where a public company is serving the people. We realize that if these companies were established in the municipalities under this Bill, it would be impossible for the Hydro-Electric to come in. We have appointed a Conservation Commission, and it is proposed to vote them $60,000 for their work. We realize more than in former times the value of our great waterways with their water falls as sources of energy. Surely, the government should accede to the request of the opposition and allow a Bill such as this, which is said to have the effect of giving to private individuals one of the greatest water powers on our greatest river, to stand over for further information.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has retired, but three ministers have come in. I desire to secure information which the Minister of Public Works did not give us. I would like to know the height of the dam shown in the plan that has been referred to. And, if it is to be 42 feet high, as has been stated, how can the present canal be used for Canadian traffic. The Minister of Public Works stated that it would not interfere with the passage upwards of Canadian boats, leaving us to infer that it would throw all the downward traffic on the American side. I see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) here. He is the senior of the ministers who have recently entered the chamber, and I will ask him for information on this subject.

Mr. FISHER. I am rather surprised that the hon. member (Mr. Geo. Taylor) has singled me out for information on the subject of a dam. Knowing my mild and peace-loving disposition as he does, I should think that he would know that I am no authority on the subject of dams. But I know something of the wording of this Bill, and I do not understand that there is any reference in it to a dam.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The hon. minister was not present, but the Minister of Public Works said that this Bill was in conjunction with that passed in 1901——

Mr. CARVELL. That is hardly a correct interpretation.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That was the meaning.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. This is a power Bill.

Mr. FISHER. No, a transmission Bill.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Minister of Public Works admitted that the other company was to make the proposed works——

Mr. CARVELL. No.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. He said that this Bill and the other would work conjointly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That the same parties were concerned in both.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL. The minister did not say that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. He tried to get out of it, but he admitted it in his first statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We will prove it by 'Hansard' when it comes out this morning. I appeal to the Minister of Agriculture again. He is an old member of the House, as I am. I think he will agree with me that never before has he seen the House held up in debating a private Bill.

Mr. FISHER. That proves that my hon. friend's friends are the most unreasonable men that have been here for many years.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), before leaving at two o'clock this morning, asked that the committee should rise, that plans that had been referred to in connection with this matter might be brought down. That was a reasonable request. The Minister of Public Works said the majority must rule. The majority is the government, and they are defending and supporting this Bill, a graft Bill of the worst kind. But they say the majority must rule and we will force the opposition down.

Mr. CONMEE. We do not know which is the majority until we vote.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) threw out the challenge that they would stay here until Saturday night at six o'clock or pass the Bill. Hon. gentlemen on this side said they would stay with them and we purpose doing so. If the government are going to defend this Bill until Saturday night, it will be the first time I knew a government to back up a private Bill in this way. I think the government ought to accede to the reasonable request to allow the committee to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again and in the meantime bring down the plans so we will see what we are doing, because there is no denying that it is all one company trying to dam the St. Lawrence and to use this charter to transmit power.

Mr. FIELDING. As a number of gentlemen have entered the House recently who have not had the great pleasure some of us have had of sitting all night until 9.30 o'clock, and for their benefit, I wish to again place on Hansard the exact position of this matter. I stated at an earlier stage that every two hours I would put this point on record so there might be no misunderstanding. I wish it to be understood that there is no proposal on the part of anybody, still less on the part of the government, who have nothing to do with this Bill, to press this Bill through at this sitting of the House. I want that to go on Hansard in large letters. A proposal was made hours ago that this Bill might be treated like any other Bill, that the clauses that are unimportant might be passed and any contentious clauses might stand over, the Bill remaining in committee until a future day. We offered that hours ago, I offer it now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Finance Minister has made that proposal time and again, but he must see the unreasonable part of it, that is that if we accept the Bill as it is at present, we will have to have the measure put through and it will be forced through by the government, no matter what the clauses are. When we come to discuss it on the clauses, we will be confined to the clause before the committee. It cannot be too strongly impressed that this Bill is opposed by many important interests, such as boards of trade of our Canadian cities, and the Conservation Commission.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to read a resolution that was moved in the Private Bills Committee for the addition of a clause to this Bill, and was voted down:

Nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to authorize the company to enter on, take or use any land or water, the property of any province, without having first obtained by order of the lieutenant governor in council the consent of the province to such entry, taker or user.

I wish to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture what objection he would have to a clause of this kind being inserted in the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is well aware that I am not a lawyer, and consequently would not like to commit myself on such a point without very careful legal advice. My own idea would be that the rights of the Dominion and the rights of the various provinces are pretty well defined in the British North America Act, and we could probably leave to those definitions to decide whether we were interfering with the rights of any province or not.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the next in order will be my hon. friend the Minister of Labour.

Mr. KING. As I understand, the discussion of the committee is at present engaged on one section of the Bill. After I have an opportunity of listening to the debate as a whole, I shall perhaps be better able to appreciate whether the proposed amendment has any significance or not.

Mr. BLAIN. As these hon. gentlemen belong to this government, which is pressing the House to pass this Bill——

Mr. FIELDING. No, no.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Finance may suggest that the opposition all comes from this side of the House; but I may remind him that the strongest pronouncement against the Bill has come from the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), and that it is also opposed by the hon member or Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). If it is not proposed to take away any rights from any province, what objection can there be to this clause going into the Bill? I appeal to the Minister of the Interior, who before he entered this government was a champion of the rights of the people, to say if he sees any special objection to such a clause being inserted in the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I would have to follow the discussion more closely than I have done in order to be able to give an answer to the question. Apparently this is a very involved matter. It has occupied the House during twelve or fourteen hours, and I certainly do not profess to have been able to follow the discussion during that time or to be able to make up my mind on the mere reading of the resolution.

Mr. CONMEE. I wish to point out that my hon. friend has brought forward this resolution on two or three occasions, and that the Minister of Public Works has pointed out that the question of dealing with the water power of the St. Lawrence river is not in the Bill before the House, but that if it were in issue, the declaration in the resolution proposes to settle a matter in dispute between the Dominion and the province by giving to the province wider powers than it has under the British North America Act. If this were a Bill involving the question of the construction of a dam, I would oppose that resolution on this ground. If the province controls the water-power, that control cannot be taken away by any declaration or legislation of this parliament. Why should we make a declaration which undertakes to give the province a more extended power than the constitution gives it?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken is evidently an ardent opponent of this Bill, or at least will be when he comes to understand what it really means. We have had within the last ten minutes the lamentable exhibition of a minister of the Crown coming in at ten o'clock in the morning and frankly admitting that he is using all his power to force through the House this Bill without knowing what it is; and we find the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) who should understand this Bill if any one does, distinctly stating that it does not and cannot take away from the province any rights it now has.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the hon. gentleman say it would?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I certainly say that it both can and does.

Mr. CONMEE. Does he say it deals with water powers at all?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I mean to say it does give water powers.

Mr. CONMEE. Will my hon. friend read the clause?

Mr. NORTHRUP. It has been read a dozen times, but I will explain it and perhaps then the hon. gentleman will see that it does give water powers and is intended to give them. Let us understand where we are. By jumping into the middle of the discussion, my hon. friend fails to understand——

Mr. CONMEE. I have been here all night.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have read that seed sown on stony ground just as carefully as on other ground did not take any root. That may be the case with my hon. friend. We had an Act passed in 1901 which no member of this House, if he will divest himself of his political prejudice, will say reflects any great credit on its judgment. By the Act a copy was incorporated, and it is a matter of notoriety that this House gave such powers to the gentlemen who obtained that charter that they were able to sell it at a handsome fortune. However, all that is past and gone, and the only argument I draw from that is this, that having made an outrageous blunder in 1901, is all the more reason why we should be doubly careful now not to give a little more and supply an omission which the promoters, by an oversight, failed to notice in the Act of 1901. In 1901 they are asking a little privilege which will make the government of 1901 absolutely complete. In the statute of 1901, the directors are given pretty broad powers. Under the 8th section they can manufacture and dispose of electricity and build a transmission line. It is perfectly clear that under that Act this company has the power to construct its transmission line exactly where it asks to construct it by the Bill before it.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend is mistaken in that. He will find that it does not give the company the power of expropriation for their transmission lines.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, and that is the reason the company come here to take the land belonging to the province of Ontario for the purposes of their enterprise. By this Bill, however, they ask that power. They

have the right to manufacture all the power they want in the Act of 1901, and they have the right to expropriate but not to expropriate provincial lands.

Mr. CONMEE. Where does my hon. friend find that?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I find nothing in the Act of 1901 which gives this company power to expropriate provincial lands. There is all the difference in the world between giving power to expropriate the land of individuals and the land belonging to the Crown. Under the statute of 1901 there is no power given the St. Lawrence Power Company to expropriate any land belonging to the province of Ontario. But this Bill of 1910 expressly gives the company all the powers conferred by the Railway Act.

Mr. CONMEE. For the purposes of its works.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Certainly.

Mr. CONMEE. That would give them power if necessary to expropriate provincial lands.

Mr. NORTHRUP. No, there is merely the general power given but not the rest to expropriate land vested in the Crown and provincial lands are vested in the Crown just the same as Dominion lands. The provincial claim held in the Attorney General of British Columbia against the Canadian Pacific Railway that section 108 of the British North America Act specially empowers the Dominion parliament to legislate regarding any lands including the foreshores proved to govern part of a public harbour. It empowers the Dominion to give the right to expropriate provincial crown land and, therefore, it has the right to expropriate the provincial foreshore for the purpose of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Taking this decision as our basis, we find in the powers conferred by the Railway Act that corporations have the right to expropriate provincial lands. Beyond question that follows from the decision in this case. Nothing can be clearer than the words in this Bill making the Railway Act applicable to this company. So it is obvious that this company, while professing to ask simply the power to extend their lines along the shore, are really asking something different.

Mr. FISHER. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether that power, which he says is conferred under this Bill, of expropriating lands and waters belonging to a province, would apply to any waters or lands belonging to a province which they expropriate for the purpose of creating power. This Bill is one allowing the company to transmit power, and for that purpose the Railway Act and its expropriation clauses apply to these people, but that would not make those clauses apply to powers granted another company under another Bill.

Mr. NORTHRUP. This company is given rather broad powers under section 6.

Mr. FISHER. Under this Bill the company has no power to generate electricity.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the difference between a scheme carried on under one act of incorporation and a scheme carried on under two charters, if they are both controlled by the same people?

Mr. FISHER. Any powers given under this Bill for the purposes of transmission do not apply to rights and privileges for the purpose of creating power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a distinction without a difference if both companies are controlled by the same people.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Public Works said that in his opinion this company we are now asked to incorporate, is simply a transmission company. When asked where they expected to get their power, he said from a dam that will be constructed across the St. Lawrence, suggesting the charter of the St. Lawrence Power Company. It would not be worth while to pass a Bill of this kind unless the company were to get their power from some other company because there is no power in this Bill for the generation of electricity.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I have been pointing out.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister state where this company is going to get their power.

Mr. FISHER. That is for them to find out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will he explain in whose name and on whose behalf plans for damming this river were brought to the Minister of Public Works? I thought we had a pretty plain statement from that minister but perhaps my hon. friend will give a little new light.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot see how this matters in the slightest degree to this Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The promoters of this scheme, having secured that particular Act, possessing it and controlling it, propose under that to dam the St. Lawrence and already have their plans filed and submitted to the Minister of Public Works, who has had them considered by the engineers of three departments—does my hon. friend claim, if that be the case, and the claims of these men that they can dam the river under

that Act be well founded, that this Bill, which gives certain powers to the very men who control that charter, is not part of a great general scheme for damming the St. Lawrence? This is an ingenious scheme for creating power and for conveying the ownership of that power by a very easy method to this company. By employing this company for the purpose of transmission, it is simply doing the work by two companies instead of by one. Can my hon. friend not see that?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot see why, if an Act of this parliament gives them power to generate electricity, they should not then be given the power to transmit that electrical energy where this Bill allows them to do it. The question of a dam and the creation of power are not in this Bill. That is not conferred on the company by this Bill; but if my hon. friend is correct in his interpretation of another Bill and they have the right he says they enjoy, then I do not see why they should not be allowed to transmit the power to various localities in Canada which might benefit by using it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will give the hon. gentleman some reasons. There was not the slightest suspicion in the minds of any man in this House when the Act of 1901 was passed, that any such scheme was intended. I have carefully looked over the debates of 1901 and find that the Bill went through the House without a word of comment. Some very clever words were introduced into some of the paragraphs in the Act of 1901, and the contention of those who control that charter is that it enables them to build a dam across the St. Lawrence joining a dam on the American side, and thus generate that power. Having that authority, they ask that this parliament shall give them certain other powers which will only be useful for the purpose of carrying out the bigger scheme to which I have alluded, and I say that that is too big a scheme to receive the approval of this House under the conditions which prevail at present. We do not know enough about it. We have not even seen the plans which have been in the possession of the Minister of Public Works for eight months, and which we find, to our astonishment, he had submitted to three engineers of the government who made a report without any man in this House knowing anything about it. We were astounded last evening to discover how far this project has advanced and how far the government is committed to it without making known its intentions to parliament. Under the circumstances, when this Bill is proposed as part of that great scheme, vitally and materially affecting the future interests of this country, affecting the great waterway of the St. Lawrence, the products of the west, and when there is lack of information and the absence of any definite policy of the government in regard to that scheme, it is perfectly clear it should not receive the approval of the committee.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman stated that he was surprised to find how far the government were committed to this scheme. I think he will see that last night it was distinctly stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works that the government were not committed at all to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said I was surprised to see how far the government were committed to it. I did not say that the government were absolutely committed.

Mr. FIELDING. If they are not committed, how can the hon. gentleman see how far they are committed?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I could not say. My hon. friend should know more about that than I do.

Mr. FIELDING. No, my knowledge is the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps so. Afterwards we discovered from the Minister of Public Works yesterday that he had gone so far as to send the engineers of three different departments to consider these plans, that they had been considered with certain objections which had been raised and that finally the engravers had come back with the plans which he said they had approved and which, as far as I can gather, had the approval of the government. They might not have had the formal approval of the government—I do not understand that they had—but if these three engineers had been sent to report upon the project and if they had reported favourably upon it with certain modifications it seems to me that they have made very great progress indeed towards winning the approval of the government. That impression is very greatly strengthened by the circumstance that the Minister of Public Works seemed to have committed himself to the project by attempting to drive this Bill through the committee before the committee should rise, although a respectful request was made to him at one o'clock this morning, when we had sat an hour and a half later than the House usually sits, and when the discussion had been absolutely relevant and instructive in every respect, that the committee should rise, the request was refused and we were told shortly afterwards by an hon. member on the other side of the House that the government had determined to sit until Saturday night for the purpose of driving this Bill through. That would seem to indicate that the government are pretty well committed to this Bill or they would not take a stand of that kind. I never knew a

statement of that kind to be made with regard to a private Bill or any other Bill under similar circumstances. There had not been one minute of debate in regard to this Bill that had not been relevant and instructive up to the time I made this request. A great deal of the debate had been raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) and by the hon member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), one of whom declared that this was evidently a much larger scheme than the House was aware of at first, and the other of whom stated that this Bill had evidently been presented to the House under false pretenses. I say that the action of the Minister of Public Works under the circumstances indicates that whether the government is committed to this scheme or not the Minister of Public Works is very strongly committed to it; otherwise he would not have taken the action that he did.

Mr. FIELDING. I am obliged to take exception to the hon. gentleman's inaccuracies. If this matter is as important as the hon. gentleman thinks it is, he will agree with me that he should not be inaccurate in his statements.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am very glad to be corrected.

Mr. FIELDING. I take exception to the statement that he made that some hon. gentleman on this side of the House stated that the government would sit here until Saturday evening. I say that no such statement was made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the statement then?

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend is making the statement he should not ask me to furnish him with the information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) did not state that?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for Hants spoke for himself. The hon. member for Hants made no allusion to the government. No man undertook to speak in the name of the government in reference to this Bill. From the beginning to the end it was stated to be a private Bill in which the government had no concern and if my hon. friend was informed that a member on this side of the House said that the government would stay here until Saturday night and force this Bill through I can assure him that he was misinformed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for Hants is the chairman of the committee which had this Bill under consideration, is he not?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that he was acting chairman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, he seemed to speak with some authority.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says that he 'seemed' to speak with some authority. A moment ago he said that the hon. member for Hants said that the government had determined to force this Bill through.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What did the hon. member for Hants say?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not called upon to answer for the hon. member for Hants; I am called upon to answer for the government when the government is misrepresented. My hon. friend was not so anxious to make a point against the hon. member for Hants as against the government. The essence of his statement was that he said that the government was going to force this Bill through.

Some hon. MEMBERS. So he did.

Mr. FIELDING. I can assure my hon. friend that in that respect he has been misinformed. I have another objection to make to a statement of my hon. friend in which statement my hon. friend has also been inaccurate. He said that he was surprised to find how far the government have been committed to this scheme of damming the St. Lawrence. The English language is plain enough for my hon. friend to know that if he was surprised to find how far the government was committed, then the government must have been committed, and yet the statement made by the Minister of Public Works was that the government was in no way committed, although it had caused some inquiry to be made by engineers. There are many projects presented to the government and to parliament as to which engineers are asked to make reports; but would any one contend that because the government sent out an engineer to inquire into a matter the government are committed to it? It is not a reasonable argument at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to say in reply to what the Minister of Finance has advanced that I do not think all the inaccuracies are on this side of the House. What the hon. member for Hants said he said in the presence of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. Did my hon. friend hear him?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I heard him.

Mr. FIELDING. I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I thought he was not present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He said: We will stay here until Saturday night to put this Bill through. I am not quoting his exact words, but that is the substance of them, the Minister of Finance was here at the time and he did not disclaim them. He

seemed, as far as I could judge, to assent to that declaration. The hon. member for Hants said that in his presence and said it after I had asked respectfully and courteously, at one o'clock, and after the hon. member for Westmorland had also asked that this committee should rise. Take the language of the hon. member for Hants, unrepudiated by the Minister of Finance, and take the action of the Minister of Finance in refusing to permit this committee to rise, put these two things together and let us see whether the inaccuracy is on my part or on the part of the Minister of Finance. My hon. friend says that I am inaccurate in stating that I did not know how far the government was committed to this project.

Mr. FIELDING. No, that was not the hon. gentleman's statement. His statement was that he was surprised to find how far the government were committed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I am surprised to find how far the government are committed. Actions speak a great deal louder than words. When we find what has been going on without the knowledge of parliament, when we find that the Minister of Public Works informed us that these plans have been under consideration for eight months, when we find that they have been referred to engineers, that these engineers have reported favourably upon them, with some modifications, and when we find the Minister of Public Works evincing such a deep and abiding interest in having this Bill go through without the production of these plans upon the table of the House, I am surprised to find the government is committed to this project to that extent.

Mr. FIELDING. To what extent?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To the extent of carrying on these negotiations with these gentlemen, having these plans referred to the engineers, receiving a favourable report about them, and making no communication whatever to this House in regard to the form of that report. It only come out last evening by accident. What does it mean? We had the Minister of Public Works endeavouring to convince this House at first—he was obliged to abandon the position afterwards—that these plans had been submitted to the government without the authority of any statute. Did any one ever hear of such a position? A body of men, without any statute, without any charter, without any legal sanction, come to this government and say: Here are certain plans for damming the St. Lawrence; will you be good enough to send the engineers of your department and have these plans considered? That was the position which the Minister of Public Works took at first, but afterwards, under the effect of certain discussion, raised not from this side of the House, but from the other side by the hon. member for Westmorland, the Minister of Public Works was obliged to admit, and did admit in answer to myself that these plans were put forward to this government under the authority conferred by a Bill passed by this House in 1901. This House was absolutely in ignorance of the fact that the persons controlling that charter believed themselves to possess the power to dam the River St. Lawrence. I had no knowledge that any such claim had been made until that admission was drawn from the Minister of Public Works last night by the hon. member for Westmorland. This has been going on behind the back of parliament and behind the back of the country. Certain gentlemen acquired the charter of the St. Lawrence Power Company. These gentlemen had raised the claim that under that they have authority from parliament to build a dam across the St. Lawrence as far as the boundary line. The same gentlemen have procured legislation from the State of New York authorizing them to build a dam from the American side to the same boundary line. These gentlemen, having these charters in their possession, came to the government, probably more than a year ago, presented their plans, and these plans have been under consideration by the government, knowing of the claim of these men, for at least eight months. The Bill now before the House is, according to the admission of the Minister of Public Works, a Bill which is designed to carry out part of this great scheme. That is the position, and under the circumstances and having regard to the action which this government have taken in endeavouring to force this Bill through against all custom and precedent, I am surprised that they have been so far committed to this project as they seem to have been.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has made an outcry, and many other hon. gentlemen have done the same thing, as to the government having in their possession certain plans which they did not present to the House, and which they say they are hiding from the House, which they are suppressing. There are hundreds of plans presented to the government in relation to public matters, and which are to be found in the various departments, which are never presented to parliament, and unless some hon. gentleman had asked for a plan and it had been refused, there would be no ground whatever for complaint.

Mr. HUGHES. I asked for them.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman asked for them last evening when he knew he could not get them.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not know that I could not get them. The Finance Minister and the Minister of Public Works stated here last night that these two Bills had a most important relation one to the other.

Mr. FIELDING. I have said that plans are submitted to the government and unless there was some special request for them they would not be brought down to the House and so this bugaboo is extremely ridiculous.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the government send three engineers to see whether plans prepared by persons having no authority to build a line of railway should be approved?

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps not, but if they did send an engineer and plans were produced and filed in the archives of the department they would never be brought to this House unless they were asked for.

Mr. HUGHES. Were they not asked for at the Private Bills Committee?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know. The hon. member says he never knew anything about them until last night.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not on the Private Bills Committee, otherwise you bet they would have been asked for.

Mr. FIELDING. I find I was too charitable in supposing that the leader of the opposition was not here when the member for Hants spoke, he was here. He shifted his ground in his last speech, he first said that the member for Hants stated that the government would sit here. I took exception to that statement and when he was called to account he said that he heard the hon. member for Hants and that hon. member said: 'We.'

An hon. MEMBER. Who is 'we.'

Mr. NORTHRUP. Who controls this House?

Mr. FIELDING. Nobody controls this House, this is the free and independent parliament of this country and it is not controlled I say in the name of the Liberals of this country there is no authority to control the parliament of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To whom did the member for Hants refer when he used the word 'we'?

Mr. CONMEE. The friends of the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. I suppose the member for Hants spoke for himself, perhaps he is in the editorial chair sometimes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the government are not committed to this proposition is that not all the more reason to call a halt.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend does not know, we called a halt long ago when he was sleeping.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If they are not committed to the project and it is known that this is part of a much wider project, why commit the House to this minor proposition when there is still a major proposition to be dealt with? The government will surely take time to discuss this with the International Waterways Commission, the Conservation Commission and other bodies of that kind. The Minister of Finance is engaged in a great issue in regard to the tariff. It is said that the United States government may have to put in force their maximum tariff against this country on account of some action of this government, and at this very time we propose to pass legislation which means that the greatest power we have left on the St. Lawrence may be so developed that the bulk of the power will be transmitted to the United States for the development of their resources. We ought to keep in our hands the absolute control of that power which may be an important factor in this tariff discussion with the United States. This power is to be used, as far as I can judge, to electrify the New York Central Railway, one of the greatest rivals of our Canadian system. That power ought to be reserved to electrify the Canadian roads. The Bill could well stand over for another year. An international claim may be based on what is done now and so we should move slowly. The province of Ontario and the people of Toronto are trying to work out a great political principle known as public ownership. For some reason this principle is being assailed by many interests, and a determined effort is being made here to prevent the progress of that movement in relation to electrical energy. There is no urgency except the urgency of private as against national interest. Is the national interest to be jeopardized in order that private interests may be advanced? Where is the national urgency? The matter should at least rest for a time to allow the fullest discussion and amplification of the facts.

Mr. CONMEE. The leader of the opposition and some other members may not have heard the offer from the Minister of Finance early in the evening, that in order to prevent a deadlock he would be willing that the committee should pass the non-contentious clauses of this Bill?

An hon. MEMBER. There are none.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. CONMEE. That is what I understood him to say. The course of hon. members opposite is a pure question of obstruction on their part, and in all fairness and having regard to the rules of this House and to the general conduct of public affairs in any legislative assembly, a minority ought

not to undertake to dictate or to control the House either in regard to the legislation of the mode of procedure with any particular legislation. I cannot see any difference between a private Bill and any other kind of Bill. It is just a question of the majority ruling. This Bill has nothing to do with the navigation of the St. Lawrence river. It does not disturb the lock, which is on the Canadian side, and not on the American side. The reason for the proposal of a lock on the American side is that there is a channel there which steamers coming down the river run without going through the lock.

Mr. J. D. REID. Large steamers cannot go through the south channel.

Mr. CONMEE. But certain steamers do use it. It is not this government that is insisting on a lock on the American side, but the United States congress. In that there is no menace to Canadian interests, but an improvement. The Minister of Public Works has stated time and again during the debate that the government were not committed to any improvements of the river, and that no plan would be approved of by them until it was first submitted to and approved by parliament. The hon. member says this Bill is linked with another Bill. I do not know that it is so.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Public Works said so.

Mr. CONMEE. The Minister of Public Works was asked where they were going to get their power, and he said he expected they would get it from the St. Lawrence Power Company.

Mr. BLAIN. Where does my hon. friend expect they will get it?

Mr. CONMEE. I do not know, and I do know that my hon. friend knows; but I do know that they could get more than 100,000 horse-power without dealing with the St. Lawrence Power Company at all. I know that there is power at the Lachine rapids, at Cornwall and at other points on the St. Lawrence where they could get power. Hon. gentlemen have referred to the Bill passed in 1901 giving a charter to a company to build a dam and generate and utilize electrical power. It is doubtful if they have exercised that power sufficiently to hold their charter. But assuming that they have that power, hon. gentlemen do not take it away by holding up this Bill. Moreover, at that time we did not make the rights of the company subordinate to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Under this Bill, we protect the public interests by putting machinery in force that will insure to the people cheap power and reasonable service. I do not care whether it is Canadian capital, or American capital, or English capital that develops this or any other water-

power so long as the people of Canada have that power under their control. This company cannot, under the law, export any power unless the government allows them to do so, and I have sufficient confidence in this government to believe that it will not alow them to do that. I may have objections to some of the clauses of this Bill, but the time has not come to discuss them. Hon. gentlemen who are opposing the Bill are determined that, as they are in the minority, they will not allow a vote to take place. I do not think any good purpose can be served by that attitude. I submit that the hon. minister has made a reasonable proposition which hon. gentlemen should accept.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the Railway Committee, of which you are the chairman, is called to meet at eleven o'clock this morning, that it is now that hour, and that there are engagements to meet to-day by that committee, and parties are here attending on those engagements who would like to go on; and I submit to the leader of the House, in order that the work of the House may not be disarranged, especially in view of the statement that the government is not committed to this Bill, that the committee should rise and report progress, and that those who are members of the Railway Committee should have an opportunity to go and attend to its business.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite appreciate the desire of my hon. friend to put an end to this protracted sitting and to go to the business of the Railway Committee; but after all we must meet the situation as we find it. He is not aware of the proposals made on this matter when he supposes that the government is attempting to force this Bill through the committee. That is due to a misapprehension of the facts. At an early stage of the discussion I asked that this Bill be treated as any other private Bill. Most of the clauses are unimportant and non-contentious, and I proposed that we pass them clause by clause, and that whenever a clause was reached that any hon. member wished to have stand over, I would raise my voice to have it stand over, and the Bill would remain in committee to give hon. members a reasonable time to prepare their amendments or do anything else that was necessary. That is a fair and reasonable proposition, and is entirely at variance with the suggestion that the government are trying to force this Bill through.

Mr. HUGHES. Let the Minister of Finance recall the situation last night. Until the Minister of Public Works made the formal statement that he did regarding the connection between the company controlling this Bill and the St. Lawrence Water Power Company, the feeling on this side was to

accede to the suggestion made by the Minister of Finance. But how were we met up to that time? Five ministers of the Crown sat in a row, and, I say it advisedly, never during the twenty sessions that I have been in this House have I seen them fight more ardently for any government measure than they fought for this Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the only other minister who spoke on the matter besides myself was the Minister of Public Works. If there were five ministers of the Crown sitting here, they were only doing their duty.

Mr. HUGHES. If more of them sat here while the government measures were being discussed, we would be less surprised; but when a government measure is before the House, there are usually only two or three ministers present. But on this private measure, the mandate was sent out by the leader of the House to the chief whip from the province of Ontario, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), who is in charge of this Bill, that not one concession was to be made, and the Minister of Finance told me that we had to let the Bill pass last night. That was early in the evening. We have discovered by our fighting that the company promoting this Bill is intimately asociated with the St. Lawrence Power Company, and I give the minister notice that we are going to get to the bottom of this thing before this Bill goes through.

Mr. FIELDING. I hope you will, and I will help you.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It might be well to find just how far we are in accord. We have a Bill before the House to confer certain rights on a company in connection with transmitting power throughout a district on the St. Lawrence river not very far from here, and for some reason no member from that district, and knowing the feelings of the people there, would father such a Bill, and its promoters had to go to the western limits of the province to find any one to father it, and selected the chief government whip for that purpose. That is a piece of evidence which certainly points in one direction, though it does not necessarily prove what is behind the Bill. Then the Bill comes before the House and we do not find the hon. gentleman who fathers the Bill or any of the hon. gentlemen from the part of the country more particularly concerned taking any active part in supporting it.

Mr. CONMEE. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I have been strongly supporting it all through the debate.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I apologize to the hon. member for Rainy River. I admit that I was wrong. I admit that he is the father of all waterworks legislation save this and he is the step-father of this. We find that this Bill was introduced by the chief government whip and that it is supported by the members of the cabinet, and when an hon. gentleman, sitting beside the minister who is now leading the House (Mr. Fielding), says that they will sit until Saturday night if necessary to force the Bill through, that is certainly further evidence to excite suspicion. The hon. gentleman who leads the House found fault with the leader of the opposition because he did not exactly quote the words used by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black). But the hon. gentleman himself did not quote his words.

Mr. FIELDING. Why should I?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think he should have done so or not have contradicted the leader of the opposition. As a man of honour, he could not contradict him.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no right to answer for the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black). I understand that the hon. gentleman, feeling displeased at the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite, expressed his own views. He did not profess to speak for the government, he had not the right to do so, and he would be the last man to attempt to do so.

Mr. NORTHRUP. In order to be perfectly fair to the Minister of Finance and afford him the opportunity to make the explanation, I am sure he is anxious to make, I ask him now whether it is the intention of the government to force the Bill through?

Mr. FIELDING. The government have no intention in the matter. This is a private Bill, and I have expressed the view that this Bill shall not be forced through and that hon. gentlemen opposite, if they will only take a reasonable course, will have ample opportunity to consider what they deem the contentious clauses. If they will only consent to our making some progress, the Bill may remain in committee, and they will be given ample time to consider it. Can anything be fairer?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The proposition would be perfectly reasonable and proper if it be admitted that this is a government measure, because what the hon. minister suggests is the practice which is followed in connection with government measures. In 1903 I had the honour of affecting a settlement along similar lines with the Minister of Justice in connection with a government measure. The principle admitted as settled is that when this House meets to transact government business, some government business must be transacted or that is an admission that the government has lost control of the House. Therefore, in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill, hon. members on this side, al-

though bitterly opposed to it, consented to some objectionable clauses, assuming that the Bill must eventually pass because it was a government measure. But here the case is different. If the hon. minister says that no pressure will be brought on members of the House——

Mr. FIELDING. I have certainly said a dozen times at least that as this is not a government Bill, I would not presume to recommend it to any member of the House. How any member of the House may vote, I do not know or care. All I desire is to make some progress with business.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Inasmuch then as it is not a government measure, and hon. members are not bound by political allegiance to support it, there may be some chance that, by discussing it, we may possibly succeed in protecting the interests of the country against the promotors of this Bill. Whatever the facts may be, it is unquestionable that the province of Ontario is bitterly opposing this Bill as encroaching on its rights. Whether the province be right or wrong is another question. In my opinion, it is right. But here we have these cabinet ministers, who formerly used to boast that they were the special defenders of provincial rights, using their influence to put through a private Bill which the Ontario government says is an interference with its rights. Here we have the singular spectacle of a government intervening in the case of a private Bill to force it through, which the Ontario government says is an interference with its rights.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have not made up my mind on this Bill entirely, but would like to consider it clause by clause. The only point affecting provincial rights is clause one, which gives some gentlemen the right to form themselves into a company.

Mr. M. MARTIN. I am opposed to this Bill, and ony a few minutes ago I told the hon. the Finance Minister that I would vote against it. He said to me: Do as you like, because it is not a government measure. I am against it, because the Board of Trade and the municipality of Montreal oppose it, but I want to be understood that in any vote any hon. member may give on this side, he is not influenced by the government, and no one on this side is voting in a certain way because of ministerial dictation.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We are getting more and more light as the debate progresses, and probably by Friday evening or Saturday morning the House may unanimously agree to throw the measure out. In the first place, we have the Bill introduced in this House by the chief government whip, who lives 100 miles away from the locus in quo, and in the second place, the Bill is being pushed through the house by the government.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is by the efforts of the hon. gentleman who is leading the government that the Bill is thrust upon the House. Then we have this other fact. If we look into the Act of 1901, we find that that Act would apparently require the construction of works on this side of the St. Lawrence, and it seems to me impossible for the St. Lawrence Power Company, under their Act, to carry on their business without constructing works on this side of the St. Lawrence. But the company now being incorporated is asking the power to make contracts for the purchase of electricity from any other company. So that this company could lease their electricity from the American side. In every way therefore the interests of Canada would be overlooked and the interests of the state of New York protected. We all know the wonderful strength of vested rights. If these enormous power plants were established on the American side and the electricity distributed along the Canadian shore to various industries, then the time might come when the supply of electricity from the United States might be shut off unless our Canadian industries would give way to some threat from the other side. As was held by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) this is a most inopportune time for Canada to do anything which would in any way jeopardize its supply of electric power. We have recklessly given away an immense amount of national wealth in timber, coal and minerals, and here it is proposed that we should part with the last and greatest of all our assets, the water-power of the St. Lawrence, which is equal to almost all the water-powers on this continent taken together; and we are doing this in absolute ignorance because there is not a member in this House competent to discuss and estimate the consequence of such an act.

Mr. DEVLIN. I want to try and give an intelligent vote on this Bill. I have listened for some hours to the discussion, and as I understand the rules of the House, we are simply called upon to consider clause 1 of the Bill. Clause 1 provides that certain gentlemen of Ontario, with the exception of one who is a resident of the town of Messina, N.Y., shall be incorporated into a company. The question of provincial rights I understand may be discussed under clause 6. When we come to the other clauses, if we find that the rights of any province are jeopardized, it would then be proper to reject any proposal which will have this effect. But by rule 53, I take it that this Bill must be considered clause by clause. I think it is a very fair proposal on the part of the government to ask hon. members to consider clause 1, against which there can be absolutely no objection and

then, after the clause is passed, it will be in order to consider whether we should go on with another clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not understand what my hon. friend means by saying there can be no objection to clause 1. Why should we incorporate a number of men, a lot of them unknown, to transmit power? Where are they going to transmit it to?

Mr. DEVLIN. We will come to that in considering the other clauses.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman says we must stick to clause 1. I would point out that he is prepared to vote for something without knowing what it may amount to. Where is this power to be transmitted to?

Mr. DEVLIN. That will come up for consideration in a subsequent clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not necessarily. This clause undertakes to say what the name of this company shall be. It is the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited. The St. Lawrence river is a boundary stream, and if you are going to transmit power from the St. Lawrence you are just as liable to transmit it southerly as northerly, and I do not think this clause should pass without more limitation.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am not now discussing the merits of the Bill. I may wish to vote against clause 6, but that is no reason why I should vote against clause 1.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think we should pass clause 1. I do not agree with the point raised by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that there is no harm in passing clause 1 even if I did admit that there was nothing but the name of the company in it. When we are incorporating this company as the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited. I want to know what sort of transmission they are going on with.

Mr. DEVLIN. If the hon. gentleman could point out anything against the honour or ability of the gentlemen seeking this incorporation, I could understand that there must be an objection to it. But, if they are honourable gentlemen, the usual practice of parliament is to allow them to be incorporated and then decide afterwards what shall be the powers to be given to them.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman might be quite willing to give them all the powers that they ask, but I am not willing and I do not say that this is any slur upon their honour or ability. The government is not prepared to tell us what these gentlemen are going to do. The government apparently knew months ago but they have not seen fit to place these plans before parliament, and parliament does not know. The company are in this position, that they cannot legally get this legislation by any secret arrangement with the government, although they must have made one. They ask parliament to endorse it, but they will not show the plans to the endorser. Yet my hon. friend thinks we should go on and consent to clause 1 of the Bill If my hon. friend knows that there is no harm in clause 1 will he give us the information that he possesses and undertake to get these plans that we have asked for so that parliament may vote intelligently upon this question.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is just what I want to do. I want to give an intelligent vote upon the Bill after due consideration of it.

Mr. LANCASTER. By whom?

Mr. DEVLIN. By the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, let us have the plans.

Mr. FIELDING. We have no plans affecting this clause.

Mr. DEVLIN. By rule 53 I find that 'in proceedings of the committee of the whole House upon bills, the preamble is first postponed and then every clause considered by the committee in its proper order, the preamble and title to be last considered.' We are now at clause 1 and there is absolutely no question of plans in clause 1. When we come to subsequent clauses it may be open to any hon. gentleman to ask for the production of plans in order that we may see just exactly what power they seek, but it is certainly not under clause 1.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it not unusual that plans are withheld until we reach a clause in the Bill which requires a discussion of the plans? Would it not be fair to submit the plans when the subject was introduced for discussion in the committee?

Mr. DEVLIN. I perfectly agree that it will be proper for the promoters of this Bill to produce the plans of the powers which they may be seeking to exercise when we come to the consideration of those particular clauses, but under clause 1 of the Bill I fail to see how any plans which might be produced would enlighten us upon the character, the quality or the honour or ability of the few gentlemen of the province of Ontario who are seeking incorporation under the name of the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited.

Mr. LANCASTER. Clause 1 seeks to incorporate these gentlemen under the name of the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited. Before we allow them to be incorporated under that name surely

we ought to know what sort of power they are going to transmit and where they are going to transmit it to. The hon. gentleman says that when we get to certain clauses these plans should be produced. Are we going to bring the promoters before the bar of the House when we get to these clauses and call upon them to produce these plans? I say that they should have been produced when the Bill was called, but the hon. gentlemen admits that when we get to certain operative clauses these plans should be produced.

Mr. DEVLIN. What plans is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. LANCASTER. To the plans that you were referring to that you stated the promoters should be called upon to produce?

Mr. DEVLIN. I was not referring to any clause, but I said that if there were any plans to be produced, I presumed they would be produced. I did not know what they referred to.

Mr. LANCASTER. We should have had these plans put on the table of the House before the Bill was called at all, why should we be prevented from examining them? These plans might be produced at a subsequent stage of this Bill, but the clause applicable to them would be called carried while hon. gentlemen were looking at the plans to see what they contain. There must be some reason in all this. I suspect this is a huge attempt being made by some persons—some of whom are mentioned and some of whom are not—to get possession of these water-powers on the St. Lawrence and avoid all our legislation about the exportation of electrical power, &c. These plans would settle the question. The people want to get that information, and they will have it.

Mr. DEVLIN. What information?

Mr. LANCASTER. The information that the government have, but that parliament has not. The engineers have made these plans, the government have seen them and still they withhold them from parliament. Why do they want to keep that information from the country? What is wrong about it? Some hon. gentlemen propose to stay here until Saturday night to put this Bill through. I am prepared to stay until Saturday night, if the Lord allows me to live that long, before I shall vote for any such legislation.

Mr. NEELY. If the hon. gentleman is sincere in his position——

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the hon. gentleman ever know me not to be sincere in any position I took?

Mr. NEELY. I am asking if he is sincere——

Mr. LANCASTER. You can bet your life on that.

Mr. NEELY. The rules of the House compel us to accept any hon. gentleman's statement as to his sincerity and I am not questioning the hon. gentleman's sincerity. If he wants to question it he has a perfect right to do so. The proposition that this Bill should be considered clause by clause seems to me to be very reasonable. The hon. member knows that passing a clause in this committee does not finally pass it. If the hon. member is sincere in his desire not to give these gentlemen any undue powers, why can he not wait until we arrive at the clauses in the Bill which are objectionable to him as giving undue powers? He talks about plans. I find no reference to any powers granted to the incorporators in this Bill that call for any plans. That has been said over and over again. Hon. members are simply trying to connect up this Bill with some other Bill, some other proposition, that has no relationship to the Bill before us.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Prime Minister is now here and perhaps he would use the influence of that sweet smile of his to induce the hon. members behind him to permit the committee to rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again, as it is about twelve o'clock. The Prime Minister has not heard the argument on this Bill. It is a private Bill and the government should not take sides on it. When the Bill was introduced the opposition and others asked that it should stand over, but the Minister of Public Works could not agree that the minister said last night that the majority must rule. This being a private Bill there is no majority unless the government force their majority to back it up. Hon. gentlemen on this side took a different view of it and we have been talking since five o'clock last evening. The question which was asked of an hon. member a few minutes ago was not answered as the Minister of Public Works answered it last night. The discussion that then took place was as follows:

Mr. BLAIN. Where does the minister think they would get their power?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My own idea is that they will get their power from a company which may develop it along the St. Lawrence. I do not know that to be the case but I suspect it. This Bill simply incorporates a transmission company which would have to make an arrangement with another company for its power. The development of power upon the St. Lawrence must be provided for by another statute, but this Bill does not give the slightest authority to dam the St. Lawrence or construct any works in the St. Lawrence or anywhere else except such works as are essential for a transmission line. As head of the department which has been investigating this subject, the matter has come before

me and hon. gentlemen are doubtless aware that the plans of the company were submitted to the government for the development of water-powers on the St. Lawrence. It was directed that these plans should be referred to the chief engineer of the Department of Railways, the chief engineer of Public Works, and the chief engineer of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under what statute did the company profess to be acting when it submitted these plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did not state, but I understood it to be under the St. Lawrence Power Company charter granted by this parliament some years ago. I also understood from them that they expected to have to come back to parliament to get authority to dam the St. Lawrence.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They have it under the other statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) thinks, but they did not lead us to understand that they had. The three engineers to whom the plans were referred reported adversely to the plans as originally proposed, and they suggested certain modifications which were accepted. The engineers, reported that the project was feasible, that the dam could be erected without interference with navigation, and the matter is now before the International Waterways Commission.

I was going to assure the committee that no plans would be approved of, no arrangement would be approved of, no agreement would be ratified by the government which does not amply protect Canadian interests. So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, I can assure the committee that the plans will not be approved of unless upon the express stipulation, which will be thoroughly safeguarded, that one-half of the water-power which will be developed will be reserved absolutely for the use of the people on the Canadian side of the line.

Mr. HUGHES. Are these the dam plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. The thing is under consideration then?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the view my department has arrived at, and that will be made a sine qua non of any action the department will take.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has your department power to do that without the consent of parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. Parliament will have to consent to the matter in the end, and my recollection is that some time ago, in answer to a question put by the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) the Prime Minister stated that before the plans were approved of, the whole matter would be submitted to parliament for consideration, and before definite action would be taken, parliament must be satisfied that the work will be in the interest of Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON. Were these plans which were submitted by the St. Lawrence Power Company to your department for approval, plans for the construction of a work to connect with another work that would come out from the American shore?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the plans were for damming the river across from the Canadian side to the American side, and also for the building of a lock for the purpose of improving navigation, the idea being to give an additional lock to the one that is already there, and which was constructed, and is owned by the Canadian government.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Does the plan provide for a lock on the American side?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and that is strongly objected to by the engineers of the department. They urge that the lock should be built on the Canadian side.

Mr. HUGHES. Why build a lock on the Canadian side unless the water is to be raised? The minister approves of it, the engineers say that lock has to be built, but they insist on it being on the Canadian side and the minister corroborates every word the opposition has contended for, that this company is a part and parcel of the company which got a charter in 1901. He says so here in plain language. I think the Prime Minister should allow the members of the committee to take recess and have dinner. The opposition have made a strong claim that they do not want to go on with the Bill until they see the plans in the minister's possession. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. DEVLIN. There is already an amendment to the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As I understand it, clause 1 is before the committee. There was a motion that the committee rise and report progress but that was defeated and it cannot be repeated until some further business is done.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. No vote was taken.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I declared a motion of that kind lost at an earlier stage and it cannot be repeated until some further step has been taken.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think it is unfair for honourable gentlemen opposite to keep us here against our will and prevent the public business from going on.

Mr. LANCASTER. Private business.

Mr. DEVLIN. We want to get at the public business. I am as keen as any other hon. member to maintain provincial rights, but I hardly see how that question comes in here. We are dealing with the St. Lawrence river, which is a navigable river, and is therefore under the exclusive jurisdiction of this parliament. But we are now considering simply clause 1 of this Bill, and the question before us is, shall a number of gentlemen of the province of Ontario be allowed to form themselves into a company for some purpose to be here after considered? I ask the leader of the opposition whether he considers that we are wrong.

Mr. LANCASTER. Let me enlighten the hon. gentleman with regard to clause 1, which he evidently does not understand. The St. Lawrence River Power Company, which was incorporated in 1901, and this company, are practically one and the same company, incorporated to do the same thing.

Mr. DEVLIN. They are two different companies, composed of altogether different gentlemen.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not say they are the same people; but the hon. gentleman proposes to incorporate two companies to do the same thing on the same river.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman state whether, if we vote for clause 1, we must of necessity give this company powers that may conflict with those of another company?

Mr. LANCASTER. It follows that we must give them some powers, and it follows from the name of the company that we must give them powers for the transmission of power from the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) asks for some expression from this side of the House as to why this Bill should not pass. May I direct his attention to his neighbour sitting besides him, the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal (Mr. Martin). That hon. gentleman will say that in his opinion, in the interests of the largest city in Canada, this Bill should not become law because it gives this company the right to enter on the streets of Montreal without the consent of the municipality.

Mr. FISHER. That statement is not correct, as the Bill stands before the committee. This company will have no power to enter on the streets of Montreal or those of any municipality without the consent of that municipality. If permitted, I would like to make clear one or two points which are evidently not known to some hon. gentlemen opposite. I had not an opportunity to be here early in the discussion, as I arrived in Ottawa only at midnight. According to my interpretation of the Bill as it has been reported on by the Private Bills Committee, the rights of the city of Montreal are absolutely safeguarded.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if the hon. member for St. Mary's division agrees with that?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think my hon. friend would dispute it for a moment, if he reads the Bill and also section 247 of the Railway Act.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Mr. Martin, and the hon. member for St. James division (Mr. Gervais) appeared before the committee and contended that this Bill did invade the rigths of the city of Montreal.

Mr. FISHER. That was before the Bill was changed. I was in the committee at the sitting when this Bill was finally passed upon and reported to the House. It was only in that sitting that the provision I have referred to was inserted. Consequently any disputes in regard to that point must have been at previous sittings.

Mr. LANCASTER. Which provision does the hon. minister mean?

Mr. FISHER. The section providing that clause 247 of the Railway Act shall apply to the works and undertakings of the company. That is subsection 3 of section 6 of the Bill as reported. That section was inserted for the express purpose of protecting the rights of municipalities and was accepted by the promoters of the Bill. The section provides that when any company is empowered by special Acts of the parliament of Canada, to construct or operate lines for the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity it may, with the consent of the municipal council, or other authorities having jurisdiction over any highway, &c., enter thereon. And subsection 8 says:

> Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize the company to exercise the powers therein mentioned for the purpose of selling or distributing light, heat, power or electricity in cities, towns or villages without the company having first obtained consent therefore by a by-law of the municipality.

That being the case, the rights and privileges of Montreal and all the other municipalities are absolutely safeguarded.

Another word or two with regard to some of the provisions. When the Bill first came in, there was nothing to control the rates, but we added a clause which gives the control to the Board of Railway Commissioners. The Bill, as it left the Private Bills Committee, is entirely different from the original measure.

My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has spoken about the opinion of the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources and he read a portion of a letter addressed by the Hon. Mr. Sifton, chairman of that commission, to the chairman of the Private Bills Committee. I propose to read that letter of which my hon. friend gave a part.

Mr. BLAIN. The letter had been previously read by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe).

Mr. FISHER. I was not aware of that:

> Referring to the letter of your clerk on the subject of Bill (No. 115), I beg to state that the Bill has been examined as carefully as time and information permits.

The St. Lawrence Power Company is at present seeking authority to develop a power scheme by damming the St. Lawrence river at Long Sault. This project is being opposed by the Commission of Conservation for reasons, some of which have already been made public.

I want to point out that the company referred to is the St. Lawrence Power Company and not the St. Lawrence Transmission Company.

An examination of Bill (No. 115) indicates clearly that the introduction of this Bill is a portion of the St. Lawrence Power Company's plans. It is to be noted that the president of the power company and one of its engineers are the first named among the proposed incorporators, and the powers asked for are of an unusual and very sweeping character.

The passage of the Bill as it stands would give parliamentary sanction to an important portion of the St. Lawrence Power Company's proposals, and would complicate the situation unnecessarily.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Was this modified Bill submitted to Mr. Sifton for his opinion?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know, but I was going to point out that his suggestions, with hardly an exception, have been embodied in the Bill, and, consequently, there was no need of submitting it to him. The Bill as reported from the Private Bills Committee is exactly in the lines of the recommendation of the chairman of the Commission for the Conservation of our Natural Resources. Mr. Sifton goes on to say:—

On the other hand it is urged that some of the towns affected, particularly Prescott and Brockville, are without a supply of power, and that a transmission line is necessary in their interest. There does not appear to be any reason why authority for the construction of a transmission line, simply, should not be given, and if Bill (No. 115) were for such a purpose alone there could be no serious objection to it.

This letter has been quoted to prove that the chairman of the Conservation Committee is opposed to this Bill. But the words I have just read in this letter show that on the contrary Mr. Sifton does not see any reason why there should be any objection to the Bill if it were for the construction of a transmission line simply.

Your particular attention is drawn to sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 as being objectionable, on account of the large and unnecessary powers asked for.

These clauses are practically all struck out of the Bill and other clauses giving the safeguards asked for are inserted in their places:—

These clauses apparently contemplate monopolization of powers on a very large scale. It is to be noted also that there are no provisions in the Bill protecting the municipalities in regard to the use of streets or roads, nor anything requiring the company to acquire or pay for a right of way. Difficulty has already arisen in regard to this latter point in other cases, and it requires to be specifically provided for.

Under these circumstances it is recommended—

First, That sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 be struck out and that, in lieu thereof, there be substituted proper provisions giving authority for the construction of a transmission line, and for power to buy, transmit and sell power within Canada.

The Bill provides for that.

Second, that a clause be added declaring that the Act shall come into force only on proclamation of the Governor General in Council and upon such conditions as the Governor General in Council may by order provide, such conditions to be read as forming part of the Act.

At the end of the Bill reported is clause 15, which provides that this Act shall come into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Governor in Council. That is an acceptance of Mr. Sifton's recommendation, but does not go quite so far. He asked that such conditions as the Governor in Council may by order provide, shall be read as forming part of the Act. When that came before the committee, I rather took exception to that last part of the recommendation, and I did so on this ground: I believe it to be the duty of parliament to insert the conditions under which the Act shall have effect and force, and not the duty of the Governor in Council to provide those conditions and add them to the Act. If my hon. friend opposite see fit to entrust that duty to the hands of the present government, that would be a mark of their confidence, but that should not warrant this parliament in shirking its duty and putting that responsibility on the shoulders of the Governor in Council. If hon. gentlemen opposite, however, wish to impose it on the Governor in Council they may move to that effect. Under these circumstances, I did not support that proposition of the chairman of the Conservation Commission, but all the other propositions which he advised are embodied in this Bill, and the clauses to which he objected are eliminated. Had that not been done, I would have protested against the Bill being reported and I would have opposed its adoption in the House. Now that the Bill is safeguarded in the way that I have indicated, first that they can only transmit power, that they cannot export any power to the United States, that they can take no action in case of any municipality without obtaining the permission of that municipality, that their expropriating powers are subject to the clause in the Railway Act and that the Bill shall only come into

force by proclamation of the Governor General, I cannot see why it should not pass. Personally, I am not interested in the Bill any more than any other member of the House. As a member of the Private Bills Committee, it was my duty to examine the Bill to listen to and take part in the discussion and see to it that the Bill fulfilled the conditions necessary to proper legislation on the part of this parliament. As to whether this Bill overrides the jurisdiction of the local legislatures I do not presume to give an opinion, but the contention of the hon. gentleman for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) does not seem to me to be an accurate one. He seemed to imply that this Bill would extend the power to expropriate the property of a provincial government, obtained under section 247 of the Railway Act, to what is called the original company. I am not a lawyer and I do not profess to give a legal opinion, but it does not seem to be possible that the power which is given to one company under one Act of a certain character can be thereby given to another company under another Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. The same people may acquire stock in both companies.

Mr. FISHER. The same people may be in the two companies, but the powers given to one incorporation under the statute could only apply to the works exercised by that corporation and not to the works which they exercise under another statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I observed in the letter of the Chairman of the Conservation Commission an expression of opinion that this was merely part of the larger scheme.

Mr. FISHER. No, not a part of the larger scheme. He says that:

> The introduction of this Bill is a portion of the St. Lawrence Power Company's plan.

That may be so. I am not aware of what their intention is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We know that from the declaration of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. FISHER. Whether it is or is not, the powers given under this Bill have reference to works connected with the transmission of electricity, and they cannot apply to the powers given under the original incorporation for the erection of a dam, &c. I cannot understand how powers created by this Bill for a certain work defined in this Bill can be transferred to work which is to be done under another and different statute. My understanding is that only this has the Railway Act applied to it and consequently the power which under the Railway Act is given to companies incorporated by this parliament to expropriate the property of provincial governments is not included in the charter of the original corporation. It is only by reason of the fact that the powers of expropriation under the Railway Act are given to this company that they get power to expropriate property of the provinces, and the reason that was given was that if they were not given that power, under the involved construction of provincial rights in regard to land under streams and on river beds, they might be prevented from crossing any river bed in Ontario, which would mean practically that they would be obstructed absolutely and forever in any work which this parliament authorized them to carry on.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not that take away some rights of the province of Ontario?

Mr. FISHER. I am not going to give a legal opinion on that, but if there is a right on the part of Ontario to obstruct a company's works which are in the interest of the people of Canada, then I say that the property of the province ought to be subjected, as private property is, to expropriation to enable the works of the company to be carried on. If the works are not in the public interest this parliament ought not to give a charter at all, but if it does give a charter it should give facilities to the company to carry on the works which this parliament has authorized.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the minister advocate a measure which would override the rights of the municipality or the province?

Mr. FISHER. If this parliament sees fit to incorporate a company for certain purposes, it ought to give that company the power to carry on its purposes.

Mr. BOYCE. The minister is saying today the very opposite of that which he said last session. Last session when he introduced the Bill to establish the Conservation Commission he explained that the interests of the provinces and municipalities as well as the interests of the Dominion would be safeguarded by this commission. We had presented the argument that this House had created certain committees on conservation, and that, therefore, there was no necessity of going to the expense of creating a Conservation Commission. Asked by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) what the Conservation Commission would do, he said on May 12, page 6369 of 'Hansard':

> They will hold a meeting and discuss what recommendations they may be able to lay down for the treatment of the natural resources of Canada in the future on such lines as may rightly appeal to the administrative bodies, all through Canada, whether municipal, provincial or Dominion who have control over natural resources.

A committee of the House is purely federal in its character. It does not enlist the sympathy or co-operation of the provincial or municipal authorities.

When the question was raised that there was a committee of this House on natural resources the minister said:

A committee of the House is purely federal in its character. It does not enlist the sympathy or co-operation of the provincial or municipal authorities.

Now, the hon. gentleman says that he would vote in support of measures which would absolutely override and take away rights municipal and provincial, notwithstanding what these rights may be, and in favour of federal legislation. My hon. friend must see the inconsistency of that position. I have a word to say to the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee). He takes a rather extraordinary stand in reference to this Bill. He has said that we should override by this Bill the rights of the provinces. The hon. gentleman has not always spoken along that line. When he was a member of the provincial house in Ontario, supporting the provincial government, he took a different position, and in the first year that he was a member of this House he also took a different position.

Mr. CONMEE. No, there has been no inconsistency in my position.

Mr. BOYCE. Having regard to the principles which are involved as regards the rights of provinces and municipalities through which this proposed transmission line would pass, I feel that this Bill should be allowed to stand over. With regard to the principles of this Bill, the time has to come, and it might as well come now, when a policy must be laid down for dealing with these questions. It is the duty of the government to lay before this House such a policy as will prevent such a discussion as this being precipitated and will prevent private rights, municipal rights and provincial rights being so continually invaded as they are at the present time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture what he makes of section 11 subsection 4.

Mr. FISHER. I take that to mean that the company has the right to acquire in fee simple such lands as it may need for the construction of its transmission line. The words, fee simple, were put in so as to require the company to buy the lands and not simply obtain a lease of them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Section 247 of the Railway Act, to which my hon. friend referred, and the general provisions of the Railway Act on which he relies, do not seem to cure the situation created by this subsection, which apparently gives the company the right to enter on and expropriate any land without acquiring a title in fee simple. This might give the company the right to obtain an easement in any municipality without acquiring the right in fee simple. Subsection 6 of section 11 says:

In the event of the company exercising the rights of expropriation hereby given for the purpose of acquiring land for its right of way, such land must be acquired in fee simple.

I do not know what the effect of these two provisions read together is. I would think it extremely probable that under subsection 4 the provisions of section 247 of the Railway Act might not be of very much avail.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the case, the clause, when we reach it, ought to be amended, because the Private Bills Committee fully understood that all questions of expropriation should be subject to the permission of the municipality, and I would be prepared to support any amendment which would make it clear that no such power would be left in the hands of the company.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. The difference between the two subsections is this: that in every case of expropriation the company would be obliged to acquire a title in fee simple; but they would not be required to do so in obtaining an easement or a privilege.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is the intention, it has been very badly expressed. The Railway Act gives a company power to expropriate land. This Bill proceeds to say that 'the word land, so far as it applies to this Act shall include any privilege or easement required by the company for constructing or operating the works authorized by this Act without the necessity of acquiring a title in fee simple.' Therefore it seems to me that this result would follow, that this company would have the right to acquire a right of way without the necessity of acquiring a title in fee simple. If this clause gives it the right by expropriation to obtain an easement for the purpose of erecting one pole, it has an equal right to acquire an easement by similar proceedings for the purpose of erecting all its poles.

Mr. FISHER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that that can be very easily remedied when we reach that clause in the Bill. Therefore I would suggest that we facilitate our reaching it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have listened with a good deal of interest to what the Minister of Agriculture said in regard to the innocent character of this Bill as it now stands, and his explanation of the letter of the hon. Chairman of the Conservation Commission. I do not read this Bill as of the innocent character that the Minister of Agriculture does, and I think he must give more consideration to it before he comes to that

conclusion. As I understand the letter, Mr. Sifton, the Chairman of the Conservation Commission, wanted the Bill to be limited to transmission, and I do not understand the minister to say that Mr. Sifton has seen the Bill in its amended form. If it be intended that this Bill is to accomplish nothing but transmission, that is not its effect even as amended. By clause 6 the company may purchase or lease electric power, and acquire such lands, easements and privileges as are necessary for the purpose of its undertakings. Now, it must be admitted that the Act of 1901, incorporating the St. Lawrence Power Company, though it may be a different Act, gives that company the right to sell those powers, and that Act contains no clause such as we insert in railway charters, preventing any amalgamation with any other company except with the approval of the Governor in Council or the Railway Commission. So that the two companies, being under the one control, could be so manipulated as to give them the joint power of generating and transmitting electricity. Clause (6) provides that the company may:—

(a) construct, maintain, operate, use and manage conduits, tunnels, transmission lines, structures, buildings, machinery, plant, appliances, instruments and devices, and erect and maintain poles and towers, and lay and maintain pipes, cables, wires or other conductors and connect them with similar lines in other provinces and with similar lines in the United States for the purpose of importation only.

It does not say for transmission only, and I cannot presume that would be the result

Mr. FISHER. That is the whole object.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not limit this clause so as to provide for transmission only in Canada?

Mr. FISHER. When we reach that clause we can put that in.

Mr. ROBB. Let my hon. friend read clause 12.

Mr. LANCASTER. That clause provides that nothing in this Act shall be construed to empower the company to export electricity or electric or other power to the United States. But there is nothing here that limits in any way their rights to transmission. We have this statute of 1901 which gives powers far beyond transmission to another company, almost identical in name and composed of the same parties, and we then are asked to pass this Bill in which care is taken not to limit the powers of the company to transmission. An attempt has been made to show that municipal rights will not be invaded and a clause was put in to that effect. Whether operative or not shall be found out later. The Bill declares what the works and powers of the company are to be, but it does not limit them to a transmission company or to anything that could be so construed. On the contrary, we do say that they can acquire, lease or obtain current, power or force, and may supply, sell, &c. They can buy or sell from any other company that can give them current. We are giving them this power and we are not putting in any such safeguard as that they should be subject to the Railway Board or to the Governor in Council. The chairman of the Conservation Commission who is not merely as an individual for whom we might have respect objected to this measure. He is not a gentleman who is simply appointed and who is desirous of protecting this country, but he is, under statute, made the policeman or guardian of these things, and it is his duty to watch and keep tab on such legislation. That gentleman has condemned this Bill as far as we know. I would like a letter from the chairman of the commission saying that, having seen the amended Bill, he is satisfied that it is all right. I understand the Bill does not remove his objection. If it were limited to transmission only, the chairman saw much objection to it, but he made the distinct statement that it should be limited to transmission only. This Bill is not limited to transmission. Does not the Minister of Agriculture think that if it is to be limited to transmission only, it would be well to put into this Bill a statement to that effect, either at the end of clause 6 or in some other part of the Bill, so that it would be quite clear?

Mr. FISHER. When we reach the clause in question I am ready to support any wording which will make clear the intention I have already described.

Mr. LANCASTER. We are asked to pass clause 1 saying what the name of this company shall be, but we have not yet determined that the name is the proper one. I am not prepared to vote that this company shall be a transmission company if it is to be something else, and the Bill indicates that it is to be something else. It is to be a great deal more than a transmission company.

Mr. FISHER. I think that the corporation ought to be made to agree with the title of the Bill, which is that of a transmission company. It is a transmission company that I am prepared to incorporate and grant powers to.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is nothing that limits it to a transmission company.

Mr. FISHER. I think there is. If there is not I am ready to put it there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was I correct in understanding the Minister of Agriculture

to say that everything objected to by the chairman of the commission had been struck out?

Mr. FISHER. As far as I can see the Bill has been reframed in exact accordance with the recommendations of the chairman of the Conservation Commission except what he proposed in regard to conditions being put in the order in council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe that the chairman recommends that clauses 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 should be struck out of the original Bill. Clause 10 has not been struck out as it appears here as clause 7.

Mr. FISHER. I see that the clause is exactly the same but it seems to me that other clauses having been put in to prevent the power there provided for being exercised except under certain restrictions that clause is not objectionable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He seemed to think that it was and he continues the objection to it as it stands at present. There are rather peculiar words in clause 7:

> The company may construct or acquire by lease, purchase or otherwise, and operate in connection with the works, lines and business of the company and for the purposes thereof, lines of telegraph or telephone or other works and means of communication.

Mr. FISHER. The words 'and for the purposes thereof' mean that these lines of telegraph and telephone are only to be used for the purposes of the company in the same way that a railway company is allowed to use telegraph and telephone lines for its own purposes.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the minister quite sure of his statement when he says that all the recommendations of the chairman of the Conservation Commission have been embodied in this Bill? The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) produced a letter from the chairman of the Conservation Commission and I gathered from his statement that there were very material differences between the recommendations and the Bill as presented to the House. I notice that the Minister of Agriculture seems to have the impression that the Bill carries out all that the chairman recommended.

Mr. FISHER. With one exception.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the minister sure that all the recommendations made by the chairman of the commission purported to be carried out—that the committee decided to adopt them all?

Mr. FISHER. That was the intention of the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the minister be good enough to state again what the exception was?

Mr. FISHER. It was that the chairman of the commission thought that in the proclamation of the Governor General bringing the Act into force there should be additional conditions imposed which I objected to on principle.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not recall whether the chairman is appointed by order in council or selected by the commission itself.

Mr. FISHER. He is specially appointed as chairman.

Mr. LENNOX. The practice is growing up in the committees of referring matters to what is called the Conservation Commission; that is referring them practically to the chairman of the Conservation Commission. I recognize that the chairman is a man of very exceptional ability, but that alone does not constitute a reason why we should leave matters of important legislation to him. The question of ability is not the sole question. I have a very serious objection to that method. It works exceedingly well at all times. It may work well on this occasion, but the time will come when it will work in the reverse order, and I think that if we once adopt that method of referring matters nominally to the Conservation Commission, but to be actually decided by the chairman or even directly referring them to the chairman, we will come to a very dangerous condition of things before long. For a time the chairman may recommend things that seem to be in the line of conserving the public interest, and the opposition will say it is very willing on these occasions to adopt them, but we have no guarantee that on other occasions the chairman will not recommend the adoption of a Bill which is a very dangerous Bill, and the fact that we have referred it to him will get us into the practice of being careless in investigating matters ourselves, and it will not be very long before a serious blunder will result from this practice. I do not wish to attack either the Conservation Commission or the chairman of that commission, but I say that in principle it is wrong. We are delegating our duties to a commission which has no responsibility, because we cannot consider that Mr. Sifton as chairman of the commission is filling a responsible position in the sense of being a member of this House, although he happens to be a member. By referring Bills to that commission or its chairman, we are delegating duties which we should perform ourselves, and we will yet bring censure upon ourselves for doing that. The most valuable work of the commission will be to deal with general cases, not on refer-

ence of a particular instance or particular Bill. They take a general survey of the country, its interests and resources, and form an opinion on these matters, when no one is interested in influencing them in a certain way, but I feel it is a dangerous principle to relegate our duties to the chairman of that commission or even to the Conservation Commission itself.

Mr. BOYCE. Was this Bill not referred to the Conservation Commission?

Mr. PARDEE. The original Bill was, but this Bill was not referred to them. The Conservation Commission went over the first Bill and cut out what they thought were objectionable clauses, and returned the Bill to the Private Bills Committee. They had no objection to the Bill going through in its amended form.

Mr. BOYCE. The Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Mines are ex-officio, by the Act, members of the Conservation Commission, to which this Bill was referred. I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any meeting of the Conservation Commission was called for the purpose of considering the Bill that was referred to that commission? It must be clear that it has never sat and deliberated upon this Bill, and we have no recommendation from the commission as to the best method of dealing with this matter. This Bill was referred to a body composed of 35 members, and we have received, not the opinion of the commission, but the opinion of one member of it who is called the chairman, and whose duties, as defined by the Act, are purely administrative, to carry out the decisions of the commission. Therefore, unless we are to make a farce of the proceedings of that commission, we should refer to it this Bill and obtain the recommendations of the commission, and not merely those of the chairman. I would like to know the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture, himself ex-officio a member of that commission, and the minister who introduced the measure creating the Conservation Commission, as to the chairman of the commission, without calling the commission together, himself disposing of questions referred to that commission?

Mr. FISHER. The only reason, so far as I know, that this question of the Conservation Commission has come up at all, is that hon. gentlemen who oppose this Bill, quoted the letter of the chairman of the commission, and used it for the purpose of obstructing the Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman is wrong in saying that the letter was used for the purpose of obstructing the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. I apologize. I meant to say for the purpose of opposing the Bill, the argument being advanced that this Bill was opposed by the Conservation Commission. That is why I referred to the matter. As to referring this question to the Conservation Commission, that suggestion is open to objection and also to commendation. There are reasons on both sides. But it is obvious that the commission, composed of thirty gentlemen scattered over Canada, cannot be got together to discuss every question that may be referred to them. If a question of that kind is referred to the commission, either the whole commission will have to be called together to deliberate and pronounce upon it, or the chairman may call together the executive committee for that purpose. I am not aware whether or not in this case he called together the executive committee.

Mr. BOYCE. You are a member of it.

Mr. FISHER. No, I am not. One of its members is one of the hon. members for Toronto, another is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), another is Dr. Robertson, another is the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, another is Senator Edwards, and there are two or three others. What the chairman wrote may be his own personal opinion as chairman, or it may be the opinion formed in consultation. Hon. gentlemen opposite, supposing that the letter of the chairman supported their opposition to this Bill, brought it up; but now that they find that it does not oppose the Bill in its present form, they are rather tired of the subject and are objecting to the opinion of the chairman of the commission being quoted against them.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), in reading the letter last night, distinctly stated that some of the requests of the commission were granted in the Bill, and some were not.

Mr. FISHER. I think they all are practically.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend will not say they all are.

Mr. FISHER. With one exception.

Mr. BLAIN. A very important exception.

Mr. BOYCE. I will repeat my question. Does the Minister of Agriculture, as the minister having charge of the Conservation Commission, consider that a reference to that commission is conformed to by a reply from the chairman of the commission, and is that the way the Conservation Commission is going to do its work?

Mr. FISHER. I would say that if the chairman of the commission is not authorized by the commission to act in that way, his reply would be of very little value except as an expression of his own personal opinion; but if the organization of

the commission authorizes the chairman to act for the commission in certain circumstances, then his reply would have the force of the commission behind it.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend knows that there is no authority for the chairman to act in that way.

Mr. FISHER. Not by statute.

Mr. BOYCE. Then, upon the minister's own statement, there is no report of the Conservation Commission on this Bill; and if we accept this letter from the chairman as the judgment of the Conservation Commission, the hon. minister must see how dangerous a precedent we are etsablishing in dealing with the natural resources of this country. This is a precedent which the hon. Minister of Agriculture himself (Mr. Fisher) is supporting by his attitude in the House. It was he who explained last session the great value of this commission for the conservation of our nat ural resources in dealing with just such cases as this affecting federal, provincial and municipal matters, and I appeal to him, as a responsible minister of the Crown, not to allow this matter to be dealt with simply by one member of that commission. I ask him to see that where there has been a reference to the commission, that commission shall pass upon it as a body and not have it simply dealt with by one of its members, no matter how distinguished that member may be. It is the report of the commission as a whole that the parliament of Canada is entitled to, and that report the minister should see that parliament obtains.

Mr. MACDONELL. We have had from the Minister of Agriculture the rather startling and novel statement that this parliament has the right to empower a private company to expropriate the public domain of any province. That is a claim which has never before been put forward in this House by any hon. gentleman much less by a minister of the Crown.

Mr. FISHER. Is it not true that under the provisions of the Railway Act, this company may get that power, and was not that Railway Act passed by this parliament and agreed to unanimously?

Mr. MACDONELL. That is one reason why I object to this Bill. It is declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada and the company are given very extensive powers under the Railway Act. We are indebted to the minister for this very frank statement of the policy of the government. It has never before been contended in this House that the Crown, as represented by the Dominion parliament, has the right to authorize the expropriation of the territory or domain of the Crown as represented by any one province, because a province is just as much entitled to its Crown rights and the entirety of its Crown privileges as is the Dominion. The provinces have just as much right to the preservation of their exclusive ownership to whatever property they possess. But the statement is now made for the first time that one Crown has the right to authorize a corporation to expropriate the right of another Crown. No court has held that doctrine in this country at any time. There was a case in British Columbia in which a company was given the right to expropriate the Crown domain for the purpose of carrying out an undertaking authorized by this parliament, but that had reference to Dominion lands in that province. The Minister of Agriculture went further and practically supported every clause in this Bill. What would be the use, therefore, of our acceding to the apparently moderate request of certain hon. gentlemen opposite that the first clause of this Bill should be passed? At the end of the final clause, the hon. gentleman was somewhat doubtful as to whether he would not add a line to it, but apart from that he is perfectly satisfied with the Bill. Apparently the government is going to force the Bill through, no matter what objections there may be to it. The hon. minister attempted to quiet the well founded apprehensions of hon. members representing the constituency of Montreal and he read the Railway Act to prove that this company has no power to enter upon the highways and byways of that city without its consent. Surely that is elementary. Every one knows section 247 of the Railway Act, and that section simply protects the municipalities to the extent that no one shall enter upon their highways without their consent. The Railway Act does not say that this company shall be bound by section 247 and that it shall not enter the city of Montreal without the consent of the city.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Agriculture was not successful in using the words of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Mr. Martin), because he resented and did not endorse the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. MACDONELL. Quite true, I was not in the House at the time, but I understand that to be the fact. This Bill gives this company the right to expropriate indiscriminately throughout the entire territory from Kingston to Montreal, inclusive. They have to buy their way, but they are given not only powers of expropriation, but the Bill gives the company the right to expropriate as far as they require expropriation powers.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. With the authorization of the municipality.

Mr. MACDONELL. No, without. I make the statement, and I challenge contradiction of it, that this Bill gives the right to this company to expropriate without the consent of the municipality. A company operating under the Railway Act was bound to acquire in fee simple and pay the value of property expropriated, but this company have the additional right of being able to acquire any privilege or easement. It means that they can run their lines anywhere in the city of Montreal, upon the side of a building or over a building, and they can acquire a privilege or easement wherever they please. They do not have to expropriate a right of way. That costs a lot of money. They do not need to spend that money. They can simply acquire an easement or right or privilege and run their lines wherever they please; the company gets this power under subsection 4 of section 11 of the Bill. I hope that hon. gentlemen representing the city of Montreal will see the effect of this thing and join with those who are trying to protect provincial rights. The Minister of Agriculture said that he saw no peril in the amalgamation of this company with its predecessor, the St. Lawrence Power Company incorporated in 1901, that whatever rights the old company had they would retain, and that this company would retain its rights, but that they could not in any way by making a combination form one company, merge their powers and operate for the joint advantage of both companies. The minister is entirely mistaken, because if he will read the statute incorporating the St. Lawrence Power Company in 1901, he will see that by clause 11 this company have the power to amalgamate with the company which is now being formed, and that the rights possessed by each company will be owned by the joint company. The company which we are incorporating will possess the entire rights of the old company, the old company of 1901 will possess the entire rights of this company, and they will jointly have the enormous powers that are provided for in both cases. With the power given to the old company to amalgamate with this company, these two companies will become one and there will be one gigantic corporation enjoying the powers of the old power company, together with the very large privileges sought in this Bill by the distributing company.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was that information not communicated to the Private Bills Committee?

Mr. MACDONELL. I do not know. Possibly it was.

Mr. BLAIN. No, my hon. friend from North Ontario says it was not.

Mr. MACDONELL. Well, it is here in the Act. They bear on their face the evidence that they are one and the same. They have practically the same name, the old company being called the St. Lawrence Power Company, and this company being called the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company. If this company that is applying to-day was not in substance the old company, would not the old company object to the similarity of names? The minister sees no danger in the exportation of power to the States. I contend that it is extremely doubtful, under both Bills, whether or not the company can be prohibited from exporting power, because the old Act contains no restriction whatever on the exportation of power. The company can sell its power.

Mr. CONMEE. No, the Exportation Act would cover that.

Mr. MACDONELL. Chapter 16 of the Exportation of Fluid Act of 1907 provides for licenses to export power and unless this company is prohibited from exporting its power it has the right to apply for a license to the Governor in Council under the Act of 1907, and if there is no good reason why it should not get a license it will doubtless get one. There is no attempt made to say that this company shall be prohibited from exporting this power, and if it applies for a license no doubt it will be given the right to export its surplus. Let me point out the unwisdom of allowing our power to be exported. Let me refer to the condition that existed at Niagara Falls many years ago, a condition of affairs that we are now repeating on the St. Lawrence river. The International Waterways Commission found that they had developed power on the American side largely in excess of their right according to the flow of water, but having regard to the establishment of industries and vested rights they divided the power over the whole river by giving to Canada some 36,000 horse-power, and giving about 20,000 horse-power to the American side, whereas, if it had been dealt with on a proper basis, the American side would not have been entitled to more than one-sixth of the total power that could be developed as less than one-sixth of the water flowed over the American side. What has happened there will happen here, and history will repeat itself. You will have the water and power diverted to the American side, or you will have the power exported to the American side, and the Americans will get a great deal more than they are entitled to. Ultimately when the question comes up to be dealt with as an international question our rights will be sacrificed, and we will get the small end of the horn, and not what we are entitled to. It is claimed that we are obstructing because we are going on record as being in favour of protecting the interests of the people as against this

corporation which is seeking to be incorporated at the public expense for its own private interest and advantage. The Minister of Agriculture has made the startling statement that this House has a perfect right to incorporate a company, and give that company the right to expropriate the domain of any province. He justifies that by saying that the company may have to run across the bed of some provincial stream, and they should have the right to expropriate there. Does that justify the sweeping power given to this company to expropriate the public domain of Ontario throughout nine counties along the St. Lawrence from Kingston to Montreal? If the Bill is only intended to give the right to expropriate the river bed here and there why not say so?

Mr. A. McCALL. I must discuss this Bill on the assumption that there is an intention to dam the St. Lawrence. That may not appear in this Bill, but it does in the Bill of 1901. I think it is clear that in time a dam will be erected across the St. Lawrence; that will be found to be the joker, the little elusive pea that is under the shell. We all agree that the St. Lawrence is one of our great national assets. It drains the Great Lakes and forms the only natural outlet for the trade of the best part of the north American continent. The Americans would give untold wealth if they could acquire the exclusive right to navigate the St. Lawrence from the lakes to the ocean. That is our great privilege, and we ought not to consent to put the slightest hindrance to the free flow of the trade that properly belongs to our great water route. So jealous are the American authorities on the subject that a proposal to build a bridge across the Detroit river was rejected at Washington, and the railways had to spend $12,000,000 to tunnel the river. The proposal to build a dam at the foot of Lake Erie, near Buffalo, to maintain the waters of the lake at standard level, has been rejected for fear of causing an ice jam with consequent flooding of the land bordering the lake and the checking of the flow of the Niagara river.

The building of such a dam as this on the St. Lawrence river would put a stop to the carriage of rafts of timber down the St. Lawrence, and it would destroy one of the great scenic attractions of the St. Lawrence river, the shooting of the rapids, which would be a very serious loss from a sentimental point of view.

The Welland canal is admittedly one of our greatest national assets. It has been enlarged three times, and the Minister of Railway and Canals proposes a still further enlargement. That would mean an enlargement and deepening of the St. Lawrence canals, but it is more likely that if this dam is erected it will be found a serious obstruction in the enlargement of those canals, as the water supply might be affected and currents caused that did not before exist. The whole condition will be changed by this scheme of spoilation. By means of our great water routes we have it within our power to draw the trade of half of the north American continent, a trade which now taxes the American shipping interests and railroads. All that is open to us with a proper system of water transportation. Moreover, it is within the range of possibilities that ocean vessels will soon find their way up the lakes. We are face to face with the possibility of difficulties in connection with our coal supply from the United States. In connection with the discussion of tariff matters now pending there may be a difficulty in adjusting the question of duties. We are all looking forward to utilizing our own coal supply in Nova Scotia so as to make it serve the lake ports and the northwest. To do all this we require the unobstructed navigation of the St. Lawrence. This is a larger question than one of a week's discussion. It is much larger than the question of the transmission of power to a number of large towns. It should be considered from a national point of view. Hon. gentlemen should not consent to the alienation of this most valuable asset of the nation which we have in the St. Lawrence river. From every point of view we should not consider for a moment the possibility of an obstruction being placed in that waterway. If we agree in all this, can we not get together on this question? I am willing, in conclusion, to propose that we call this debate off and get out and have an old-fashioned game of snow-ball before the snow disappears—and I invite my friend Mr. Loggie to be my opponent in a friendly game—and we will come back on another day and dispose of this matter quickly.

Mr. HUGHES This morning three ministers were appealed to in succession by one of the hon. members on this side of the House, and each of them gave the clearest possible reason why this Bill should be postponed immediately. The Minister of Agriculture, in answer to the query what he thought of the Bill, stated that before he could answer he required to consider the Bill; the Minister of Labour stated that before he could express an opinion, he would require to consider the whole discussion; and the Minister of the Interior stated that the question involved matters which had taken up twelve or fourteen hours of discussion, and he wanted more light. I appeal to the Minister of Militia, who is now leading the House, to comply with the very proper request of the leader of the opposition, that this Bill be laid over until the plans can be looked into.

Committee divided on the question that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again: Yeas, 32; nays, 34.

Mr. HUGHES. When this Bill first came before the Private Bills Committee, it attracted very little attention. Very few on this side of the House suspected that there was anything behind it. Our suspicions were first aroused by seeing the great interest taken in it by certain gentlemen who were never known to attend the meetings of the Private Bills Committee at all. They were there early and late; they drummed up their friends and urged all sorts of arguments for the passing of the Bill. On one occasion thirty or forty men deserted one power scheme in the Railway Committee to float another through in the Private Bills Committee. The spectacle naturally excited the attention even of honest plodding Conservatives, and we thought it our duty to commence an inquiry Then suspicion grew, based on the rumour that behind this scheme was the plan to dam the St. Lawrence river, and hand over the entire water-power to this grasping corporation of American trusts. I was amazed to see the determined interest taken in that Bill by the government. I strolled in, not expecting anything special on, but when I saw the activity of five or six ministers of the Crown in pushing through this private Bill, I began to suspect, to use an Americanism, that there was a nigger in the wood pile. The Minister of Public Works in a moment of excitement gave the whole story away. He frankly admitted that there was a connection between the two Bills, the St. Lawrence Power Company, and the St. Lawrence Power and Transmission Company. He admitted that he had been waited upon repeatedly during the last two years in the interest of that Bill, that this company had come to him and had shown him the plans for damming the St. Lawrence, and had talked the whole matter over with him, and he admitted that the two Bills were one and the same thing. Up to that time we had confined our efforts to preserving the rights of the province of Ontario. We asked the Minister of Public Works to let the Bill stand over until we could obtain information on certain matters, and that we might look more carefully into it. That was refused, they point blank refused to take anything short of the passage of the entire Bill. Well, the Minister of Public Works saw that he could not carry his point. Then, as the night wore on, these gentlemen agreed to compromise the matter if we would pass the preamble, and all the clauses, leaving one to be reserved for discussion. We very properly rejected that proposition. We were determined then that before this Bill should go through the plans of that dam should be brought down, and we would see what was behind it all. I am sure that there is nothing that any fair minded man on the government side could object to in the position we took. Then what was the next step on the programme? Two of these gentlemen from Ontario. the province that was being robbed of her natural resources, commenced in their usual manner to try and shove this matter through. They found that did not work. So in the small hours of the morning the government came to their senses, and another proposition was made that section 1 should be passed, and all the rest should stand over for consideration. But since we had been denied an opportunity to see the plans, we decided to reject that proposition. Our duty to our constituents demanded that we should get to the bottom of this whole matter. I see before me now three ministers who were not here during the night, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Labour, and the Minister of the Interior. Have they heard the reasons why this matter should be adjourned? I am sure the Secretary of State will join them in a desire for more light on this matter. I regard this as a most dangerous measure in the interests of the peace and good relationship which should exist between this country and the United States. I feel satisfied that if the Minister of Militia will only give my hon. friend the leader of the opposition a definite statement that these plans will be brought down we will be prepared to end this matter by the passage of section 1.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would not venture to give an assurance because I have not been here during the debate and I am not familiar with it at all, but I understand that the Minister of Public Works did make some offer during the debate.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of Public Works did offer to bring the plans down, but he insisted that the Bill should go through. Later in the night he changed his tactics.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman again state that?

Mr. HUGHES. I have no doubt that the leader of the opposition—and I believe he speaks for the entire party on this side—will accept the assurance of the minister that the plans will be laid on the table and in case that would be done we would be competent to pass clause 1.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Would the opposition be willing to allow section 1 to pass? I am not able to state as to the plans.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of Public Works promised to bring them down.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Smith) said that the plans were in the possession of everybody, that they were published.

Mr. PARDEE. Did he not say that they are not in the minister's office, but that they are in the possession of the Waterways Commission?

Mr. S. SHARPE. You could easily send for them.

Mr. CONMEE. It might take a couple of days.

Mr. S. SHARPE. You cannot reach the conclusion of the consideration of this Bill before the expiration of a couple of days.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may say to the Minister of Militia that the difficulty originated in the very unreasonable attitude which was taken by the Minister of Finance who was leading the House last evening. I do not know whether it was his own view, but certainly he expressed it. There had been a very interesting and instructive discussion of this Bill. The opposition to it was not on party lines. The strongest attack upon the Bill was made by the hon. member for Westmorland, and a somewhat similar attack was made by the hon. member for Assiniboia. There was nothing to indicate a desire for anything except to ascertain all the facts, to get at the bottom of the project, and in the course of the debate the Minister of Public Works referred to certain plans and stated the purport of the plans that had been submitted to him. I asked the Minister of Public Works to lay the plans on the table of the House and I suggested at one o'clock, about an hour after the usual time of adjournment, that it was time for the committee to rise and report progress. The Minister of Finance did not acquiesce in that view for some reason which I cannot apprehend. It was a most reasonable request. The request was rejected and the discussion went on. A little later a gentleman on the other side of the House intimated that it was the intention to sit until Saturday unless the opposition were prepared to give way. That is the whole situation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did my hon. friend wish information from me?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I feel that I have got a good deal already, but I would be quite glad to get more. I want to know whether the minister intends to lay these plans on the table of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very frank with my hon. friend. I stated last night that I would be very glad indeed to lay the plans on the table. The situation in regard to the plans is this: There was a joint report made by the chief engineer of the Public Works Department, the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, and the chief engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries upon the amended plans. These plans were in charge of the late Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Butler. In accordance with the promise I made to my hon. friend I telephoned to the chief engineer of my department and I find that the plans are not in my department. Of course, they were submitted to the International Waterways Commission, but I am informed that it is not unlikely there is a copy of the plans in the Department of Railways and Canals. I have asked the deputy minister to see and, if they are available, I will have them this afternoon, and I will be very glad to lay them on the table of the House. If not I shall send to the chairman of the International Waterways Commission and get them here as soon as possible.

Mr. BLAIN. How many sets of plans were there in connection with the work altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I only saw one set, which was submitted accompanied by the joint report.

Mr. BLAIN. They were submitted as the amended plans, were they not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were the amended plans. I am now referring to the amended plans upon which the three engineers reported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that I have any special warrant or authority to speak on behalf of those who are opposing this Bill. Some are on the other side of the House, but, as far as I am concerned, I would like to ask the minister whether or not the plans to which he alludes and which he has said he would be glad to lay on the table of the House, include any reports in connection with the plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there is the joint report made by the three engineers and my desire is to submit that at the same time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I would recommend to my friends, as far as I have any influence with them in regard to a matter of this kind, that upon the assurance of the minister that these will be laid upon the table before the Bill is taken up again, we should allow the first clause of the Bill to pass upon the condition that the committee shall immediately afterwards rise and report progress. I cannot speak for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are opposing this Bill with fierce determination, but perhaps the Minister of Public Works can use his persuasive powers to induce them to agree to the same thing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have just had communication with my hon. friend from Lambton, who is in charge of the Bill, and he would be quite willing, and I think I can speak for other gentlemen on this side of the House, if the first clause is allowed to pass, then to report progress, with the

understanding that I will get the plans as soon as possible, and have them laid on the table.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And that they shall be laid on the table before the Bill is taken up again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not say that; but if the plans are not laid on the table, there will be the best possible reason for it. They will be laid on the table if they are available, and I have not a shadow of doubt that they will be available. I may have them this afternoon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In case the plans are not laid on the table, it will be for the committee to consider the very good reason which my hon. friend thinks he can produce.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that question will arise at all, for I have no doubt that the plans will be submitted.

Mr. BLAIN. These will include all the plans that have been under consideration by the government, including the modified plan which my hon. friend referred to a few days ago in the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I had in mind was the final plans, those which were recommended by the engineers, and accompanied by their report.

Mr. BLAIN. In order that there may be no mistake, I refer to 'Hansard' of January 18:

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

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

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

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the plan which I would propose to lay upon the table, together with the joint report of the three engineers in reference to that plan.

Mr. BLAIN. When my hon. friend made this statement, I presume that there were two sets of plans submitted by the company to the members of the Privy Council. Will he submit both?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I mean is that I will submit the modified plans, which were approved of by the engineers. With regard to the plans first filed, I could not undertake to submit them, because they may have been withdrawn; but the important point is to have the modified plans, accompanied by the report of the engineers.

Mr. HUGHES. As I cannot understand how a dam 42 feet high can be placed where a dam of 20 feet would flood the countryside, I would like the minister also to bring down profiles.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to bring down all the plans which are in the possession of any of the three departments, together with the report of the engineers.

Section 1 agreed to, and progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 136) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Doherty.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. D. A. Gorden.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. D. A. Gordon.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 156) to incorporate the Weyburn Security Bank.—Mr. Turiff.

Bill (No. 157) for the relief of Cecilia Marie Pringle.—Mr. Price.

Bill (No. 161) respecting the Sovereign Trust Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 153) for the relief of James Albert Green.—Mr. Prowse.

Bill (No. 164) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

RELIEF OF ADA ANN REID.

Mr. NESBITT moved the second reading of (Bill No. 158) for the relief of Ada Ann Reid.

Mr. BOYCE. I desire with some reluctance to point out to the House, some features in connection with this Bill. Doubtless, most of the members have read the evidence. It does seem to me that the committee before whom the witnesses were examined must have proceeded upon a very extraordinary method of dealing with the evidence. There are two matters which contain the substance of the evidence on which the relief was based. One was the

co-habitation of the respondent with another woman and the other was the production of evidence tending to show that the respondent was afflicted with a venereal disease. I present to the House this proposition that upon a perusal of the evidence given before the Senate Committee and sent over to this House there is not one fact from which even a presumption, if a presumption were proper, could be drawn as to the affirmative of either of those two facts. What is the evidence with regard to co-habitation with another woman? There is the evidence of only one witness, a medical clergyman, and the whole statement by that one witness consists of his having met this man in a shanty in the Yukon or in Alaska territory out of which shanty, before he went there, he had met a woman coming. That is the whole evidence with the exception of what he states himself was evidence of a notorious fact with regard to co-habitation which as all hon. gentlemen know is no evidence at all where the direct fact has to be proved. The evidence with regard to the other part of it, from which fact if proved might be drawn a presumption of infidelity, is absolutely wanting. It is the evidence of a medical man, a man used to the care of the sick. He at first stated that it was his opinion that this respondent was afflicted with that disease, but when he is asked, not on cross-examination but in examination in chief, whether he is sure of that fact he says: No, he is not, it had the appearance of that, but it might be something else. I do not desire to interfere in a private Bill or to prevent relief which doubtless is, apart from the weighty considerations attached to it, very much to be desired between two people evidently not mated to one another. I do not desire to interfere, but I feel it my duty to submit to you and to the House the fact that it appears to me that there are absolutely wanting any elements and all elements on which this House can safely proceed to give the relief asked for by this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

QUESTIONS.

EMPLOYMENT OF FRITZ CIRKLE.

Mr. STRATTON:

1. Has Mr. Fritz Cirkle been employed by the Department of Mines?
2. Has the attention of the department been called to alleged unprofessional conduct on the part of Mr. Cirkle during the time he was said to be employed by the department?
3. If so, was there an investigation into such charge and what was the result?
4. Will the papers relating to such investigation, if any, be laid on the table of the House?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Investigated during the month of July, 1909. Result: Charges not sustained.
4. Yes.

MONTREAL HARBOUR BERTHS.

Mr. MONK:

1. Upon what dates were the local berth allotments made by the Montreal Harbour Commission in the years 1907, 1908 and 1909?
2. Has such allotments been made for the season of 1910? If so, when? If not, why not?
3. Has any complaint reached the government from shipping companies or importers regarding delay in the allotment of berths by said commission?
4. Is it a fact that shipping companies are unwilling to quote freight rates until the berths have been allotted?
5. Is it a fact that importers are in consequence said to be unable to calculate the cost of imports which must be delivered f.o.b. at their destination in distribution throughout Canada?
6. Are the sittings of the commission open to the public, and have any complaints been received that the sittings are held in camera?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

Answers to questions 1 and 2 are furnished by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners.

1. 1907, 8th March; 1908, 27th February; 1909, 24th March.
2. Not yet, for the reason that on the 25th February, when the allotments of berths with permanent sheds were made for Transatlantic steamers delay was given until 10th March, for acceptance of allotments, which were made conditionally, and which delay was, on the 8th March, at the request of the shipping agents, extended to the 21st March, and until a decision was arrived at concerning the allotment of berths for Transatlantic steamers it was not considered advisable to make local berth allotments.
3. No.

4 and 5. The government has no information on the subject.

6. No.

CANADIANS IN PERMANENT FORCES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What proportion of officers and other ranks of the permanent forces, respectively, are native born Canadians?
2. To what extent has recruiting for the Canadian permanent services been carried on among discharged soldiers of the imperial army?
3. What number of officers and other ranks,

respectively, have been transferred from the imperial army to the Canadian permanent forces?

4. Has service in the imperial army been admitted under the Militia Pensions Act other than as respects the officers and men transferred to the Canadian service on the taking over of Halifax and Esquimalt? If so, under what authority?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Approximately ninety per cent of the officers and twenty per cent of the rank and file.

2. Discharged soldiers of the imperial army are enlisted provided they fulfil the conditions required for enlistment in the permanent forces, and vacancies exist.

3. 431.

4. No.

SURVEY CHU-CHU-WAY-HA RESERVE.

Mr. BURRELL:

Were written instructions given to Capt. Jemmett in connection with the survey in 1889 of Chu-chu-way-ha reserve No. 2 Similikameen district, B.C.? If so, what was the wording of such instructions?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

Instructions to surveyors in British Columbia, including those to Capt. Jemmett, were issued direct from the office of the reserve commissioner, under authority of the Dominion and provincial governments, for the purpose of allotting and defining the Indian reserves in that province. The particular instructions given to Capt. Jemmett are not of record in the Department of Indian Affairs at Ottawa.

ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. How many Ross Rifles Mark II. have been received from the manufacturers to date?

2. What further number, if any, have been contracted for?

3. How many bayonets for the Ross rifle have been received from the manufacturers to date?

4. What further number, if any, have been contracted for?

5. How many Ross Rifles Mark I. are on store charge and on issue to militia corps, respectively?

6. How many Ross Rifles Mark II. are on store charge and on issue to militia corps, respectively?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. 60,000 up to 3rd instant.

2. 3,000.

3. 47,500 up to 3rd instant.

4. 4,500.

5.

On ordnance charge	5,024
Under orders for distribution to units	3,952
Converted to parts	2
With inspector of small arms	5
Lost (paid for)	17
	9,000

6.

On ordnance charge	39,322
On units charge	18,041
Under orders for distribution to units	1,173
Converted to parts	149
Royal Northwest Mounted Police	1,000
With inspector of small arms for conversion	15
In use with sub-target machines	300
	60,000

With regard to the replies to questions Nos. 5 and 6, rifles shown as 'under orders for distribution to units' have been converted by the inspector of small arms, and are now awaiting removal for issue.

MAJOR DE LA RONDE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Has the Department of Justice yet dealt with the case of the investigation by a Militia Court of Inquiry into charges of malfeasance of office said to have been preferred against Major S. E. de la Ronde and Captain S. E. de la Ronde, jr., of the Army Service Corps? If so, what was the nature of the action taken or advised? If not, when is it expected that this matter of alleged infraction of the Criminal Code by officers occupying positions of trust in militia service will be disposed of?

2. Is the government aware that Major S. E. de la Ronde has been replaced in the office of Chief of Police of the city of Ottawa?

3. Is the government aware that, while resting under the onus of charges said to have been formally made against him by officers of his corps, which were stated by the Minister of Militia and Defence to the House to be 'sub judice,' Major S. E de la Ronde officially called upon the officers who had preferred such charges against him to submit their resignations in writing as officers of the corps? If so, was such action taken by direction or with the approval of the Militia Council?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Advice has been given by the Department of Justice in regard to some features of the case. Such advice is confidential in its character, and the case it at present under consideration in the Department of Justice in regard to other features of it.

2. The government has no official information with reference to this matter.

3. This particular rumour has not yet reached the government except as suggested by the question.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all memorials, reports of surveys, engineers' reports, estimates, correspondence and documents in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals, and of the Intercolonial Railway Commission, relat-

ing to the survey and construction of a proposed branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway through New London and along the north shore of Queens county, in that island. —Mr. Warburton.

For a copy of all memorials, reports of surveys, engineers' reports, estimates, correspondence and documents in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals, and the Intercolonial Railway Commission, relating to the survey and construction of a proposed branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway to the west shore in lots 7 and 8 in that island.—Mr. Richards.

For a copy of all correspondence, proceedings of courts of inquiry, and other documents, respecting the dismissal from His Majesty's service by the Governor in Council of officers of the Canadian militia, during the past ten years, without trial or option of trial, by a legally constituted military or civil tribunal having statutory powers of trial and punishment.—Mr. Worthington.

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, documents and papers relating to the strike of the employees of the Dominion Coal Company and the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company, in the counties of Cape Breton and Cumberland, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Rhodes.

For a return showing: 'Since the appointment of the Government Railways' Managing Board, how many employees of the Intercolonial Railway have been dismissed at Truro, at Halifax, and at Stellarton respectively, with their respective names; at what kind of work each was employed; on what dates respectively, each one was dismissed; how many of them since re-employed; on what dates respectively, each one was re-employed how long since such re-employment each one has remained in the service; how many of them are still in the service, with their names and what each one is employed at'—Mr. Rhodes.

For a return showing the names of all persons who have been fined for breach of fisheries regulations in the coast waters of the counties of Pictou and Cumberland, Nova Scotia, and Westmorland, New Brunswick, during the years 1907, 1908 and 1909, together with a full statement of the penalties inflicted, moneys collected, and fines or portion thereof remitted, if any, in each case, and for a copy of all instructions issued, reports, correspondence and documents relating in any manner thereto.—Mr. Rhodes.

For a return showing, for the last two months, the time of each transmission of mails from Montreal to London, England, and from London, England, to Montreal, and showing the date and hour of closing, and date and hour of delivery in each case.—Mr. Monk.

For a return showing what amount of money has been paid each year to Geo. Walton, Manitoba, by the Interior Department, from January 1, 1906, to December 31, 1909; and what moneys Mr. Geo. Walton has received since January 1, 1909, from any other department of the government.—Mr. Schaffner.

For a return showing the number of accidents to trains on the Intercolonial railway between April 1, 1909, and present date, and the location and particulars of each; the number of persons killed or injured in each of such accidents since April 1, 1909, to date; and the cost of each of such accidents to the Intercolonial railway, respectively, for repairs, property destroyed, compensation to passengers, and for compensation to shippers for freight and baggage.—Mr. Stanfield.

For a return showing the number of accidents to trains of the Intercolonial railway for ten months, from April 1, 1908, to December 31, 1908; the number of persons killed or injured in each of such accidents for ten months, from April 1, 1908, to December 31, 1908; and the cost of each of such accident to the Intercolonial railway, respectively, for repairs, property destroyed, compensation to passengers, and for compensation to shippers for freight and baggage.—Mr. Stanfield.

For a return showing on what occasions counsel has been employed by this government, or paid out of the public funds of Canada, to represent or act for witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee, or to represent or act for the Transcontinental Railway Commission, in respect of the examination of witnesses before such committee, with the names and addresses of such counsel, when they were paid, for whom they were acting and what services they actually rendered.—Mr. Rhodes.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence relating to the sale and refund of the money paid on the sale of the N.E. ¼ section of section 11, township 1, range 9, west of the 1st meridian in Manitoba.—Mr. W. H. Sharpe, (Lisgar).

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, affidavits, cancellations, &c., in connection with the entry of Wm. Reid Gardiner, for the N.W. ¼ section 22, township 35, range 16, west of the 2nd meridian.—Mr. Roche.

For a return showing the names of the sessional and temporary employees of the House of Commons who were under pay on the 27th January last; and the number of the said employees stated in the estimates of 1909-10. —Mr. Best.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence between different persons or companies and the Department of Mines, in reference to a charge of unprofessional conduct made in the 'Canadian Mining Journal' of July 1, 1909, against Mr. Fritz Cirkle, a mining engineer, temporarily employed by the Department of Mines in preparing a report on the asbestos mining industry of the province of Quebec.—Mr. R. Smith.

IMMIGRATION ACT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 102) respecting immigration. He said: In view of the fact that some explanation was given on the inroduction of the Bill, and in view of the further fact that the Bill was before the House during a great deal of last session, it will not be necessary to make any very lengthy introductory remarks. The main reason for the introduction of the Bill is not so much the desire to change the policy of the government

as to facilitate the administration of that policy to a degree that is not provided for under the present Act, and to bring out, as clearly and as fully as possible in the form of the Act, what the policy of the government is, so that all parties interested may understand it.

There have been, of course, changes of conditions since the Act of 1906 was passed. One important change, and one that leads to a number of amendments in detail which appear in this Bill, is the necessity which has arisen for the exclusion of immigrants at international boundary ports. Up to the time of the passing of the Bill of 1906, there had not arisen, so far as we then understood the matter, any necessity for special efforts toward the exclusion of immigrants at these points. It was understood that there was such necessity at ocean ports, but in the framing the details were not made so clearly applicable. Since then, cause has arisen for quite as strict exclusion provisions at international boundary ports as at ocean ports, and necessarily, in the application of the policy of the government, there are points arising from day to day which make it desirable that they should be made as far as possible in legislation, so that, as I said, all parties interested shall have due notice of the intention of the government in administering its policy. There are many changes in detail throughout the Bill—all these changes in the Bill are changes of detail and not of policy. Some of them are important—in fact, we believe them all important or they would not have been proposed—but they are made for the purpose of carrying out more thoroughly and with more notice of the public the policy of the government, rather than to secure any change in the policy or in methods of administration.

One or two of the more important details I may mention. One is to define the word 'domicile.' As matters stand at present, the person who has once lived in Canada is entitled to come back, whether he is desirable or not. We agree that after a man has established his domicile in Canada, whether he has become a citizen or not, he should be entitled to re-entry into Canada. But there has been an indefiniteness on that point which should be cleared up as far as it can be cleared up. We are aware that a definition of 'domicile' is very difficult, but, for the purposes of this Act, for the better administration of the government's policy and for the better information of the public—both immigrants and those interested in transportation—we think it well that this word 'domicile' should be defined as clearly as possible. There is another very important provision, one which may not meet with the approval of the House. I drew attention to it when I brought the Bill before the House in the first place, and I again draw attention to it. This is a provision which, while guaranteeing to the immigrant every opportunity to establish his right to enter the country—guaranteeing to him the full opportunity of giving evidence and of having that evidence recorded, with the right of appeal—yet does not permit the immigrant to take advantage of the protection of the courts until he has passed the administrative authority of the government at the port of landing. We believe that it is desirable, in the interest of proper exclusion of undesirable immigrants, that this provision should be made. We understand that it is a somewhat radical provision, and as I have said, it may not meet the approval of the House. But, as I have said also, we believe that it would be in the best interest of immigrants, transportation companies and the country generally if that provision were adopted. As I have suggested, there being no change in policy or administration intended, it will be more convenient to deal with the changes of detail as we come to them in the different clauses of the Bill, and with the opportunities of explanation and discussion that are afforded when the House is in committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a demand from any part of Canada to abolish altogether assisted immigration?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no assisted immigration into Canada so far as this government is concerned. I know of no demand to abolish that which, in this case, does not exist.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does this Bill apply to Doukhobors?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it applies to all my hon. friend's (Mr. Campbell) friends.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to tell the hon. Minister of the Interior that, if he is going to class me with the Doukhobors, he is like Paddy's dog, making a mistake. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that while they are perhaps pets, the so-called Sifton pets of this government, they are no pets of mine, and I will tell the hon. gentleman the reason. They have been a detriment to the civilization of the west in every possible manner. They have been a people so immorally indecent—innocent perhaps—that they have been a disgrace to the people of the west, and to the administration that brought them here. I want to ask the Minister of the Interior, if he will come down from the lofty position of levity he is assuming, how many of these people he expects, and how he is going to take care of them? I want to ask him what the cost has been to the Dominion in the past in bringing that class of immigrants into this country; and further, what cost it has been to the decent self-respecting people of Canada in taking care of them, and keeping them in some way of decency since they

came. I want to ask him what the cost has been to compel these people to comply with the laws of Canada, that all other immigrants are obliged to comply with.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps it would be as well to defer question and answer of this nature until we are in committee. I am unable to give my hon. friend at the moment the information he asks for. He has asked for considerable information in the way of figures and facts, of course he does not expect me to have them in hand. But I will be glad to furnish all the information we have that he has asked for. The intention of the Bill, and the policy of the government, is that all immigration shall be treated on exactly the same footing, on the same basis, according to their merits, irrespective of their race or religion. Our purpose in the Bill is to put before the public as plainly as we can what the policy of the government is, so that there may be no misapprehension in regard to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would ask the minister if, after the experience of this government with regard to that particular class of people, he considers them desirable as immigrants?

Mr. OLIVER. As I have said already, I think it would be more in order that question and answer should pass across the House while we are in committee. But as my hon. friend has asked me a question, I can only say that I do not think it is a matter of concern to this House what my private opinion may be in regard to that subject.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am merely asking——

Mr. SPEAKER. On the second reading the rule applies that a member can only speak once.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not presuming to speak, I am only presuming to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The object of going into committee is to allow discussion to be carried on more freely.

Mr. MONK. I can tell my hon. friend what it cost us to move the Doukhobors out here. The transportation of the Doukhobors by the government from their native country to their settlement in the Northwest, cost $48,000. That was the answer given several days ago in the House by the government when asked upon that point. But it must not be forgotten that since they are in this country they have cost us large sums of money every time there has been amongst them a breaking out which is familiar to most of the members of this House. One is naturally led to inquire whether we have not advanced far enough to take precautionary measures before we import into this country in large numbers certain classes of people. That is a question that naturally arises at this stage of the legislation. Nor is it, I think, for the minister to say that we have not state-aided immigration. We have not state-aided immigration in the sense that we do not take the immigrant at our own expense on foreign shores and bring him here. There are not many nations that do that, in fact I do not know of any. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) alluded to the system we have followed of bonusing immigrants in the first place, and in the next place of keeping a large number of immigration agents in different parts of the world, many of them at great expense, and to very little purpose. Should we continue that system? Is it wise, for instance, to keep in the United States so many immigration agents, who are merely nominees of the government for political purposes, and who do very little there, when we see, as we do at this moment, such large numbers of immigrants coming into this country, according to my mind, without any particular action on the part of these agents that cost us so dear? They came in last year, I think over 60,000 from the United States. We are not in a position to say how many of these men were brought in through the action of these very expensive immigration agents, I think none at all. We have no trace of any one that was brought in by our agents from Michigan or Minnesota. Look at the expense of those agents, the paucity of their reports. Indeed, we have no reports from them in the departmental report. There is a general report from the chief, but surely when an agent in Michigan, or some other state, costs us between $6,000 and $8,000 a year, we ought to get from him a detailed statement, some document that would give us information showing what use he is to the country and what results he has obtained. Hon. members of the House know that we have also in England and in many parts of the continent immigration agents, and even there I question if they are of much use to us. I think the time has arrived for Canada, as for the United States, to adopt a different policy, not catering for immigrants, but making a suitable advertisement of this country by a grant when exhibitions occur, keeping an office in London in a general way, but not paying men to remain over there for the purpose of soliciting immigrants. I think the time has come when such an effort on our part is superfluous. So I think I am right in saying that we have an absolutely different policy from that of the United States, who receive over a million immigrants a year, and sometimes more than that. They are overcrowded with immigrants, without paying a single cent for soliciting them. On the contrary, they charge a head tax which leaves a

handsome surplus and enables them to defray entirely a system of inspection.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not my hon. friend think that the policy of this government is in reality a policy of assisted immigration?

Mr. MONK. Certainly, I call it assisted immigration, as much so as in any country that adopts it. My hon. friend thinks that assisted immigration means defraying part of the expense of immigrants who come out here.

Mr. BLAIN. I have no such thought in my mind.

Mr. MONK. Then we assist immigration in that we provide considerable help for the immigrant when he arrives. That, I think, to a certain extent, might continue. We have spent a great deal of money on hospitals and inspection. I heard from a medical man that the disease of trachoma, which is a great pest in eastern Europe, has spread very considerably, and that it now exists in different parts of Canada. For a time we had it in Montreal, and I believe they have had it in certain parts of the west. The minister speaks of this Bill as being a continuation of the policy of the government. I do not think he is altogether correct in that. This Bill is getting away from the policy of the time when we spent $50,000, and more in importing Doukhobors, and making special conditions for them, one of which was that they would be entirely exempt from one of the duties of every citizen of this country—military duty. That would not be done to-day by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. This Bill is an improvement and I regret that we did not adopt it last year. But, that improvement—let us be fair—is due to two causes particularly. In the first place, it is due to the criticism which for several years we have offered in this House of the system of immigration as it is being continued. It was more or less the system which brought the Doukhobors in. The inspection was insufficient and faulty in many respects. The principle of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who then occupied the position of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, was to fill the country up at any cost with anybody, provided we crowded up the country, and could report to the people that the immense prosperity of Canada was producing this result. We criticised that system. We pointed out that every man admitted to the Canadian family should only be admitted after careful examination. We were seconded by the immigration officers of the United States who made representations to this government that they were not exercising due severity in the examination of the immigrants that we bonused to come here, and who then went over to the United States, because that course had been followed for a long time. Bonused immigrants passed over to the United States. The Americans got the cream of them, and those that they refused remained in this country with their diseases and short-comings. That criticism brought about an improvement in the regulations. The representations of the American officers in their yearly reports on immigration in which they blamed very severely what we were doing brought about this change, and I think we can claim some of the credit for having brought about the improvement in this line. But, let the House bear in mind that even to-day we keep no trace of the immigrants who came here. Where do they go? About 60,000 Americans came into Canada last year. I think a larger number went from Canada to the United States.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. 85,000.

Mr. MONK. Who were they? You must, under your immigration system, trace those who come in, and those who go out. We do not trace those who go out, and until we have a provision to that effect in our law, our law would be failing in that respect. We have spent millions a year in securing immigration, we should know that we have it here, and I think we are getting the full benefit of this expenditure. We ought to know who are going out too. We ought to know if our own people are going out. There was a time when there was a large exodus from Quebec, and the maritime provinces, and when the best in those provinces left us. We should know that, and we should rather spend our money to find that out than to take it to pay our cousins, our friends and our defeated candidates, large salaries to do, we do not know what, in the United States, and elsewhere. There is an improvement in that policy, and some of the credit for that improvement is due to us, but as the minister is not always willing to give it, it is better to call the attention of the House to it. I notice some points in connection with this new legislation to which I desire to particularly call the attention of the House. This Bill fails entirely, as every other Bill has failed, to provide for moral guarantees with respect to immigration. We continue to receive somewhere about a quarter of a million people every year without any inquiry whatever as to who they are or as to what are their moral qualifications. Who are the men who compose this vast herd that is going to make up the nation here, and that is going to enter into our families? I contend that we should endeavour to secure some certainty as to who these people are. I do not pretend to solve absolutely the problem that presents itself as

to how that can be done, but no effort is attempted in that direction. Could we not secure some certainty as to his moral qualifications from the immigrant before his embarkation? It seems that that could be done since we have a staff of immigration agents in foreign countries. At any rate, could the immigrant, when he arrives, bring something to show where he comes from, and who he is? This is just as important as the physical examination. Members of this House who have given this matter any attention know that when the immigrant arrives in a batch of 1,200, and sometimes 2,000 on a ship, he passes the physical examination very quickly. The inspector general told us once at the Immigration Committee that as many as four a minute passed the inspecting medical officer. It is somewhat difficult even to ascertain the physical condition. He is detained, of course, if there is some suspicion as to his condition. What about his moral qualification? Would it not be necessary that a man should be required to bring, when he comes to this country, some reference, something from the mayor of his municipality, from some responsible officer, from somebody, to show that he is not a criminal, and that he ought to be welcomed into this country? You do not admit a man into your family without letters of introduction. When these people come in large numbers we ought to have some means of ascertaining who they are, because it is needless to say that a vast number of those found in our jails in Montreal, and in Toronto, and in the jails, penitentiaries, and houses of refuge of Ontario, and of my own province, and probably in others there is an undue proportion of foreign criminals. I think that we might, before the immigrant starts out, or at any rate when he arrives here, have some means to get from him guarantees as to his moral qualifications. A very serious question arises as to whether it would not be an act of humanity to the immigrant himself, a great economy for ourselves, and generally a better course to secure the examination physically before he leaves foreign shores.

I am sure that is possible. It is done in the United States to a very large extent. They have an examination at the port of destination, no doubt; but I understand that in the great ports of embarkation in Europe there is an officer who examines the emigrants. I think that last year the cost of our deportations considerably exceeded $25,000, because even though the transportation companies are obliged to take a man back if he is rejected at the port of debarkation, or after a certain delay, still he sometimes wanders into the country and causes great expense to the municipalities and to the government before he is brought back under guard to the place of embarkation and handed back to the country from which he came. Anyway it is a great expense and a fearful hardship. You have to separate families; you return a man to Europe and land him there penniless and hopeless. Instances appear from time to time in the papers. This is a matter which I think ought to engage the attention of the government. I repeat what has already formed the subject of a question by my hon. friend from Peel: ought we not now to abolish state aid in any form? Canada is becoming well known; we advertise it, and should continue to make it known everywhere in the proper way; but should we pay more bonuses? The answer given to the question of the hon. member for Peel was that there was now no state aid properly so called. But it must be borne in mind that the labouring classes in the country, through the Trades Congress and other societies, have from time to time called on the government to abolish bonuses, giving reasons therefor, and coming and urging these reasons verbally on the government. There is, therefore, a large class, and a class exposed to suffer from bonused immigrants, who have repeatedly asked for the abolition of bonuses. I think that the Bill, even in its incomplete and imperfect state, is a considerable improvement on past legislation. There is a point which I wish to make in favour of the immigrants, and it is the result of representations made to me in the city of Montreal and elsewhere, not by government officials as a rule, but by men who are familiar with immigration and who take a large part in assisting worthy immigrants. Is it right to fix the amount of money which an immigrant on landing should have? I have often raised an objection to that. It very often happens that an immigrant who lands without a cent, is just the man to fall to work at once; he may be an excellent immigrant, eager to work, and yet because he has not that fixed sum in his hand, he is sent back. There is no discretion in the office. Lately my attention has been called to Syrians, who are to be found in Montreal and elsewhere. They came to this country very poor, but I am not aware that there has ever been a Syrian who has required public aid. Why should we not admit into this country men of that race, or of any other race, if they are willing to work, and are qualified in every other respect to become excellent settlers? A man who arrives here with more than the requisite sum of money may be a very unfit man, who intends to live on that money and afterwards to rove. This is the testimony I have heard from men who follow closely the movement of immigrants. When I first raised this question, I was told by my hon. friend that it was a dangerous discretion to leave to the officer

who inspects. Surely an officer who is obliged in a few moments to judge of the moral, physical and general qualifications of an immigrant ought to be able to say whether he has sufficient resources upon him or whether he is disposed to become a public charge. If he is a suitable officer for this important function, he ought to be able to exercise that discretion. On the whole, I think the Bill is a good one, because it constitutes a progress on the laxity of previous legislation; but I shall never be satisfied, so far as I am concerned, until we advance a step further—until we consider that the admission of an immigrant into this country is not a goal to be sought for at all costs. The country is rich, we are called on to make a great country of it, and we ought not to admit any but the most suitable into it. We should go further even than the Americans have gone in the selection of those who are to constitute so large a section of the Canadian people.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER. I am sure that the members generally are glad to realize that the government are getting a little more exacting in regard to the class of immigrants who are allowed to come into this country. We have an agent of the Department of the Interior living at Iroquois, in the county of Dundas, who has had to do with deporting undesirable immigrants, and I am glad to say that I think he is very attentive to his duties and uses a good deal of judgment in carrying out the law. This is required, because an official ought to be able to tell, on looking at an individual, whether he has money or not, what is in him. But there is a more serious side to this question than perhaps even the minister is aware of. We sometimes hear it said that there are no more people leaving Canada than are coming into it. I want to show that that is a fallacy, and every patriotic Canadian will be sorry that that is the case. I hold in my hand the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration of the United States for 1909. Every one who looks into these records will realize that they are very thorough and effective in all their statistical work. I was simply astounded in looking over this report to find these figures. He gives these figures of those who have come into Canada, acknowledging the courtesy of the department here in giving these figures. He says:

Through the courtesy of the superintendent of the Immigration Department I am able to invite the attention of the bureau to the record of immigration to Canada for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1909, such record being as follows:—

He gives the different months, but I shall simply give the totals.

Total for the British Isles.. ..	47,407
" Continental..	32,315
" United States..	72,349
Total..	152,071

What surprises me, and I think that which must strike everybody as a very undesirable condition of things, are the following figures. He gives the number of people who have gone out of this country:

Aliens manifested on board steamships and examined at ports of arrival under the immigration laws of the United States..	15,417
Aliens coming originally to Canada and who sought entry to the United States within one year from date of arrival.	6,116
Aliens who entered Canada via United States ports, and aliens from the United States who sought re-entry thereto within one year..	9,495
Aliens claiming residence or more than one year in Canada, but who were unable to give satisfactory proof thereof.	4,454
Aliens who applied for admission to the United States after a residence of more than one year in Canada (the transportation companies being exempt from payment of head-tax as to this class)..	12,920
Citizens of Canada entering the United States for permanent residence.. ..	33,118
Total..	81,520

In addition to that there should be added United States citizens returned to the United States after a residence in Canada, approximated 15,000 people, making a grand total of 96,520. Deducting this from the total immigration of 152,071 we find that we have a balance of 55,551 in our favour.

We swapped off 34,000 Canadians, our own people, the best citizens we could have, for aliens from Europe, or some other country. This is a condition of things that should be more thoroughly looked into. The figures are carefully collated, and there is no doubt that they are correct. We hear so much about the outflow being stopped, about no more Canadians leaving Canada. There never were so many leaving in our history as there are now. I can quite understand the 15,000 Americans who go back home. They come here and buy land, and go home, they are speculating in our lands. They have not got their coats off, they come over here with their pocket books. We hear so much about $92,000,000 coming into the country with these people. If a man comes into our country with $92,000,000 and invests it and makes the price double in ten years, if he is not doing so much, for this country, especially, if he goes home with his coat on to wait until those lands become valuable. Fifteen thousand people have done that.

Another astounding thing to me is that coming and going by our different transportation lines into the United States, and

back again last year 8,000,000 passengers passed to and fro between this country and the United States according to this book. These are rather astonishing figures to contemplate, that is more than the whole population of this country. That is a large outflow compared with what we thought there was and some record should be kept of the fluctuation of population. If we cannot fasten them down somewhere, we ought to be more careful about bringing them in.

I can understand the effort made a few years ago to bring all kinds of people into this country. Why? Because a good many men influential with the government wanted to see the prices of land go up because they were holders, and therefore wanted to fill the country with any class of immigrants who would come in order to make lands in the Northwest more valuable.

Another serious question is the outflow of people from the older provinces to the west. I do not find fault with that, the western country is the heritage of the older provinces; but there should be some attempt on the part of the government to counteract that in some sense by bringing other people into the older provinces to take the places of those who leave. There are no better pioneers than our own Canadian born young men who grow up full of energy and strength and purpose, no better men, but while they go out to the west, to build up that great country, and make it what it will be, a good country, some reasonable attempt should be made to fill their places by suitable immigrants from some part of Europe. I suggest these things to the House, thinking they will look more thoroughly into them. It is a condition of things that should not exist, and we ought to make some attempt to counteract these things.

Mr. JAMESON. While the Immigration Bill is under discussion I wish to draw to the attention of the government, and parliament the fact that immigration so far as the Atlantic provinces of Canada are concerned, has in the past, been neglected. The efforts which the government have been putting out for many years past have been entirely directed to the filling up of our western country. With the peopling of that country, and with its development, we in the east have no quarrel whatever. On the contrary it is our pride, and it would be a very great source of satisfaction to us to see that country filled up with a desirable class of people, to see it developed and to see it prosper.

At the same time we cannot but recognize that the government have overlooked almost entirely, if not entirely, the needs of the maritime provinces so far as immigration is concerned. Only some few weeks ago, the question of the representation of these provinces in parliament was discussed in this House. It was then very clearly pointed out that there has been serious loss in the population of the three maritime provinces during the past few years, and the next redistribution will probably result in the loss of two or three, possibly more seats in this House to the maritime provinces. The question is one of very vital interest to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The government should make some effort to see that these provinces, which have been described as the long wharfs of this Dominion, should not merely serve the purpose of a wharf, but should retain a certain percentage of the people brought to this country as the result of the government propaganda. We have in the past lost tens of thousands of people who have gone to the United States. Some of our best and most capable people who have gone there have secured in that country eminent positions. They as a whole have been a credit to the country from which they went and were gladly received by the American nation. But when this government, some time ago placed immigration agents in the eastern states for the purpose of inducing the return of some of those people from the maritime provinces back to Canada, the instructions, so far as I am informed—and I am led to believe by the answer which the Minister of the Interior gave to a question put last year that my information is correct—were given those agents to endeavour to secure the return of those people not to the maritime provinces, but to direct them to western Canada. I do not think that is right. In view of the fact that the maritime provinces have lost very seriously in population, and that their representation is likely to be seriously impaired after the next redistribution owing to the fact it would be only right and proper that the government should make a special effort, and direct its energies particularly, towards the preserving to the maritime provinces of a percentage at least of the immigrants of the agricultural class brought into Canada through those provinces. For many years the literature which this government has been circulating in Europe has been almost entirely that descriptive of our western country. As I said a few moments ago, we of the east have no quarrels with the west, on the contrary the west is a source of great pride to us, but I say that the government have unfairly discriminated against the east in their immigration policy. I trust that in the future a more equitable and proper view of the matter will be taken by the government and that some of the energy of their various representatives in Europe will be directed toward sending immigrants to the maritime provinces and

towards informing them of the advantages offered by those provinces. This in a measure will redeem the injury they have sustained through the serious emigration from our provinces which took place some years ago and which let me add is still continuing, to the eastern states of the American union. I hope also that the government will change the instructions to their agents in the eastern states and instruct them, when they seek to return to this country the people who have left it in years past, not to alone direct their attention to the Canadian west, but make at least an effort, and a fair effort, first of all, to see that these people are reminded of the advantages which the maritime provinces offer them, and endeavour to return to the land of their birth those who left it. In this connection I may refer to the condition which has developed as the result of some regulations recently issued by the Postmaster General with regard to postage upon newspapers published in Canada and going to the United States. Some time ago I put a question on the order paper respecting this matter and the answer I received I confess was somewhat confusing. I placed the question on the order paper at the request of the editor of a local paper in the town where I reside. He told me that up to the time that increased postage was imposed his paper had a large circulation in the United States, and that these papers were taken very largely by people who had formerly been residents of the county of Digby and also by subscribers among American summer tourists who spent part of their time in Digby. The result of the increase in the postage necessitated an advance of 50 per cent in the subscription for the paper, an advance from one dollar to one dollar and fifty cents. The consequence was that he found the circulation of his paper in the United States declined very materially. This, he said, did not represent all the loss. The greatest loss was to the country, through losing touch with the former residents. This applies to all weekly newspapers in the east. The local paper is the best repatriation agent. So long as we are able to place in the hands of people who have left this country our weekly newspapers and they can see what transpires from week to week in their old home, so long do we retain their interest in the place and we have always a prospect of bringing them back. I have known of many instances where, because of some development reported in the weekly newspapers, people have returned to the country and taken up their abode there again. I consider that the imposition upon the weekly newspapers of that increased postal rate is a very serious detriment and is in no way compensated by the paltry increase in postal revenue. I trust that the Postmaster General will remove the charge, as I think it would be for the general benefit of the country, by keeping our people who have gone to the United States in touch with their old homes. The severing of that tie involves the risk of losing them for ever, as residents of the maritime provinces.

Mr. MAGRATH. I confess that I have not made any preparation for this debate, but there are a few observations I should like to offer in view of the fact that I have given some attention to this question of immigration. I think I am correct in saying that this Bill is similar in principle to the existing Act. This Bill elaborates certain features of the existing law. My opinion is that, so far as the operation of the law is concerned, we can accomplish the same results under it as under this Bill. The principle of this Bill is to keep undesirables out of the country. Therefore, the Bill is good. Any weaknesses are not a question of law, but in the operation of the law. There is a law, ordained some centuries ago, commanding men not to steal. That law has been elaborated from time to time down through the ages, yet it has not wholly restrained people from walking off with their neighbours' goods. If we had only one entrance to this country and instructed the doorkeeper to allow none to enter but the morally and physically sound, we might elaborate the order into pages of law, but unless the man had the discriminating faculty to sift the good from the bad, the law would not be of much effect. I make no criticism of the immigration officials, for those I know appear to be very good men. But I suggest to the minister that he cannot get results under the present system of selecting the outside service. This applies whichever government may be in power. You cannot get the same results as if you placed the selection of these officers under a commission and allowed the superintendent of immigration to pick out men specially suitable for that character of work. We hear much about the greatness of Canada and of the vast number of people we are going to receive into this country. We certainly are having some prosperous years. Lean years will come, and the movement, some day, will be from the cities back to the land. If we have confidence in our own statements as to the riches of this country, we must believe that there will be a vast movement of people towards our borders. We ought not to wait until that time comes before beginning to train our immigration service. There is no portion of our public service so necessary or important as this immigration service. The commissioner general of the United States,

in reporting on his men in his report for the year ending June 30 last, states:

The bureau never fails in its annual reports to call attention to the high estimate it places upon the character and capacity of employees, as a whole and taken individually, and to its appreciation of their loyality, zeal and industry. The work upon which they are engaged is quite different from that performed by many other classes of government employees. They handle human beings, and must, in order to be successful in the highest sense, exhibit the qualities of mind and heart that have no particular place in the handling of books, papers or commodities.

Our present system of securing an outside service, by patronage committees, the recommendation of members of parliament —I speak regardless of what party is in power—must certainly result in putting some men into this immigration service who are better fitted for something else. We must get away from that system if we wish to properly guard our borders. I am making no complaints about the officials; I believe our men are doing good service. But there will be a greater service for them to render when later on they will be called on to inspect vast masses of people who turn towards Canada. When that movement comes it will carry with it the flushings of vice out from the large centres of population. Upon our immigration officials depends our ability to maintain the moral and physical standard of our people. Let that go down, and it is unnecessary for me to say what will happen to this country.

So far, I assume, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will largely agree with what I have said. If there should be a question of difference between us, it may be on what I am about to say. I believe that it is the duty of the government to appoint a royal commission to investigate immigration matters. It will cost a little money, of course, but great results will accrue. We are largely creatures of habit; the ordinary business institution gets into a rut; departmental officials are apt to get into a rut. It is desirable to bring in fresh thoughts and ideas and have these matters thoroughly investigated. That idea is not original with me, as the minister knows. The United States government, in 1907, appointed a commission of nine—the President, the Senate and the House of Representatives each appointing three. That commission is doing a most valuable work for the United States. If it has not already done so, it will shortly present its report to congress. I believe the time has arrived when there should be a royal commission to investigate immigration matters in this country, and I certainly think there should be a representative of the labour interest on such a commission.

Another question is that of naturalization. I believe that we make ourselves too cheap in the making of Canadian citizens. Everybody knows that we pay no heed or attention to the matter. If citizenship implies anything in Canada, it must mean ownership. In some European countries, citizenship means burdens. In this country it carries responsibility, but it means also the ownership of something very valuable. Are we not offering this citizenship too freely? We all know that the idea of making citizens never occurs to any one until there is an election. And we know, in the west, at least, the method is this: A foreign-born man is met somewhere; he takes an affidavit before a notary public; this is posted up for a few days; and the man is shortly afterwards certified by the judge as a citizen of this country. The United States have realized that this is a very serious question. In the past few years they have changed the Naturalization Act, and the three-year period no longer exists. At present no man can become a citizen of the United States without being approved by two other citizens who will guarantee his fitness to become a citizen. Perhaps the minister might not agree with me in this matter, but I think it is one that might be profitably looked into by a royal commission, certainly it is of great importance to this country, and I am sure that every hon. gentleman in the House realizes that I am correct in that statement.

The Bill before us has no bearing on the policy of the government. There are some features in connection with the immigration administration that I will refer to in committee, when the minister will be better able to discuss it with me. We have a branch of our government supplying us with statements as to the estimated population. I am afraid we will discover, when our next census is taken, that the population will not be as great as we have hoped. A short time ago, I put a question on the order paper, and learned that those estimates are based upon the increase of births over deaths as determined at the last census, which increase was 12·7. To that is to be added yearly the increase by immigration as shown by the returns. Well, this country is not like Siberia, where people who come in cannot get out. There is freedom to come in and to go out, and there is a movement of population back and forth. Population is more or less in a fluid state, and there are many people who come in and who go out, of whom no account has been taken in these estimates of population. In the United States, while they have not much information to work upon, they estimate the population that remains at 68 per cent of the entire immigration. I mention this because, if I am correct in the interpretation of the answer that was given me, I repeat we will probably be disappointed when the next census is taken.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Before you leave the Chair I would like to make a few remarks on this question of immigration. The minister has increased the time for deportation from two to three years. Dr. Clark, of the insane hospital in Toronto, is strongly in favour of increasing the period to four years. For myself I can see no reason why there should be any limit fixed to the time within which deportation may take place. If people come into this country who are not able to take care of themselves, who have to be sent to an insane asylum, or other places, to be supported by the public, I do not see why we should retain them at all. There is another provision that I am sorry the minister has not put into his Bill. In the law of the United States they have a clause that when transportation companies bring aliens into the country having a loathsome or dangerous disease, or of weak mind, if the diseases are such as might have been discovered at the port of embarkation, those companies are liable to a fine for each case of $100; and last year, for that offence, the fines amounted to $27,400. In his last report the commissioner recommends that the fine be increased to $200. I think that such a provision should be put into our law also, because there is a temptation on the part of transportation companies to bring people into this country for the purpose of getting the price of their fare across the Atlantic. Then there is another matter which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and that is the advisability of doing away with commissions. I am in favour of cutting out these commissions altogether and of appropriating the money now spent on that purpose, or as much money as is necessary, to the employment of a doctor on each immigration ship, who shall thoroughly examine every immigrant on the voyage across the Atlantic from whatever country he may come. I think in that way we would be able to exclude people coming to this country who are diseased, or weak minded, or otherwise unfit to become permanent and useful citizens of our country. The question of weaklings and undesirables is troubling the United States as well as Canada. There are people in the United States, as stated by the report of the Commissioner General, who advocate an increase in the head tax. Some are advocating a literary test, and some are in favour of both. Now, whether that would be advisable, I am not prepared to say. But one thing is certain, and that is that we ought to get at the best possible means of discovering those undesirables before they embark, and keeping them out. That is a question in which not only we are personally interested, but in which our children and our grandchildren will be still more interested, because they will have to live side by side with these undesirable people who succeed in entering our country. We ought to take every precaution to keep the physical standard of Canadians as high as possible. There are people in the United States who even think that there should be a physical test applied to immigrants, and that all males from 16 to 50 should be submitted to a physical examination as severe as the military test. A good many people are sent to this country by relatives who are anxious to get rid of them. I notice in the reports from the asylum that people have been sent out here, and after they have been deported, their friends in the old country have admitted that they sent them out here for the purpose of getting rid of them. I could mention a number of such cases. I have here the report issued by the Ontario government for the last year, in which is pointed out quite a number of cases that are very interesting. Here is what it says about deportations:

> The work of deporting undesirables has been effectively carried on throughout the year, and with the result that 263 persons were deported.

That is from Ontario alone. There is here a comparative table showing the number of persons deported in the years 1906, 1907 and 1908. In 1908 there were 263 persons deported. In November of that year, 18 insane persons were deported as not coming within the provisions of the Immigration Act. Arrangements have been made by the Ontario government agent at Liverpool for the reception of deported people in their respective homes upon their arrival. So that these eighteen were not deported in the regular way. Private arrangements were made by the government of Ontario whereby these people were sent back to their friends in the old country.

> Of these 18, nine were acknowledged as being mentally defective before coming to Canada and two others were acknowledged epileptics, the relatives having no hesitancy in stating that they were sent to this country for the purpose of getting rid of them. . . . Of the 65 insane deported, their average residence in the hospitals for the insane was one year and two and a half months. Of 81 criminals deported 15 were committed to the Central prison and 66 to the jails of the province. Of the 117 deported 'as likely to become a public charge,' 26 had been living on public charity since their arrival in Canada, 44 were young children of undesirables who were deported, and the remainder were deported owing to disease, physical infirmities and immorality. The pecuniary advantage to the provinces by the deportation of the insane persons alone amounts to over $325,000. In addition to the deportations which were mentioned above, the chief of frontier police at Niagara Falls, acting on instructions received from the Attorney General's department, de-

ported to the United States, during the three months ending December 31, 1908, 303 undesirables.

These were people in regard to which nothing was done by the Dominion government. I have a good deal of that kind of information, but perhaps it would not be worth while to go into it at this stage. It was mentioned here to-day that we have a very imperfect way of ascertaining the number of people that are living in this country. I recollect that the Minister of Finance, in his budget speech, made the statement that there were in this country at the present time 7,450,000 people. I quite understand how he got that information. He, in all probability, got Mr. Blue to prepare the statement for him. That statement was made up from the census of 1901, and every person then in Canada was enumerated in that census. Then the natural increase was added. We all know that large numbers of people from the older provinces went to the Northwest. Train loads of them went. Only the other day 4,000 left Toronto. We know that in 1906 a census was taken in the northwest. Every person who went to that country from the older provinces between 1901 and 1906 was enumerated there as if he had been a newcomer. Then, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance took the reports of the Immigration Department and added the figures which were there given to make the total amount. According to the figures in the United States reports for 1907-8, 58,000 people left Canada and went to the United States. For the year 1908-9, we have the report that 81,000 people left Canada and went to the United States. We also know that the United States keep track of their immigration, and I have some figures here taken from their report. In 1908 there were arrivals in the United States to the number of 924,695. Of these, it was reported that 714,874 left the United States again, leaving a net increase in population of 209,867. Then, in 1908-9, the total arrivals in the United States numbered 944,235 and the departures 400,392, leaving a net increase of 543,843. They do not claim in the United States that more than 68 per cent of the immigrants that go to that country stay there. and I do not see how we can reasonably expect that we will retain anywhere near the whole of our immigrants because there are attractions in the United States. There are people who come to this country to work during the summer time many of whom go to their own countries in the fall. Possibly there are a great many reasons why men should stay here and there are a great many why they should not, I presume. However, I am very strong upon the point that we should be very particular about the inspection of immigrants coming to this country, and I think the best way to do that is to have a doctor upon every ship that brings immigrants and have them thoroughly examined on the voyage. Those that are not up to the mark should not be allowed to land. I think that is the best from the humanitarian point of view, because it is cruel to allow people to be brought to this country when we know they will have to be deported and sent back to their own country, after having spent perhaps all the money they have in their attempt to get to this country. We should keep in mind the reports from the asylums and jails. In the province of Ontario we have not quite 20 per cent of a foreign-born population. It is about 17·1 or 17·2 per cent. I mean people born outside of Canada, but in our jails, prisons and insane hospitals, according to the report of Dr. Clark, 40 or 50 per cent of the inmates are foreign-born. That is a state of things that ought not to be, and it did not exist before 1900. The whole trouble has been that we have been too careless in our inspection. Just imagine 7,000 people being landed at one port in one day to be examined. I do not care how many officials you have at such a place, there is no room to examine them properly and do justice. At Ellis Island, New York, they will not allow the number to be examined to exceed 5,000 in any one day, and the equipment that they have there must be better than ours, because their immigration is so much larger than that which we have, and it is necessary for them to have a better equipment. I do not know that I shall continue this debate any longer, because as the Bill proceeds we will have an opportunity of speaking on the different clauses. I think it is an improvement on what we have had heretofore, and I think that the government has to some extent listened to the suggestions that have come from time to time from the opposition. If we cannot get quality and quantity it is essential that we shall have quality anyway. I think the minister himself has come to that conclusion and that the immigration work should be carried on upon that principle. I think that Mr. Scott is a real good official. He wrote a letter in 1908 to his assistant over in London, saying that the only kind of people we wanted in this country were experienced farm labourers, farmers who are able to take up land, farmers who had money to buy land, or female domestic servants. These were the three kinds that he specified as being desirable, but I notice that the government are very anxious to take credit when they get before a popular audience, excepting it be an audience of workingmen or a trades union, to show the great number that they have brought to this country. But, when they are talking to the trades unions that view of it does not get very much prominence. They

then give more prominence to the class of people that they are paying bonuses for, that is farmers, farm labourers and female domestic servants. I hope that this Bill will be made as perfect as possible, and that a clause will be inserted providing that the transportation companies that bring undesirable people to this country shall be fined and made to take them back, and if necessary made to take a caretaker with them so that they will not suffer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The provisions of the Bill, as I understand, do not involve any radical departure from the law as it exists at present. There is some elaboration of the provisions for the restriction of immigration with a view to securing a thoroughly desirable class of settlers in this country. In so far as the Bill promotes that ideal I am thoroughly in sympathy with it, because I entirely agree with what has been said by other speakers that we in this country can, and do offer inducements which should invite the settlement in this country of the very best of the emigrating population from the most favoured countries in the world, I was very much impressed with the figures cited from the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration of the United States for the fiscal year ended the 30th of June, 1909. Some two or three years ago, I had occasion to make a personal investigation of the methods of the United States immigration service. I was impressed with the wonderful thoroughness of their organization. I say that without in the slightest degree desiring to cast any discredit on our own organization. Perhaps it might be expected that the organization of the immigration service of the United States would be more advanced than ours. They have been dealing with this problem longer, and they have had a number of very able men dealing with it. I am convinced that there is no service more thoroughly and efficiently organized for the purpose for which it is intended than the immigration service of the United States. For that reason I attach the more importance to the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration of the United States, with respect to immigration from Canada to the United States in recent years. We were told, and we were glad to hear it, that immigration from Canada to the United States had practically ceased. That is by no means the record contained in this report. I would like to read once more, exactly in the words of the report, what is said by the Commissioner General of Immigration for the United States with regard to that particular subject. In the first place, as my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) pointed out, there is set forth on page 139 of this report a record of the immigration into Canada during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900. The details are as follows:

Britain	47,407
Continental	32,315
United States	72,349
Total	152,071

Then at page 140 the report continues as follows:

For easy comparison of emigration from the United States to Canada with immigration from Canada to the United States during the past year, the showing of our records regarding the number of aliens admitted is given.

A. Aliens manifested on board steamship and examined at ports of arrival under immigration laws of the United States	15,417
B. Aliens coming originally to Canada, and who sought entry to the United States within one year from date of arrival	6,116
C. Aliens who entered Canada by United States ports, and aliens from the United States who sought re-entry thereto within one year	9,495
CC. Aliens claiming residence of more than one year in Canada who were unable to give satisfactory proof thereof	4,454
D. Aliens who applied for admission to the United States after their residence of more than one year in Canada, the transportation companies being exempt from payment of head tax as to this class	12,920
E. Citizens of Canada entering the United States for permanent residence.	33,118
Total	81,520
F. To which there should be added United States citizens returning to the United States after residence in Canada approximated	15,000
Total	96,520

Now, I put out of consideration for the moment classes A, B, C, and CC, and I take simply classes D, E, and F, for the purpose of coming to a conclusion as to what the actual immigration from Canada to the United States amounted to for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1909, according to this report. The total of these three classes is 61,038. Let us see what is said in another portion of the report, with respect to these classes. First, with regard to class F, 15,000 is merely an approximation. Let us see on what that approximation is based. The language of the report, on page 137, is as follows:

There has been an element in the travel from Canada to the United States, in which I feel our bureau will be especially interested, reference being had to citizens of our own country, who, having settled in Canada, return to again take up their residence in the United States.

Commencing with January 1, of the current year, a record has been compiled, showing

that 6,869 of such citizens were interviewed by our officers during the past six months, and as containing important information, it has been directed that a similar record be obtained in the future. As the foregoing record covered that period of the year when the movement would naturally be northbound, I feel it perfectly safe to say that not less than 15,000 American citizens returned from Canada within the year to resume residence in the United States.

There is another significant passage in this report to which I think the attention of the Minister of the Interior ought especially to be directed. I have always understood that the efforts of the government in regard to immigration from Europe were directed towards securing agricultural settlers, agricultural labourers and domestic servants. We have agreed with the government as to the wisdom of that policy. Occasionally matters have been discussed which lead to the conclusion that some officials of the government have directed their energies towards bringing other classes of settlers into this country and particularly a labouring population. The commissioner of the United States government in dealing with Class E, numbering in all 33,118 and comprising citizens of Canada entering the United States for permanent residence, states that the movement of that particular class of immigration from Canada to the United States increased very greatly during the fiscal year 1909. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, the number of such immigrants into the United States from Canada was 18,111. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, the number increased to 34,689, being an increase of 91½ per cent. The commissioner in dealing with that increase and with that class uses this language:

Reference to class E above, shows a remarkable movement in the number of Canadian citizens coming to the United States for a permanent settlement, the increase approximating 92 per cent over the fiscal year of 1908. * * * Should those interested in statistics inquire for a cause for the above exodus of Canada to the United States, it may be stated, as a result of careful questioning, for manifest purposes, that, in many instances, the claim is made that native workmen are being replaced by those brought into Canada under the government's immigration policy, and to accept this explanation is not difficult when we recall conditions existing in the United States, where in many of the great manufacturing centres, particularly in the New England states, native help has been entirely superseded by the foreign article.

I am not prepared to speak as to the accuracy of the comment made by the Commissioner of Immigration of the United States in this particular connection but, knowing as I do the thorough organization of their immigration service, I would be inclined to attach some credit to it and I simply quote it for the purpose of asking the Minister of the Interior to take this comment into consideration and to inquire whether or not he concurs in it, and if not what explanation there is of this very large emigration from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year, 1909. As I have already pointed out, taking all the various classes mentioned which I think ought to be fairly taken into consideration, the total emigration from Canada to the United States amounted to at least 61,038 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and the total immigration from the United States into Canada during the same period was 72,349, showing a balance in favour of Canada of a little over 11,000 in all. That is certainly not the idea that I have had from the statements of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior and other members of the government as to the actual conditions. I think the matter is perhaps deserving of some comment and some explanation from the Minister of the Interior later on. I can only say that the results as disclosed in this report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the United States were a very great surprise to me when they were read in the House this afternoon by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder).

Mr. WRIGHT. I would be very pleased if efforts were made to improve the immigration into this country. I have in my hands the report of the Superintendent General of Immigration of the United States, and as it has been freely quoted from I shall not cite many figures. In the opening pages of the report, the commissioner deals with the accuracy of the work done by his department and states that it is as nearly perfect as possible. He refers to the fact that further legislation will be required to keep the undesirable immigrants out of the United States. With all the perfection they have obtained they still find it necessary to recommend that further steps be taken in the way of legislation in order to keep out this class of people. I shall quote his words:

It is not intended and should not be regarded as a declaration that the bureau is satisfied that the law, even if made at every point effective of its present intent, would be all-sufficient to control immigration. On the contrary, the bureau believes that the time has come for the adoption of some measures more restrictive than any so far enacted That such is the case has been demonstrated by the evils that have grown out of immigration, particularly in the large cities of the east and middle west, which evils have been accentuated during the past few years of industrial depression. The point at which, perhaps, the

law is especially inadequate is in the class of excluded aliens termed 'persons likely to become a public charge.' This standard is not high enough. The alien who becomes a burden on the taxpayers is ultimately undesirable principally for financial reasons. The alien who is barely able, perhaps even with the assistance of private charity, to eke out an existence is continuously undesirable for economic reasons. The presence of such persons in the community tends always to lower the standard of living, of work, and of wages; must have, in an economic sense, a degrading effect. Each community can in time elevate a few such persons to its own level, but its capacity in this respect is limited, and many of our communities have been degraded, and many others will be unless some means are found of preventing the immigration of the alien who is barely able to maintain himself.

We will all recognize the difficulty of drawing the line with regard to alien immigration. The figures have been given in this report of the total immigration into the United States during the last financial year as 944,235 and I would like to point out that of that total immigration three-quarters is what they term immigrant and one-quarter non-immigrant immigration.

They found it necessary to stop a large number at the borders, and of that amount of 944,000, over 400,000 went out of the country almost immediately during the year. Where did they go? We can arrive at no other conclusion than that a large number are trying to make their way across the border into Canada. I have it from the Immigration Department that over 6,700 of these people were stopped at the border last year, and only some 1,300 from all other countries. That would point to the fact that there must be a large number of an undesirable class who manage to get into the United States in some way, and either the American authorities are trying to squeeze them out of the United States, or these undesirables are trying to get into our borders.

I am pleased that a step has been taken to make the regulations more stringent, and I hope the minister will be able to keep out a larger number of these undesirable immigrants. A year or two ago I said I did not believe that Canada was getting an excess of immigration from the United States over and above the emigration going there from this country. There is a balance in favour of the United States. Whether that could be overcome by efforts on our part I do not know, but it is more important that we should get the best class than have a larger immigration, it is especially important that we should keep our young people at home. We ought to direct our attention to getting the diversified employment necessary to keep our young people in the country rather than run the chance of getting foreign immigration to replace those who leave us for the United States. If there be no way of preventing that large emigration from this country to the United States, we must do the best we can to get the best class of immigrants to fill their places. What has been the gain of our Northwest Territories has been in a large measure the loss of our provinces in the east. In Ontario we have been losing our best young men. There has been a depreciation in the value of farms in the east, and they are worth less to-day than they were worth twenty years ago. Go into any of the outlying settlements in Ontario a little distance from the large cities, and you can buy a farm cheaper than you could at any previous time in my memory. That is caused by the drain to the United States on the one hand, and to our Northwest Territories on the other. We ought to make that up to the eastern provinces; but if I understand rightly, the hon. minister is directing his sole attention to filling up the west. I do not object to his giving his attention to the west, but without any effort on the part of this government, the people of the east are flocking out there to get these free lands. In my humble judgment every quarter-section homestead in that country is worth, when the patent is issued, $1,000, and our government are offering that as a bonus to people from the United States. A large number of these people, when they get their homesteads, sell them as soon as possible. They simply settle in our country as a speculation, and return to the United States as soon as they can. Some 15,000 of them returned last year and 18,000 of them the year before. That being the case, it would be well to look into the question, and see whether the regulations might not be changed so as not to allow these settlers to get their patents so quickly, and in that way keep them in the country.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EDWARDS. It seems to me that this government has made the same mistake that was made by the Conservative government; it has been entirely too anxious to bring immigrants into this country. We all recognize that we have a great heritage in the west. But I think what we do not recognize is that that heritage belongs to the people of Canada rather than to the people of any other country. It seems to me that the people of the older provinces, Ontario, Quebec, and the maritime provinces, should have been more considered than they have been in times past in settling the Northwest. There are many parts of Ontario and Quebec, for instance, that, in the days of the lumber kings, gave employment to hundreds of people and that were far more capable of yielding a liveli-

hood to the people than they are to day. In my own county, for instance, there are sections which have been denuded of their timber, yet which are entirely unfit for agriculture. I believe that if some of the money expended in times past in inducing immigrants to come to Canada had been expended in assisting some of these people to take up homes in the Northwest, that money would have been well expended. One of these settlers from the older portions of Ontario, acquainted as they are with our laws, our language and our customs, would be worth more to this country than a whole colony of Doukhobors. I think it would be worth the government's while to take into consideration the people of the older provinces in settling the Northwest. We know that there are people in older Canada who would be only too glad to take up homes in the west and would do so if they had a little encouragement and assistance. But they find, if they make their way to the Northwest with a view to taking up lands, that the lands have been apportioned to peoples from other countries. Their means are limited, and they find themselves unable to cope with the conditions. I am heartily in accordance with the expressions of the hon. member for Lennox (Uriah Wilson). The statistics of our jails and asylums afford ample evidence that not sufficient attention has been paid to the quality of our immigrants. In our anxiety to people the Northwest we have thought rather of quantity, and have paid too little attention to quality. I agree with the hon. member for Lennox in advising that the government should use the utmost care in examining immigrants, not only as to their financial standing and the amount of money they have, but, also, and even more carefully, as to their mental, moral and physical qualities. I reserve any further remarks I may have to make on the subject of immigra- to another occasion.

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

Mr. FIELDING. I propose for the consideration of the committee, that we should rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again at the present sitting of the House. I do this in order that I may have an opportunity to move the House into Committee of Supply to take the necessary steps to give effect to an understanding come to on both sides of the House for the passage of a special supply Bill.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

SUPPLY—INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. We have submitted to the House recently some estimates for the close of the fiscal year which ends on the 31st of this month. I am afraid that the House has been so busily occupied with other matters during the last few hours that hon. members, perhaps, have not had an opportunity to give much consideration to these estimates. I realize that if any hon. member desires that the consideration of these estimates should be deferred, I can offer no objection. On the other hand, I would point out that it would be a convenience if, in getting a special vote covering one quarter of the unvoted items for the new year we could take also the estimates which will wind up the affairs of the current year. I do not think there is much of a controversial nature in these estimates, and I am pretty sure that there is no discussion likely to arise from them which could not take place at a later stage on some item in other estimates. If there be no objection, I would suggest that we pass these supplementary estimates with the understanding that everything that is contained in them may be debated at a later stage. If there is no objection, I will proceed along that line.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) called me up by telephone a few minutes ago to say that he would not be here to-night, but that he and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had made an arrangement to pass one-quarter of the estimates that had not been voted, in order that contractors, civil servants and others might get their pay. This, I understand, is because the Minister of Finance is anxious to get the Bill over to the Senate, as that body purposes adjourning to-morrow until April 6. But the leader of the opposition did not say anything about the supplementary estimates of which the minister has spoken. I do not know of anything controversial in them, but some hon. members on this side are not satisfied to let these supplementaries go en bloc, but they are quite willing that one-quarter of the main estimates should pass in that way.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Geo. Taylor) is quite right as to the understanding; it did not cover the supplementary estimates. I had a few words about it with the leader of the opposition, but that hon. gentleman told me that he had had no opportunity of looking over these estimates and could offer no opinion concerning them. They are supplementary estimates for the current year, not for the coming year, and they are necessary in order to make provision for the close of the year. I would prefer that we should have them voted, but if the hon. member presses his objection, I cannot say that it is unreasonable.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I assume that the minister would be willing to make an arrangement that if there is an item in them which any hon. member desires to discuss, he should have an opportunity to deal with the matter.

Mr. FIELDING. I give that assurance without qualification.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the Minister of Finance went even further than that—that we could debate any of these items as a matter of course at a later time, because only one-quarter of each is being voted.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the case with regard to the estimates for the coming year. But, if the committee deals with the supplementary estimates, I would ask that they be voted in full. I quite appreciate the fact that if we are able to pass these estimates, it is done by general consent, and, if any hon. member desires to discuss any of these items, he should have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Would to-morrow at three o'clock be too late to pass these items? The leader of the opposition would be here then. I would hardly like to consent to their passing in his absence.

Mr. LENNOX. I was going to suggest that if we had something to occupy the time for a few minutes, the chief whip could probably ring up the leader of the opposition and consult with him.

Mr. FIELDING. For the moment we will not proceed with the supplementary estimates, but we will ask the committee to concur in one-fourth of the unvoted items for the next year, with that understanding. Let me explain that the House, in Committee of Supply, has dealt already with a number of the items of the estimates, and they are now ready, if the House sees fit to concur, to be put in the form of a Supply Bill. But there is a considerable portion of the estimates which the House has not dealt with at all, or if it has considered the matter, the items have been held over for further consideration. We propose now, in Committee of Supply, to vote one-fourth of the remaining items, and these, together with what the committee have already dealt with, shall be gathered into a Supply Bill and sent to the Senate as quickly as possible. That being the understanding, I would move that one-fourth of the items which this committee have not already voted in the estimates for the coming fiscal year, do now pass this committee.

Mr. CROSBY. Do these unvoted items cover the civil service for the current year?

Mr. FIELDING. A number of items, including those for the civil service.

Mr. CROSBY. I ask the question because, in the eastern end of the Dominion, we find that the salaries of civil servants are sometimes held up for a time, particularly the military salaries. When these supplies have been voted, will there be no delay in paying them?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The 25 per cent applies to every branch of the service.

Mr. FIELDING. I have here all the items in detail, but I suspect that the House will not wish me to read them. So we will rely upon the clerks of the House to see that they give effect to the motion that is now made, that one-fourth of these items shall be passed and put into the form of a Supply Bill. I move that the committee rise and report the resolution.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Some time ago the Minister of Railways and Canals promised to put a certain amount in the estimates for this year to start the building of the Hudson Bay railway. Has the government decided yet what amount to put in the estimates for that purpose?

Mr. FIELDING. That will be for the estimates for the coming year, not for the current year. It will have to come in the supplementary estimates for the coming year, and I am not in a position to make any statement concerning these until they are ready to be submitted to the House.

Motion agreed to, and resolution reported.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 102) respecting immigration.

On section 1.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior to define the meaning of his remark before six o'clock, when, in answer to a question I preferred to him with regard to the Doukhobors, he said that his Act covered the immigration of Doukhobors, as well as my other friends.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no explanation to make, the words, I think, are perfectly clear, and I cannot see that my hon. friend can take any objection to them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to know what the hon. gentleman meant. I want him to explain to whom he refers as my other friends, in speaking of the Doukhobors.

Mr. OLIVER. I said the Act applied to all the friends of my hon. friend. I have no explanation to offer. The Act does apply to every person who comes

under its operation whether they are friends of myself I want to know what he means.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister is begging the question. His words were that the intention was to introduce an Act to bring out Doukhobors as well as other friends of myself. I want to know what he means.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I shall have to take issue with my hon. friend. I did not say that the Act contemplated the bringing out of Doukhobors, or that it had anything to do with Doukhobors, more than with anybody else.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may have misquoted him as to bringing out Doukhobors, but that was the effect of the words, to bring out Doukhobors as well as other friends of his hon. friend, meaning myself. I wrote down the words when he used them, and I want to know what he means.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, he means exactly what he says, as he generally does.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want the hon. gentleman to make himself clear. I understand the English language nearly as well as he does, and I understood from what he said that he meant to convey an imputation on me in some way. If he did, I throw it back in his teeth, absolutely and at all times.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to apologize for the Doukhobors.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman who has, from time to time, got up in this House and decried people who are decent citizens of this country, as I pretend to be, Mr. Speaker, as I strive to be, and I take back water from no man, Grit or Tory, who ever lived in the aspiration to be a decent and honourable citizen of this country. When he makes a statement of that kind I hold it is an insult and if it were anywhere else than on the floor of this House I would tell him in very plain language—in that language that of all men in this House he is supposed to be a past master of—that there is no justification whatever for it. He is protected by the rules of this House when he throws an insult like that across the floor. There is no Liberal in this House, be he the smallest or the biggest man, that ever can say to me, with truth that I have done anything else towards him than show him the courtesy that one gentleman owes to another. That is my asipration and I want to tell you that evidently that is not the aspiration of the minister, or if it is his aspiration, he does not know in the slightest degree how to walk up to it. He does not know the courtesy that one gentleman should show to another, when he throws in my teeth such words as those which he uttered to-night. He says that he owes an apology to the Doukhobors. Does he owe an apology to the poor men, women and children, who paraded through Saskatchewan in the garb that God gave them when they were born, a most indecent horde of people? Yet, he apologized to them because I have brought up in this House something in regard to them. If ever I felt like apologizing for a Liberal or a Liberal minister for his want of courtesy in this House I feel like it now. I think it is shameful, and I think that if the minister will only pause to consider a moment he will realize that he has gone beyond the bounds of what is parliamentary and beyond the bounds of the courtesy which one hon. gentleman owes to another. He owes me a personal apology and I expect to get it—I do not care whether it is written or verbal.

Mr. LENNOX. There is such a thing as a person sacrificing too much for the sake of being smart, and if an illustration of that is wanted in this House we have a very apt one at this time. The minister had every opportunity of doing what was honourable and square by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell). The hon. member repeated his question a great many times. He had a good right to repeat the question, because the remark made before we rose at six o'clock was open to a very uncomplimentary construction. Instead of making amends, as I anticipated, the hon. gentleman would and which was, I submit, what any hon. member of this House should have done, and particularly a minister of the Crown who ought to be an example of decorum and propriety, instead of availing himself of the opportunity of saying frankly that he did not intend to be discourteous or uncomplimentary and that he had no ground for saying anything discourteous or uncomplimentary about the hon. member for Dauphin, he plays upon words for some time and in the end becomes very clever and tells the hon. gentleman that he owes an apology to the Doukhobors. If he owes an apology to anybody he owes it to this House for his conduct as a minister of the Crown. If he owes an apology it is not to the Doukhobors but it is to the honest, respectable people of Canada for bringing in a horde such as he has brought at the expense of Canada and to the great detriment of the future of this country. As I have had a fair amount of respect for the Minister of the Interior, and as I never had any occasion to complain of him in reference to any former matter of this kind, I regret very much indeed that he has seen fit to so degrade the hon. position

he occupies and has descended to this petty, miserable——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

An hon. MEMBER. Chair.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if the hon. gentleman has any right to tell any minister of the Crown that he has degraded himself either in word or action.

Mr. LENNOX. A minister of the Crown has greater opportunities of degrading himself than an ordinary member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) has the right to explain his words before I make a ruling. I hope the hon. gentleman will at this time confine himself to that explanation.

Mr. LENNOX. I say that a minister of the Crown can more readily degrade himself than an ordinary member, and if you rule that I have to modify the words, I will modify them or withdraw them, but I will not do so otherwise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) he had not completed his sentence, but I think he used the words that the minister had so far degraded his position——

Mr. LENNOX. As a minister of the Crown.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. —as a minister of the Crown, and that he had proceeded a little farther. I regret the strength of the expression and I would ask the hon. gentleman to modify it.

Mr. LENNOX. I will be very pleased to withdraw the statement on the ruling of the Chair, although I would not otherwise have done so. I withdraw it absolutely and unreservedly by reason of the ruling of the Chair, but I would say that in so far as I can go in describing my very great regret that any person who occupies the distinguished position in the service of Canada, one to which we would like to look with pride, I regret very much that the hon. member has forgotten the fundamental duty he owes to this House and the people of Canada as he has forgotten and ignored it to-night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 1 be adopted?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I asked some questions of the Minister of the Interior before six o'clock, and I was told that it would be much better to ask these questions when this Bill came up in Committee of the Whole House. The first question I asked was in regard to the cost of bringing the Doukhobors into this country. I would like to repeat the question now.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry that I have not had the opportunity of getting the information. My hon. friend will understand that it is not possible to carry in a person's mind a series of questions that might be asked across the floor, and it is usual, I think, to depend upon 'Hansard' for the question so that a proper answer may be secured. I can assure my hon. friend that the questions he asked will receive every attention, but I would ask to have the opportunity of getting them from 'Hansard' in order that I may be sure that I am giving the answer that is called for.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I asked another question, and I might say that in the answer that I got from the minister just now I was somewhat surprised to be termed the hon. member for Dauphin, remembering the remarks that proceeded from him a few minutes ago. I asked if this Bill applies to the Doukhobors and their immigration and importation into this country. I would like an answer to that.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, unquestionably.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Might I ask what is the intention of the government in regard to the numbers of Doukhobors that are to be imported? I have seen it stated in the papers to be in the neighbourhood of 8,000. What is the policy of the government with regard to the settlement of these people in view of the government's experience with them in the past? Do they mean to segregate them or do they mean to use them as they use every other class of immigrants—scatter them throughout the country?

Mr. OLIVER. There was a rumour some time ago in the papers that there was a possibility of further immigration of Doukhobors from Russia to the Northwest. On seeing that rumour, I made such inquiry as was possible, and found as far as I was able to find that there was no foundation for that rumour. I may say that the provisions of the Bill are intended to meet the need of excluding undesirable people, and should the Doukhobors come within the exclusion provisions of the Bill they would necessarily be excluded.

Mr. EDWARDS. Who is going to determine that?

Mr. OLIVER. The officers of the government, when the matter comes up for consideration.

Mr. EDWARDS. Under your direction?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is the minister in a position to say now whether he considers these Doukhobors a desirable class of people or not?

Mr. OLIVER. The government is in a position to know whether the Doukhobors who are now in Canada are a desirable class of people or not, and on that point I may say that some of them may fairly be considered desirable, and some of them may just as fairly be considered undesirable. I understand that there are differences of sect among the Doukhobors. Some of them hold more extreme views than others. As to those who are in Russia, I do not know whether they hold the views of those who are in Canada or not. I presume that they do not, otherwise they would have come to Canada along with those who are here now. The fact that they did not come indicates to me that they hold somewhat different views. What those views are I do not know, but if we had to decide we would get the information and would judge accordingly. If the views of any of those who are in Russia, if there are any there, are in accord with the views of a certain portion of the Doukhobors who are in Canada, they would certainly be excluded under the provisions of the Act as it is at present, and under the policy under which that Act is administered.

Mr. J. D. REID. What became of those Doukhobors who were at Port Arthur, and did the government pay $5 a head for bringing them into this country.

Mr. OLIVER. I believe that they are a part of the general immigration of Doukhobors, and in respect of those who were alive at the time there was a payment of $5 a head.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where are they now? They were all crazy the last time I saw them a Port Arthur.

Mr. OLIVER. Some of them are dead, some in jail, some are back at their original village, and some are scattered elsewhere.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then we paid $5 a head to bring them out here to keep them in jail? Is that what we are to understand?

Mr. OLIVER. I am giving the facts. The government did pay $5 a head, I understand, and some of these people either are or were in jail as a result of their escapade at Port Arthur.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. To what kind of an examination will the minister subject those Doukhobors that he intends importing into this country—a medical examination? Will that show what their views are on religious questions, or will he have to extract their brains, and put them under a microscopic examination? I do not see how he can ascertain by any examination what their views are so as to say whether they are desirable or not.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill makes provision for the exclusion of people who are physically, mentally or morally unfit or undesirable. I think it would be fair to say that the party of Doukhobors who were at Port Arthur would come under one of these classifications, and if those who are in Russia are of the same mind, they would come under the same classification. I may, however, take exception to the words of my hon. friend when he speaks of Doukhobors that this government intends to bring from Russia. I can assure him that the government do not intend to bring Doukhobors from Russia or anybody from anywhere. If Doukhobors come from Russia or anybody comes from anywhere, they will have to pass the conditions of the immigration law before they are admitted to Canada.

Mr. CROSBY. As a junior member of this parliament I have been somewhat surprised, and for my future conduct, if I should remain in parliament, I want to understand where we are in regard to a discussion which took place to-night. The hon. Minister of the Interior, apologized to the Doukhobors for having mentioned the name of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) in connection with the Doukhobors, and when the hon. member for Dauphin addressed the House with regard to the matter, I understood the Minister of Finance to say to him, 'be careful.' But, when the Minister of Finance, who I understand to be leading this House, heard that statement from the Minister of the Interior, he did not ask him to be careful. I want to know whether or not that is parliamentary language, or whether it is to be taken as an example to the junfor members of this House as to how they are to govern themselves in addressing this House. I want to know if the hon. Minister of the Interior has not yet something to do or to explain so far as the hon. member for Dauphin is concerned. We on this side of the House have the highest regard and respect for the hon. member for Dauphin, and I am sure I am not going too far when I say that hon. members on the other side have the same regard for that hon. gentleman, and I feel confident that the hon. Minister of the Interior, knowing the hon. member for Dauphin perhaps much better than I do, has the same regard for him, even though they may not have the same political views. Therefore, before we go any further in discussing the matter before the committee, I would like this matter to be cleared up, because I feel, as a junior member of par-

liament that the impression made by it on my mind will have a great deal to do with my conduct in future in addressing this House, either in Committee of the Whole or with the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman has raised a point of order, and it would be, of course, too late now to raise it on the point he has mentioned. I will say though, on the appeal of the hon. member, that I very much regret personal recrimination in the House. I was cognizant of the remark made by the Minister of the Interior. It will not do for me to comment on it. Had I felt that it distinctly contravened any rule of the House to which I could point, I would have called it to order. It was a class of expression that might convey perhaps an unkindly thought to the member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), and yet I did not feel that it was of that class that I could call out of order.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. A western expression.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would say though, having been appealed to by the member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) that it is my desire to hold the debates in this House clear of personal recrimination. I hope that in any efforts I make in the future in that way I will get the support of the House, and if so, the debates will reach a higher standard than I feel they have recently been on.

Mr. CROSBY. I fear I misunderstood the minister, and if the minister will be good enough to set the matter right, I feel it will make us all feel happier and we can go on better. I ask this for my guidance. Like every other member, I have a tendency and desire to be courteous and fair to the ministers of the Crown, but at the same time I do look for strong lessons in courtesy and kindliness, and even sympathy, from ministers of the Crown to members of the House. I hope the minister will in a few words set this at rest and let us go on.

Mr. STAPLES. I think the member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) is taking good ground when he raises this question, and I was hoping the Minister of the Interior would retract the statement he threw across the House to the member for Dauphin. The minister is a westerner, and probably outside of this House he would be in the habit of using western expressions that would not be thought anything of in the west. I think as a member of this House, it was a dirty slur he cast when he made the statement that he apologized to the Doukhobors because he had classified the member for Dauphin with them. I have known the member for Dauphin for a great many years, and outside of his western spirit, which is very noticeable, he is the last man who would cast a slur that would in any way reflect on the character of an hon. member of this House. I do not believe it is yet too late to raise the point of order, and I ask the minister to retract the statement he made reflecting on the character and associates of the member for Dauphin. There is no doubt the Minister of the Interior had in his mind, he has admitted tonight when he made that statement before six o'clock, we who know the member for Dauphin, and he who knows him, knows what he had in his mind when he made the statement across the floor that his Bill, which is now before us for discussion, was wide enough for the member for Dauphin and all his relatives to come in on.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I did not say relatives.

Mr. STAPLES. Until the minister acts the man and withdraws what he said, I for one do not intend clause 1 to pass.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. STAPLES. If an hon. member on this side made the same statement as the Minister of the Interior made, you would rise to a man, and ask him to retract, but if an hon. member on this side had made that statement we as his colleagues would go to him, and ask him for the dignity of this House to retract it. Hon. gentlemen opposite when a minister casts a slur on a member on this side pound their desks. If the minister will say he did not mean anything more, if he will explain what he did mean or retract the words that in his opinion were offensive, we will proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend says he knows what was in my mind when I replied to the hon. member for Dauphin.

Mr. STAPLES. I said I had an opinion of what was in your mind.

Mr. OLIVER. And wanted me to apologize for that which he thought was in my mind. Before I apologize I will ask him to tell the House what he thinks was in my mind so I will know what I am apologizing for.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no desire to be a football between my Liberal friends and my own partisans in a question of this kind. I feel that the Minister of the Interior was acting a part far beneath the dignity of his office when he threw the slur across at me which he did throw, but for that reason if he has not the manliness and the gentlemanliness to get up and withdraw the sentiment that he put into my mind, I have no desire, and I would ask my hon. friends on this side to take no

further notice, because a man of that kind is absolutely beneath contempt.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid the closing words of the member for Dauphin are not in order, and I would prefer that he withdrew them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no desire, as I think you know, at any time to contravene the rules of this House, but you must know, from what you said a few moments ago you must feel, that the provocation has been very great, and that while my words are not parliamentary they are absolutely just, but being unparliamentary I must withdraw them on your ruling.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say that there seems to be some misunderstanding on the part of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) as to what was in my mind when I answered my hon. friend from Dauphin. I cannot tell what he thinks was in my mind. I presume he thinks it was something that was very bad.

Mr. EDWARDS. Withdraw your words and never mind what was in your mind.

Mr. OLIVER. I will not withdraw any words at the call of any bully inside or outside the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. EDWARDS. As I was speaking before the Minister of the Interior got up I infer that his word 'bully,' refers to me, and I ask him to withdraw it unreservedly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the minister has referred to any member as a 'bully,' of course it would be unparliamentary, and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend from Frontenac considers that I applied the word to him——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I certainly will take it back.

Mr. J. D. REID. I object to the minister taking it back as applied to only one member——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am surprised that you as Chairman of this committee will allow the minister to apply that word to any member on this side of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have risen to order, and the hon. member must resume his seat. While I will endeavour to do justice to every member of the House I cannot allow the hon. member to discuss the ruling at the present time.

Mr. J. D. REID. Let me say that the hon. minister applied the word 'bully' to a member of this House, and so far as your ruling, Sir, is concerned, I have a right to appeal, and I shall do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman who used the term 'bully' has withdrawn it. The hon. member for Frontenac raised the point that he was the one to whom that epithet was intended to apply, and the epithet having been withdrawn in regard to him, I did not understand that any other member was referred to, and the rules of the House do not protect any one who is not a member.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) said that if I thought he applied the word to me, thereby leaving the inference that he meant it to apply to more than myself, he withdrew it. I took it up so far as I was concerned, and other gentlemen have the same right.

Mr. OLIVER. In order to ease the strain, I want to say that if any hon. gentleman considers that I applied the word to him, I beg to withdraw it and to say that I do not consider any of them bullies. I wish to say further that, so far as my attitude is concerned, I have always desired to be courteous to every hon. member and transact business with due regard to the dignity of the House and the respect due by one man to another, whether in the House or out of it. When the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) questioned me with regard to the Bill before six o'clock, I replied to him in the spirit in which, as I judged, he had asked the question. When he reverted to the matter after eight o'clock, he seemed to consider that I had attached some ill-meaning to the words, or intended to convey an insult to him, and I could not understand what was in his mind. As far as I can judge, there must have been something in his mind that was not in mine, judging by the remarks of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples); and while I would like every one to understand that I wish to treat every one with all courtesy, I would like also every one to understand that they can always get their change when they come to me. But I do want the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) to understand that I had no intention of conveying any slur upon him, either as a man or member of the House, or in any way, shape or manner.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think that what the Minister of the Interior says, though at a late date, covers the question; and if I was perhaps somewhat bitter in some words I used since the inception of this debate, I do him the same courtesy as he has done me, and beg to withdraw them in so far as they hurt his feelings. To go

on with this matter, before we pass clause 1, I think it would be desirable for the Minister of the Interior to tell us what proportion of good settlers there were among the Doukhobors. He has told us about some bad ones, those that are in asylums or in jail or dead, and I would like to have some idea what the proportion of good settlers was.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the information at hand. There is, of course, a difference in degree even among the good settlers.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I might make it perhaps a little easier for the minister to reply if I put it in this way. How many Doukhobors who settled in Saskatchewan and other parts have proved upon their homesteads and become decent, civilized citizens and good settlers?

Mr. OLIVER. As the hon. gentleman now asks the question, it would amount to this: How many Doukhobors have left the community and become individual settlers? I cannot give the actual figures, but I think in the neighbourhood of one-quarter of the total number. Of those who remain in the community, while they are not to be classed as the most desirable settlers, I do not think that they are as good as those who work individually. They are industrious, thrifty, law-abiding and have added very considerable to the wealth of the country, and to that extent are good settlers, but I do not think that those who continue to live in community are as good as those who have gone out on their homesteads and proved up to them, as a certain proportion have done.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have been told by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that in the neighbourhood of $45,000 to $50,000 has been spent by the government in bringing these people out to this country, only one-quarter of whom, according to the minister, have proved good settlers. I realize, of course, that the minister is not perhaps altogether to blame for the bringing out of these people, but I would ask him what they cost this country since they came out? What has it cost Canada to send out the police and special trains and to take care of those people when on these famous pilgrimages of which my hon. friend knows, which were an insult to the decent Canadian men, women and children throughout the country through which they paraded. Those pets of the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), when they paraded in all their nakedness, were the most indecent exhibition we have ever seen in the Canadian west, not even excepting the poor ignorant aborigines. And these people were brought out as good settlers by this government, and the government took credit to themselves for bringing them to Canada. I would like to know approximately what it cost to semi-civilize these people and teach them some morality and semi-decency.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the information off-hand, but I shall use my endeavours to get it as nearly as possible. I hope to be able to place it before the House at a later date. As evidence that these people are not altogether undesirables, I may mention that a number have bought lands in British Columbia at very high prices and have formed colonies in two or three of the valleys there and are establishing fruit farms. I do not say that the fact that they have been able to accumulate wealth and that they have been large producers of wealth alone makes them desirable citizens. But I would not like the House to understand that they are without qualities that would entitle them to consideration. While I am speaking on this subject, I may say that it is quite a mistake to suppose that these people are of inferior mentality any more than they are inferior in physique to other people.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. To which class does the minister refer?

Mr. OLIVER. We speak of the people of Ontario as a very superior class as they are, but there are undesirable people in Ontario. So that, out of 8,000 Doukhobors, a very considerable portion of them are, I say, not inferior in either mentality or physique to other people. There is a minority of them who are certainly inferior, so much so as to be classed as entirely undesirable.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. The minister has time and again spoken of these people as being divided into two classes. Of course, we all admit that some of them are fairly good settlers. If we could be sure of getting only that kind, I do not think there are many in western Canada who would object to more of them coming. But what we do object to is the government bringing into our decent settlements such people as were described by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) a few minutes ago. Would it be possible, under this new Bill, to prevent this undesirable class from coming into Canada? If not, I would advise the minister to have these people settle in Ottawa in all their native glory and in all their nakedness. Then the members of parliament from one end of Canada to the other would see the kind of people who have been sent into western Canada. As showing the wide range from which our immigrants are drawn, I may say that there are 49 different languages spoken in Winnipeg alone. There is no doubt that this foreign immigration are

not only filling our jails and asylums in western Canada, but, as shown by the returns brought down, the asylums and jails of Ontario as well. Will the minister tell me whether it is possible for these undesirables, such as he has described, to come into Canada under this new Bill?

Mr. TURRIFF. There has been a good deal of unfair criticism of the Doukhobors this evening. It is a good many years since these people came into Canada. They were brought in by the government and they were generally thought to be a good class of people. So far as my observation goes, the great majority of the Doukhobors are as good a class of settlers, almost, as you get from any other country. One great point against them, in my judgment, is that they wish to live in communities. But they are gradually breaking away from that. As the minister has pointed out, there is a minority who are practically insane.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This government brought them in.

Mr. TURRIFF. There are people among other classes who go crazy and have to be put in asylums. I believe that you can easily find other classes who have entailed more expense from the Justice Department than has been spent in looking after the small proportion of Doukhobors who needed looking after, and who, in my judgment, are insane. It sometimes costs the government a great deal to punish a criminal. It may take $25,000 to capture, convict and punish a murderer. I have in mind one such case in which it cost the government $100,000 to execute justice. Will you say that the people who came from the same country as that murderer are an undesirable class because of this man's crime? Are the Doukhobors all to be classed as bad settlers because some of them have practically gone insane and acted in a reprehensible manner? There is much criticism of the government for bringing these people into the country, but when they were brought in hon. members opposite did not offer a word of criticism.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. If the hon. member will allow me, I recollect very distinctly when the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and myself criticised that action very freely.

Mr. TURRIFF. I was going to remark —if my hon. friend had waited—that the chief criticism of that action came from my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, who was then a private member of the House, and not from hon. members opposite.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. We were not here.

Mr. TURRIFF. Further, the predecessors of this government were those who began bringing in the people who are now said to be so undesirable.

Mr. EDWARDS. What class?

Mr. TURRIFF. If the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) will remain quiet, he will get further ahead.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the hon. member object to a question?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, until I get through.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have no wish to interrupt.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is easy to criticise, because some of the people who come to Canada have not turned out well. But if you are going to condemn all the people from a given country because some of them turn out badly, where will you get your immigration?

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. I do not wish to be misunderstood. The hon. gentleman has interpreted my words as condemning the whole crowd of Doukhobors. A moment ago when the minister said that he put them into two classes, a good class and a class that was no good, I said distinctly that a part of them were all right.

Mr. TURRIFF. I accept the hon. gentleman's view of the matter, and I quite agree that a considerable part of them are all right, and a part of them are not right. But we have them in the country, and we must deal with them as we find them. Not many more Doukhobors will come in, and I think I have heard it stated that about all that class of people in Russia have now come into Canada. But if any more of them do come in, under our present law, and more especially under the law it is now proposed to amend, we would not only be able to stop them from coming in, but if they are found to be undesirable we can deport them at any time during three years after their arrival. I have seen a statement made by one of the ministers of the Ontario government that the jails and asylums of the province were being filled with undesirables from foreign countries, and that although it was within the power of any municipality in which one of those undesirables was found, to deport him, in a great many cases it had not been done. The municipality had only to notify the Department of the Interior and the individual would be deported, but in a great many cases no such step had been taken by the municipality. I am satisfied that the government do not wish to bring in any class of people who live in communities. We want the people who come into this country to adopt Canadian ways of living. Even English speaking people

coming into Canada, if they live in communities, would not be the class that we desire. I think this Bill will go a long way towards making it possible to handle the immigration question better than we have handled it in the past, and it will better enable us to keep out undesirables.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Minister of Interior referred to these people as being not inferior in mentality or physique to other races who form the people of Canada, and he said that some 25 per cent of them had proved to be good settlers. But I hold that when he is bringing in a Bill with regard to immigration it is up to him to provide that no immigrant, no matter how good his physique or his mentality, shall be allowed to come into this country as a settler unless he is prepared to subscribe to the oath of allegiance and become a Canadian first as we all do who form the great Canadian people. The minister has had to admit that up to date only a small percentage of Doukhobors have subscribed to the oath of allegiance. For that reason alone. I say they are bad settlers, regardless of their physique or menality. I think we should pass a law that no man should be allowed to reside in this country unless he is prepared to become a Canadian citizen in the fullest meaning of the word, and unless he is prepared to take up arms in defence of the flag that waves over him. I would suggest that a clause be put in the Bill to that effect.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. The minister has divided the Doukhobors into two classes. Will it be possible, under the new Bill, to keep an undesirable Doukhobor out of the country?

Mr. OLIVER. If they were recognized as being of the class that my hon. friend mentions, of course they would be shut out under the Bill. But having come in without being recognized as undesirable, if they were found to be undesirable within three years afterwards, they could be deported to the country from whence they came. It might be difficult to distinguish between one who was mentally weak and one who was sound. But if their fanaticism broke out within three years after their coming into the country, under this Bill they could be deported. In regard to what the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) said, I quite agree with him that men who decline to take the oath of allegiance are undesirable. I am satisfied that had the government been aware, when they entered into negotiations for bringing these people out to Canada that such was their religion, certainly no such arrangement would have been entered into.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Could the minister tell us about what proportion of the Doukhobors have taken the oath?

Mr. TURRIFF.

Mr. OLIVER. I think about 25 per cent of the adult males.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I suppose that the reason why they left their homesteads in the west and removed into British Columbia was because they refused to take the oath of allegiance.

Mr. OLIVER. No, they were not on homesteads, they were living in a community, and refused to take their lands in severalty. We have no means of giving land to people except in severalty, and as they would not take their land on those conditions, they decided to remove to British Columbia where they would be allowed to retain their communal system.

Mr. ROCHE. In connection with their Port Arthur pilgrimage, I understand that the government of Saskatchewan took issue with the Dominion government in reference to the payment of the expenses of that pilgrimage, and that some correspondence passed between the two governments as to which government should bear the expenditure.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give an absolutely sure answer, but my impression is that the whole of the expenditures, after the return of the Doukhobors to the province of Saskatchewan, was borne by the government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. ROCHE. That was borne by the province.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. ROCHE. Who paid the expense in connection with Port Arthur?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know, but I suppose the Ontario government. I could not say.

Mr. HERRON. Have the government any requests from any other class of settlers to come in under the Act referred to by the hon. member for Dauphin; that is to avoid military service, and if so has the government any intention of making any such arrangement with any other classs of people? I hope not.

Mr. OLIVER. At the present time, in so far as I am entitled to speak on behalf of the government in declaring its policy on immigration, the government has consistently declined to enter into any proposition for admitting settlers to Canada during recent years on any terms other than those that are common to citizens of Canada. We never recognize any special privilege to any class of people from any part of the world.

Mr. HERRON. Are you still permitting settlers to settle in communities?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there was provision in the Dominion Lands Act to allow peo-

ple to settle in hamlets. That provision was abolished by the new Act of 1908, and we have no arrangement now whereby people can occupy government lands except under the terms set down in the Homestead Act.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Since the discussion has arisen between the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) on this side of the House, and the hon. the minister, and the hon. member for Assinaboia (Mr. Turriff) on the other side, as to the deportation of undesirables, I desire to say that I cannot agree with the construction placed upon the Act as it is before us in reference to those who are prohibited, and those who may be deported. The word, 'undesirable' would not be a proper term in an Act like this. The Act provides for a board of inquiry, but it would be a very serious matter to allow that board of inquiry to adjudicate upon a person, or a class of persons, and to determine as to whether they were undesirable or not. By referring to section 3 of the Act it will be seen that the following are placed among the prohibited classes:

(a) idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous.

I doubt very much if on a fair and proper construction of the Act, Doukhobors would come within that definition, and section 40, which provides for deportation, also specifically names a different class of persons who may be deported at the expiration of five years. When these clauses come up I have no doubt that with the assistance of the Minister of Justice we may be able to get some more suitable expression that would meet the views which were set forth by the hon. member for Lisgar, and the hon. member for Dauphin, and something which would also meet what appears to be the views of the majority of the members of this House. The whole subject matter can be properly discussed under these sections.

Mr. U. WILSON. I have a vivid recollection of the debates that took place in this House on several occasions in reference to the Doukhobors. I have always been opposed to giving any class of immigrants any special privileges. I recollect that when the Mormons wanted to settle in Canada, and when they applied to Sir John Macdonald's government to know if they could bring with them their peculiar institutions—for instance that with regard to their plurality of wives—Sir John said: If you want to come into our country you will have to abide by the laws of our country. When the Doukhobors were brought into this country it was under a special arrangement that was made by Mr. W. T. R. Preston. Mr. Sifton was Minister of the Interior. They had been trying for a good while to make a good showing with regard to immigration, and to get as large a number of people as possible to come into this country. I have no doubt that there were special inducements held out to the Doukhobors because when they had an interview with the present Minister of the Interior, they claimed that they had a right, under the agreement that was made with them, to live in communities, and that their special settlement duties could be performed in that way. They were also to be freed from the performance of military duty. I think all these things were a mistake. In addition to that instead of giving the immigration agents a commission on these people the government paid the amount directly to the Doukhobors, and they got $5 per head which amounted to something over $36,000. Then, when they arrived in this country we advanced them $20,000 to keep them from starving to death. We were told by the then deputy Minister of the Interior, who appeared before the Agricultural Committee many times that we had good security for the money that was loaned them, because we had a lien upon their land. But it turned out afterwards that they had no land, because they would not comply with the laws of the country. But, there were more serious objections than any of these. The head man of the Doukhobors, who was living in Russia, wrote to this country that any man who could not agree with his wife might put her away and take another wife to himself, but he must be careful not to marry her, because if he did they would put him in jail. We do not want any communities of that kind. We want people who will abide by our laws, or we do not want them at all. I am very strong on the point that we should insist upon any person being subject to our laws before he is allowed to put his foot on our soil.

Mr. EDWARDS. Do I understand that the first Doukhobors came here subsequent to 1896?

Mr. U. WILSON. Yes, when Mr. Sifton was Minister of the Interior, and Mr. W. T. R. Preston was commissioner or inspector of immigration in London.

Mr. OLIVER. In reply to the question of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. A. Haggart), if he will turn to page 4, section 38, subsection (c). I think he will find a clause that will enable us to meet the case.

Mr. HERRON. Are the children and the descendents of the Doukhobors exempt from military service under that agreement? Does it extend from generation to generation?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it does. It is not by a special agreement with the Doukhobors,

however; it is, as I understand it, a law of Canada that a man who by reason of his religion objects to military service is not compelled to do military service. There was no exception made in the case of the Doukhobors, but they being a class of people who would be able to avail themselves of that privilege under our law we still arranged for them to be brought to this country. Everybody knows that the Quakers and the Mennonites are exempt from military service under the general law of Canada.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. There are a great many Mennonites in my constituency. I have about 1,000 voters of that class. We cannot adopt legislation at the present time for those who have come in the past, but we can take precautions in connection with those who are going to come in the future. I would like to ask the minister if there is anything in this Bill—I cannot see it—whereby these immigrants that come in future will have to take the oath of allegiance, and be required to take up arms and fight for our country. If they are going to receive the benefit why not make them take some of the responsibility? We give them all the cream and take up the burden ourselves. I do not think it is right. If they come to settle, and take part in the welfare of this country they should stand by the country from start to finish. In the time of prosperity they reap the benefit, while in the time of war and trouble they sit back in their chairs and say, fight your own battles. I do not think that is right. If they are to have a part in our inheritance, they should help us to defend it. I would like to ask the minister if there is anything in this Bill that will cover that point. Now, I wish to say a word in regard to the way in which immigrants are used when they arrive in Winnipeg. In that city we have a very fine immigrant shed, and when foreigners come there, it matters not where they come from, they are taken in hand by our immigrant agents, and are used, as the saying is like princes; but an Englishman, an Irishman, a Scotchman or a Canadian farmer who goes to Winnipeg is absolutely shut out of the immigrant shed, and is told to go and look after himself. I do not think this is right. I think it is our duty to look after our own first, and after the others afterwards. I have heard a great many complaints of this kind myself in western Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot speak definitely upon the administration of the immigration hall in Winnipeg. I am glad to know that some of the immigrants who come are well treated, and I will credit that up to the department. As to the treatment accorded to British immigrants and Canadian immigrants, as far as Canadian immigrants are concerned, my belief is that very few of them would care to use the immigrant shed in Winnipeg or anywhere else.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. In some cases they do.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as British immigrants are concerned, I have been at some of the immigrant sheds in the northwest, and I have found British immigrants in them whenever I have gone, and my impression is that the advantage is given every time to the British immigrant.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Not in Winnipeg.

Mr. OLIVER. I think in Winnipeg, and I am sure in other places. In regard to the oath, my hon. friend is complaining of something that is a part of the general law of Canada. I am not undertaking to amend the general law of Canada in this Bill. It is not a matter which pertains to immigration; it is a matter which would be dealt with by an amendment to the general law, and my hon. friend would do well to bring his point to the attention of the Minister of Justice, in whose department the general law rests.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the Bill not govern all classes of immigrants? It it does there could be nothing simpler than to put a clause in this Bill saying that no man shall be allowed to come in and take part in Canadian citizenship unless he is prepared to take the oath of allegiance, and in case of necessity to perform service for the flag that protects him, just as the rest of us do.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as that is concerned, subsection (c) of section 38 gives ample authority to meet that or any other case that may arise. But unless and until it is the mind of the people of Canada, as expressed in their statutes, that every man who enjoys the benefits of citizenship in Canada should be required to fight for Canada when the occasion arises, I would feel rather doubtful about bringing it forward in an immigration Bill, which is of a subordinate character, undertaking as it were to dictate a policy in regard to a matter of general and vital interest to the country.

Mr. BRADBURY. I think that clause 38 gives the government all the powers that the government ought to have. I think that a man who comes in to take up land should be required to take the oath of allegiance, but I do not think that should be exacted from every man who comes to this country. I think it ought to be left entirely in the hands of the man himself. If you go to the United States or any other country in the world you can live there for fifty years and you do not need

to take the oath of allegiance unless you want to, and I do not think it would be wise to put such a provision on our statute-books.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I quite agree with my hon. friend that every man who gets land in this country should take the oath of allegiance; but I would not go so far as to compel every man to fight for the country. I do not think that those who abstain for conscience sake should be compelled to fight. I think the minister would do well to inquire into the complaint made in regard to the different treatment of immigrants at Winnipeg. There are one or two points in the Bill that I would like to discuss. I think it is a very good Bill on the whole; but I think the inspection should be done on the other side instead of on this side.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. On both sides.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. On both sides if necessary. If gentlemen living in the west could see the heart-rending scenes that we in the east sometimes witness, when families are broken up on debarkation, they would feel as we do.

By section 2 clause (j) the cattle men are perhaps a little aggrieved. I would desire to insert the words: 'Not including a cattle man.' It now includes cattle men as immigrants. Most of them are Canadians and I do not think they should be brought under that section.

In clause 3 some of our friends ask that the words 'mentally' be added after the word 'otherwise.'

In clause 23 we claim passengers are deprived of the right of appealing to the courts until they are passed by the Canadian officials, unless they are Canadians. We claim there should be always some place to appeal to, that the judgment of the doctors should not be final. That clause might be amended especially in the case of British subjects of the Anglo-Saxon race. This depriving them of the right to apply for a writ of Habeas Corpus in a court is all wrong. In Great Britain a Canadian has the right to apply for a writ. I hope the minister will see his way clear to have the inspection made on the other side. It is pitiful to see the breaking up of a family. It may be that the youngest child is discovered to have trachoma, and the whole family is broken up and sent back. If the inspection were made in England or on the other side it would save all these heart rending scenes that we in the east are compelled to witness.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has presented the views held by the steamship companies. When the Bill was first introduced it was first made public. We were then called upon by some of the steamship companies who made certain suggestions asking us to meet their views in certain particulars. I have certain amendments which I propose to offer at a later stage to meet some of the views of the shipping companies. There were some views that we did not feel able to meet, and these are the views my hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House.

While inspection at the other side would theoretically be the best as a matter of practice, so far we have found it impossible. First of all the government of Canada has no jurisdiction outside the boundaries of Canada, and an inspector stationed at the port of any other country would have no authority by which his inspection could be enforced. He would be standing on unsafe ground, and would not be in a position to do credit to the authority of the government to which he was responsible. Besides that, in a large majority of cases the immigrant family have left their homes far away from any port at which our inspector could be stationed. If the immigrant comes from Northern Europe, Scandinavia, for instance, he travels across the German ocean to a British port, then across England to an Atlantic port at which port we might station our inspector. But the family would already have been broken up, and if they are met by a Canadian inspector at a British port they are no better off than they would be at a Canadian port. The steamship company would be better off because they would save the transport to and from Canada, but the immigrant is no better off.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Americans have their officers in Montreal and inspect immigrants before going to the United States. Is that by private arrangement?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why could not the same arrangement be made in Great Britain?

Mr. OLIVER. That would be no advantage to the immigrant.

Mr. U. WILSON. Would he not save his fare across the Atlantic?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The inspection by United States officers at Montreal or Quebec is quite different from inspecting at the other side of the Atlantic. The United States do not inspect on the other side of the Atlantic. Their inspection at Montreal, or Quebec is by arrangement with our people for the advantage of the steamship companies, running to Canadian ports so that they shall not be at any disadvantage in the transaction of United States business. It is an arrangement of amity between the officials of the two countries in order to facilitate the business of Canadian

steamships, and it does no injury to Canadian interests. It has no bearing on the question of inspection previous to the immigrants embarking on the other side of the Atlantic.

Mr. BRADBURY. Does it not seem to the hon. minister that if the government would put the onus on the shipping companies by compelling them to do the inspection and fining them whenever they bring in any undesirables, that would have a very strong preventative effect. I believe there is a law in the United States of that kind. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) mentioned that fact to-day.

Mr. OLIVER. That is exactly our policy. While we have not imposed an actual fine upon the steamship companies, our view is that if they know that their undesirables are subjected to a strict inspection at our ports, and that the company will be put to the double expense of taking them back again, they will take care not to bring out any. If that be not a sufficient deterrent, we will require to put on a fine. But what is absolutely wanted is a strict enforcement of the inspection law at the Canadian ports. By that means the responsibility is placed on the steamship companies, and these companies have been very much more careful during the past year or two than in previous years just because of that policy.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the penalty were made high enough, that would be a great safeguard. The mere fact of compelling the steamship companies to take these people back is not a sufficiently heavy penalty. There should be a heavy fine.

Mr. OLIVER. We find that the certainty that an undesirable immigrant will have to be taken back is a better deterrent than a heavy fine, because the company might be able to escape the fine. It is not the severity of the punishment, but the certainty, which is its best deterrent. If my hon. friend could only hear the roar which a steamship company puts up every time it has to take an immigrant back, he would think it was punished very severely.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will the hon. minister explain subsection 8 of clause 33?

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Might I suggest to the minister that he should take twelve or fifteen hours to look up that section and become thoroughly able to explain it. We have been here thirty hours continuously, and I arranged with the Minister of Finance that at 10 o'clock the committee would rise and report progress.

Mr. OLIVER. I am obliged to reply to the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) on the two or three points he mentioned.

Mr. CROSBY. I want to speak on the same line and the hon. minister can answer both at the same time. I was very pleased indeed that the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) brought up the matter regarding the deportation of undesirable immigrants. When an immigrant comes into Canada who is undesirable, the steamship company discover that they have the onus of deporting him, and they use all their influence to try and keep him in Canada. I know that in Halifax the companies have named a doctor to represent them and examine the immigrants with the doctor of the government, and the company's doctor will use all his influence in favour of his employer. Of course when two professional men get together and have a difference regarding an immigrant, it is reasonable to expect that they will give the benefit of the doubt to the stronger interest, and that would be in favour of keeping the immigrant in Canada and relieving the steamship companies of the cost of deporting him. In the past we had more cases of undesirables kept in the country than now, but still we have quite a number at present. When a large company, such as the Allan line or the Canadian Pacific railway, bring in a number of passengers, and these passengers come up for medical inspection, the government doctor passes along and sets a great many to one side. Then he goes over them a second time and finds there are a few he can allow to remain. He goes over them again and studies them some more and then, influenced by the doctor representing the steamship company, he goes over the lot a fourth time for the purpose of relieving as many as possible. I do not blame the government's officials, because they act conscientiously and always give the newcomer the benefit of the doubt. I followed very closely the argument of the hon. member for St. Lawrence division. I think it would be well if this inspection could be made on the other side so that when the immigrants arrive here, they would feel at home and we could keep them and take care of them. You can understand what a hardship it is when a family lands at Halifax and two or three do not pass the inspection and are sent back, and the others go on to the new land. When one portion of the family must go back to the old land and the other can take up homes in the new land, the division of that family is very sad. Therefore I would endorse the appeal made by the hon. member for St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike).

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. It is now five minutes past ten o'clock. The Minister of the Interior will read in 'Hansard' what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) and the hon. member for St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) has

said, and he can reply when the Bill is next in committee.

Progress reported.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. What business to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We shall continue our work of completing the Interim Supply Bill, and then the Minister of the Interior will resume his Bill.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 16, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 165) for the relief of Elmore Walker Scott.—Mr. Carvell.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

Ottawa, March 16, 1910.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Mr. Justice Girouard, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber to-morrow at 3.30 o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. J. JONES.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER TRANSMISSION COMPANY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I beg to lay upon the table of the House an amended petition of the St. Lawrence Power Company, Limited, to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, for permission to erect the structures therein described in the town of Mille Roches, Ontario. This relates to the application for the development of power at the Long Sault rapids. Also, a description of the works proposed by the St. Lawrence Power Company, Limited at the Long Sault rapids in the St. Lawrence near the boundary line, which is the same thing. Also, the amended plans of the company; also, five plans connected with the original project; also, blue prints showing the contour along the north shore of the river; also, some additional plans. I think, Mr. Speaker, as I propose to present a copy of the report of the engineers, with your permission and that of the House, it might be well to read it, so that it may appear in the 'Hansard' for the information of hon. members:

No. 344395.

Ottawa, January 13, 1910.

Hon. William Pugsley,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—We have the honour to report in regard to the amended petition of the St. Lawrence Power Company, Limited, to His Excellency the Governor in Council, for permission to erect certain dams in the St. Lawrence river, as follows:—

On December 15, 1908, we reported on the facts as contained in the application of the company at that time. The objections found against the original plan have, in a large measure been remedied by the amended proposition. The integrity of the Cornwall canal has been preserved. No detail plans have been submitted showing the style of dam proposed to be erected; and this, of course, will have to be done before the project could be allowed to be entered upon. An approximate computation of the horse-power capable of being developed at the site of the proposed dams is about six hundred thousand. The creation of such an enormous quantity of power will be of the highest importance to the district in question. Experience has shown us that in the proximity of such a large development of power, great industries are created and that towns and cities grow up. We are convinced that the project is one worthy of the most serious consideration at the hands of the government.

The plans contemplate the construction of a lock in the American channel, and the objections which were taken against the former proposition apply with equal force to the present one, viz.: the approach channel to the lock, as it now exists, is a tortuous one, with the swift current, and is not, in our opinion, a satisfactory channel. It is our opinion, however, that a single lock about one thousand feet long between hollow quoins, eighty-five feet wide, with twenty-five feet of water on the sill, should be built on the Canadian side, so as to duplicate the Cornwall canal. We believe that if this lock is constructed on satisfactory lines, it will, to a considerable extent, eliminate any objections the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company might reasonably have in being interfered with in their descent of the Long Sault rapids. It is also necessary that there should be built a timber slide, and all necessary piers and booms for the protection of the lumber industry and the free use of the navigation of the river for that purpose.

The location and position of the power-house and dam on the Canadian side would have to be adjusted, when the plans are worked out in detail. We have satisfied ourselves that the objections which we formulated, with regard to the possible danger in having such a large dam in a river like the St. Lawrence, are obviated by the amended plan.

The effect of the board ice and frazil, upon which we laid considerable stress in our former report, we are convinced need not be seriously considered, for the reason that the company is willing to enter into an undertaking to not permit board ice to form at the head of the dam. They are willing to supply ice-breakers to prevent such a possibility.

The plans show a small percentage of development on the Canadian side, and the geographical conditions are such that it will be somewhat difficult to increase the power plant on the Canadian side to the fifty per cent which we feel should be preserved for the use of Canada. This difficulty, however, may be obviated by the company undertaking to hold in readiness fifty per cent of the total power developed in the river available for Canadian consumption. No doubt, if the project goes through and the working plans are submitted, a more equitable division of the power plants can be worked out.

We desire to reiterate the necessity of a complete agreement on behalf of the governments of Canada and the United States as to the supervision and control of the plans, specification, and every detail of the works in question. The subsequent operation in so far as the level of the water in the river is concerned, and the regulation of the flow, should in like manner be under the joint supervision of an officer from both governments.

A question has been propounded to us as to what effect the construction of such dams as are proposed would likely have upon the elevation of the water in the harbour of Montreal. We agree that they would have no effect whatever.

It must be understood that the present report does not attempt to deal with the sites selected for the several dams or power-houses, or other works connected with the scheme. All such matters are to be determined later should the general scheme be approved of by the government.

We are, Sir,
Your obedient servants,

(Sgd.) M. J. BUTLER,
Chief Engineer, Railways and Canals.
(Sgd.) EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,
Chief Engineer, Public Works.
(Sgd.) WM. P. ANDERSON,
Chief Engineer, Marine and Fisheries.

As these plans were in the possession of Mr. Stewart, secretary of the Canadian branch of the International Waterways Commission, I would like it understood that they are not placed in the custody of the House, but they will be returned to the department after hon. gentlemen have had full opportunity to examine them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to ask the minister to furnish the original report of the engineers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to make inquiries for that, and will get it. I may say that one difficulty I had in getting the plans, or rather the report, was that they were left with Mr. Butler, the late deputy minister, and owing to his having resigned, and the Minister of Railways and Canals being away, I was not able to get all the papers. But I have no doubt I will be able to get the original report.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I thought they were all in the hands of the International Waterways Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only the last plans. The original report, I presume, would be in the Railway Department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what personal plan he has with regard to this Bill?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Public Works has no plans with regard to the Bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad to hear it, because, judging by what he said the other night, he has some plan which we would like to have divulged.

Mr. BRODER. Were those plans got up by the engineers of the department, or by some one else?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These were plans submitted by the company

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if these are blue prints? If they are, I cannot see why additional copies cannot be obtained by the secretary of the Waterways Commission, and these should remain in the custody of the House for discussion of this matter. If they are originals, we can get blue prints made of them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These plans will remain here just as long as is necessary for discussion, probably until the close of the session. There is no objection, I think, to their remaining here.

QUESTIONS.

INDEMNITY TO CANADIAN VETERANS.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

Has the government received a request for indemnity on behalf of the Canadian veterans for services rendered in 1866 and 1870? If so, has the government arrived at any decision in the matter?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There have been such requests, but no decision has been reached.

ALIENATION OF COAL AND TIMBER LANDS.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. During the time the Hon. Clifford Sifton was Minister of the Interior, what was the total acreage of coal lands alienated from the Crown?

2. What was the total acreage of timber lands for which licenses and permits were

issued, and what is the total acreage of land sold?

3. During the time Hon. Frank Oliver has been Minister of the Interior, what was the total acreage of coal lands alienated from the Crown?

4. What was the total acreage of timber lands for which licenses and permits were issued?

5. What has been the total acreage of lands sold, exclusive of pre-emption?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

	Acres.	
1. From November 1, 1896, to April 5, 1905, surface and coal rights		21,264·30
2. (a) From November 17, 1896, to February 27, 1905		3,946,329·68
(b) From November 17, 1896, to March 31, 1905— School lands		335,817·05
	Acres alienated.	
Coal and mineral land	71,351·61	
In western provinces	2,791·33	
In the Yukon	2,219·99	
Total		76,362·93
Irrigation sales		489,009·09
Agricultural land sales		608,128·00
		1,509,317·07
3. From April 5, 1905, to March 10, 1910, surface and coal rights		34,527·31
4. From April 5, 1905, to March 11, 1910		1,299,750·40
	Acres	
5. School lands	738,297	
Coal and mineral land	66,793	
Irrigation sales	529,513	
Agricultural land sales	305,772	
Purchased homesteads	285,440	
		1,925,815:00
Pre-emptions		4,541,327·00

FRONTIER QUARANTINE INSPECTORS.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

Was there any correspondence when appointing the following frontier quarantine inspectors: Dr. Bradford, Dr. Carter, Dr. Duncan, Dr. Thornton, Dr. Wallace, Dr. Nay, Dr. McKenty, Dr. Little, Dr. Henderson and Dr. Scott? If so, how many letters were sent and how many received by the department?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. Yes. Sent sixteen letters and seventeen telegrams; received, nine letters and seven telegrams.

These messages were dealing with the appointments and were not such as are usually brought down to the House.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—THE LUMSDEN COMMITTEE.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to a question of privilege. On Friday last the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), the chairman of the Lumsden Committee, speaking in reply to a complaint made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), as to the omission of certain words from the second report of the Lumsden Committee, said:

The report was prepared by the clerk of the committee, and was submitted to the committee, and nobody objected. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by saying that the chairman omitted any words at all. I submitted the report which was prepared by the clerk, according to the order of the House, which says that the committee shall report to the House from time to time.

The printed minutes of the committee show that on the 22nd February last the following resolution was carried:

Mr. Lennox moved that committee recommend that their proceedings and the evidence taken by them be printed and reported to the House from day to day, which was agreed to.

The committee sat on the following day, the 23rd February, and at that meeting the minutes of the previous day were read, including the resolution I have just read. These minutes were duly confirmed, as appears by the printed evidence on page 41, and these minutes were accordingly attested as being correct by Walter Todd, clerk of the committee and marked 'approved' over the signature 'Victor Geoffrion, Chairman,' which will be found in the printed proceedings at page 8. I call to the attention of the House the fact that there was no chance for any misconception or mistake in this matter. I do so because it is important to know how this extraordinary omission occurred, an omission very embarrassing to some members, of the House. On the occasion when I moved this resolution the attention of the chairman was specifically directed to it. I mean by that, Mr. Speaker, that it was not one of those resolutions that go through without the attention of the chairman, but his attention was specifically directed to the resolution at the time of its going through, and that is evidenced by the fact that he says 'I shall have to be empowered by the House to have it done.' Dealing with this in a way which substantially amounts to practically the second reading of my resolution, although not, on the second occasion, in the exact words, I say in reply:

My motion is that the evidence be printed and reported day by day.

Not only was the attention of the chairman evidently directly challenged by the motion that was made, but the attention of the clerk was specifically directed to it. I say that, because, as the members of the committee were leaving, the clerk came to me and said: 'Do you really mean reported as well as printed from day to day'? To which I replied: 'I mean every word of it; I mean it very much; see that you get it just as I put it'. I may say that I did so far the reason that I had some little experience upon committees of this kind, and I had considerable experience as to the difficulties that confront us in the Public Accounts Committee where, when the ruling is, in the opinion of the minority, unjust, we are unable to bring the matter into the light of day in the House because the majority refuse to report to the House. Therefore, advisedly, and I think, wisely, I had taken the precaution of preparing a resolution which covered the whole ground that the proceedings should be printed from day to day, and that they should be reported to the House from day to day, so that we would have an opportunity of, to some extent, controlling the action of the committee. The result of it is this, as I submit to the House, that it was manifestly impossible for the clerk inadvertently to omit the important words: reported to the House,' and equally impossible, as I know the clerk, for him to be dishonest. We are, therefore, confronted by an important inquiry, a very exceptional inquiry, one that I am glad to say has not often presented itself to this House, that is how this peculiar blunder, if you call it a blunder, occurred, by whose command, or at whose instance, or instigation, this important provision, calculated to enable us to carry on our proceedings more satisfactorily, and calculated to enable the people to know just what was being done was left out, and how it is that our intention should have been so speedily, and for the time being, so effectively blocked. The public, Mr. Speaker, is interested in this. It goes to a question which has come up in this House very frequently during recent years, namely, the procedure for getting these matters before the public, and letting the people know what is being done. It is important to the public, and it is important to me personally, and to the other members of the minority of the committee, because, by reason of what was done our way is blocked for the time being and certain important incidents that have occurred in that committee, we have not been able to discuss because there is no report before the House. Our way is barred, but I trust to effectively urge on the Prime Minister that it shall be barred no longer, and that an opportunity shall be afforded to the minority to present certain matters to this House, and to the people. Resuming the thread of the incidents—in professed pursuance of the action of the committee which provided that the proceedings should be reported from day to day to the House, there was a report presented by the committee and passed by the House in these words:

Your committee recommend that their proceedings and any evidence taken by them be printed from day to day for use of the members of the committee and that rule 72 be suspended in reference thereto.

Two important changes are made in that report. First, it entirely omits the important provision that the proceedings are to be reported to the House from day to day, and next, they have incorporated in it this qualification: That the printing is to be done for the use of the members of the committee, and not for the use of the members of the House. And so, if this plan was carried out in the way suggested the effect would be that the resolution is absolutely useless, because the committee already had power to report from time to time as they saw fit. Of course, the report provided for the printing of the proceedings and evidence from day to day, but only for the use of the members of the committee, and that does not amount to anything, because we already had better than that in the typewritten copy of the proceedings to hand every morning of what took place the day before. It does, Mr. Speaker, suggest some puzzling thoughts as to why and how this thing was done. I shall not at the moment say what my idea of it is, because the chairman of the committee will no doubt make a statement which I hope will be more satisfactory than his statement of the other day. I shall feel it my duty to analyse his former statement. The chairman said:

The report was submitted to the committee and nobody objected.

Surely this experienced chairman, the chairman of the Hodgins committee as well, a gentleman whom I think I can say without offence, but rather in compliment, above all other of their supporters the government selected for offices of this kind; surely he has not so far lost his head as well as his candour as to say that such is the fact. The facts are: At one o'clock in the afternoon the resolution was moved and the committee dispersed. At three o'clock in the afternoon the report is presented to the House. Every hon. member of the House had the right to presume, I certainly presumed that once the report was brought in it was in harmony with the action of the committee. But that has not turned out to be so. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Geoffrion) seriously want to pro-

pound to this House that the report was presented to the members of the committee and was not objected to? There is not one word of foundation in fact for that statement; it is absolutely incorrect. It was never submitted at any time to the members of the committee; but, of course, it is most important to establish that it was, because if it were it would to some extent estop us from complaining. Now, the second defence of the chairman of the committee is the statement that the report was prepared by the clerk. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that the report was prepared by the clerk? Of course, the report of the committee is always prepared by the clerk, but does he mean by that, that the clerk is responsible for the mutilation of this report? I venture to say that I refuse to believe it. Mr. Todd is an experienced, an efficient and painstaking official as everybody in this House knows. Could he make a mistake under the circumstances? Let us see. With the resolution before him, within probably half an hour after it was read in the committee, twice read in his presence, impressed upon him by the subsequent conversation, a mistake on the part of the clerk is wholly inconceivable, and treachery on his part is to my mind equally inconceivable. If the chairman of the committee wishes to put it otherwise I will give him an opportunity now. If he does not feel that he has to shoulder not only the theoretic responsibility for this improper report by which the House was misled, but the actual responsibility as well, I will challenge him to get up in his place now and say that he had no hand in guiding the wording of that report. The third defence of the chairman of the committee is—and this is very innocent in this gentleman who has had so little experience in matters of this kind—his third defence is to say:

> I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by saying that the chairman omitted any word at all.

He does not know—what marvellous innocence—he does not know what was meant by the leader of the opposition. I hope he has had time for reflection, and knows now. He does not know: I have endeavoured to make my meaning reasonably undisguised. What I mean to-day is that a most unprecedented omission has occurred in this report, and if the chairman made it accidentally he should have detected it the next day, when the wording of my resolution was read in his presence. What I mean is this: that when the matter was brought to the attention of the chairman, the other day it was time for him to get busy, and I mean that he shall get busy now. What I mean to say, just as emphatically, though I hope moderately, as I can, is that if this matter is not adjusted now the government will have to hear something more about it—we will have something more to say, and it will be said. One other point. I admit that the chairman had not much time for thought. The complaint was presented unexpectedly to him, and he wound up in this way:

> I submitted the report, which was prepared by the clerk according to the order of the House, which says that the committee shall report to the House from time to time.

Here is the clerk again. We have, I think, exonerated the clerk pretty effectually. I think the hon. gentleman has left it so that there is no loophole in that direction. The First Minister suggested the other day that there may have been a misprint in the report. I had examined the records, and I knew that there was no mistake in the printing, so that that avenue of escape is not open. The chairman says that the report was prepared by the clerk according to the order of the House. Mr. Speaker, I will ask you if in your experience you have ever known such an extraordinary statement as this. I thought the report was to be prepared according to the resolution which I submitted, and which was carried unanimously by the committee. Does the hon. gentleman mean that what he thought he was bringing into the House was an application of the House of Commons to authorize that which the House had authorized to be done?—because that is what he would have us understand if he thought he was presenting a report which was prepared according to the order of the House. I think he will hardly argue that that is a position which he can very successfully take. The only other alternative is that the chairman, a gentleman of distinguished ability, and of special training in matters of this kind, forgets within two hours all about the resolution which was passed in his presence, which he declared carried, to which he had his attention specifically called, and when he prepares the report absolutely omits practically all the provisions that were to have been covered by the report, all the ground practically that was to be covered by that report. Referring to the order of the House, the hon. gentleman says:

> Prepared by the clerk according to the order of the House, which says that the committee shall report to the House from time to time.

The order of the House does not say anything of the kind. My resolution was that the committee should report from day to day, but the order of the House is 'that the committee shall be appointed to in-

vestigate this matter, and that it shall have power to send for persons, papers and records and examine witnesses on oath, and report from time to time.' But the hon. gentleman, the other day, wanted us to understand that he thought it was not necessary to include the exact terms of my resolution, inasmuch as we were already ordered by the House to report from time to time; in other words, that the order of reference was mandatory that the committee should report from time to time. If the hon. gentleman means that he thought it was mandatory and obligatory, why has he not reported accordingly? That is a cogent and important question, particularly so in face of the fact that we have an event in that committee which is unprecedented in the annals of the Dominion parliament—an action by which three members of the committee have been practically compelled to retire from its deliberations; and yet there is absolute silence from that day to this, although the committee meet from day to day, and although I have reason to believe that the question has been considered. Yes, and I have reason to believe that the First Minister has been consulted as to whether there should be a report or not; and he can say I am wrong if he choses to say so. I have reason to believe that the First Minister has been consulted as to whether this committee should proceed practically in the dark with only members.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, in the dark practically—a committee which is not constituted according to the order of this House; a committee proceeding as it was never intended to do by the order of this House; and I ask the chairman of this committee if he thought that order of reference meant that we were to report from day to day, why is it that he has been contented with perambulating backwards and forwards to interview the First Minister instead of reporting to the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has brought up this question as a matter of privilege; but in my humble judgment he has not uttered a single word which has any reference to a matter of privilege. My hon. friend complains that the full orders of the committee have not been reported to the House. On the 22nd of last month Mr. Clarke, of Essex, for the chairman, brought in this report:

Mr. Clarke (Essex), from the special committee appointed to investigate the charges and allegations made by Hugh D. Lumsden regarding a portion of the engineering staff of the National Transcontinental Railway, presented the second report of the said committee, which is as follows:—

Your committee recommend that their proceedings and any evidence taken by them be printed from day to day, for the use of the committee, and that rule 72 be suspended in reference thereto.

Subsequently:

On motion of Mr. Clarke (Essex), the second report of the special committee appointed to investigate the charges and allegations made by Hugh D. Lumsden, presented this day, was concurred in.

I do not know whether my hon. friend was present in the House on that day, and heard the report. My impression is that he was. If he was in the House at that time, his attention was not called to the fact that the report did not, as he states now, contain a true statement of the proceedings of the committee. If that be so my hon. friend made a mistake in not giving to the report the attention which he might have done. If he is mistaken other members may have been mistaken also. My hon. friend charges the chairman of the committee by insinuation with having voluntarily deceived the committee. My hon. friend has no reason to make any such insinuation. If my hon. friend when the report was twice read to the House on Friday last did not perceive the mistake which he says was in the report, it is quite possible that the acting chairman, my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke) who brought in the report may also have overlooked the same mistake. I have only to appeal to the fairness of every member of this House. Everybody knows that the proceedings of the committee are prepared from day to day by the clerk of a committee and brought to the chairman, and as a rule the chairman signs simply on the statement of the officer that the report is correct without looking at it farther. If any one is guilty many of us are guilty, I cannot say that I have not been guilty as I have been chairman of a committee, and that is what I have done. I have taken the word of the clerk that it was all right, and presented the report accordingly. My hon. friend says the report is not a true statement of the proceedings that took place in the committee. That is possible. I do not say it is not so. I assume, since my hon. friend says so, that that was the case, but I have to say to my hon. friend if the report of the committee is not a true statement of the facts that took place in the committee on that day, then what is there before the House to-day, but that report of the committee? We must assume that this report is correct. It is no use for my hon. friend to say on the floor of this House that the report is not correct, and not a true statement of the proceedings of the committee on that day.

How can we change it or alter it, and if there has been a mistake how can we amend it? The remedy of my hon. friend is to go before the committee, there is the place where he should address himself, and if there has been, as I understand, a mistake made somewhere, there the mistake can be corrected. But I ask my hon. friend and every member of this House how will the House undertake to amend this report, which is now here, and which has been adopted? How will any member say the report is not correct, and ought to be amended accordingly? There is only one thing for my hon. friend to do, that is to go before the committee, and there have the statement corrected. My hon. friend has no confidence in the committee; I understand he has withdrawn from it, and I understand he says the committee is proceeding in the dark. If the committee is proceeding in the dark, according to common report, it is because my hon. friend refuses to give it the benefit of his light. The committee would have the full light upon it if my hon. friend would be present, but he has chosen for some reason or other to withdraw from the committee, if I am correctly informed. But even although he has chosen to withdraw from the committee, I see no reason why he should not go back into it. If he cannot go as a member of the committee he can as a member of the House, and he has only to call the attention of the chairman or members of the committee, and to show them that the report is incorrect to have it corrected, and he would have satisfaction. If the statement is correct that he made a certain motion which should have been reported, and has not been reported I would be the very first to say to my hon. friend that he ought to have his rights properly placed before the House. But I appeal to his sense of justice and fairness, and I am sure he will agree that at this moment this House is powerless to redress the grievance of which he complains. How can we change the report of the committee? What have we before us to do so? He will agree that the only thing for him to do is to go before the committee, and I am satisfied he will have every satisfaction there. Perhaps I have no right, no reason, no authority to offer any advice to my hon. friend, but I may say to him that I hope he will bear with me. I have a high idea of his sense of honour and justice, but is he the only man who has a right sense of honour and justice in this House? There are others besides him, and I believe that when such a clear fact is brought to the attention of the committee as he states, that is that he made a motion, that the motion should have been included in the report, and was not included in the report, he is entitled to have the correction made. In so saying I have no desire to throw blame on anybody. My hon. friend was altogether unwarranted not in the statement, because he made no statement, but in the insinuations which he made against the chairman of the committee. He stated that Mr. Todd, the clerk of the committee, is an experienced and faithful officer of this House. No one denies that, Mr. Todd is a faithful and experienced officer of this House. But by making that statement my hon. friend made an insinuation against the chairman, and I have only to say that the chairman of the committee is an experienced and faithful member of this House. My hon. friend may depend on his honour to do my hon. friend every justice, and all the justice to which he is entitled.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no objection to a question of privilege being raised and an explanation given on the other side, but as there is nothing before the House, I am wondering where the debate will lead us. There is nothing before the House, and it is not customary to debate a question of privilege. The House will realize that there should be something before the Chair.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. In view of what occurred the other day in the discussion of this question, I would like to know how far this debate is to be permitted to go. If my hon. friend is to be allowed to speak, and no one on this side is to be allowed later on I would like to know it.

Mr. SPEAKER. My idea at present is that it cannot be continued because there is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are the government taking the stand that they will not allow——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not consulting the government, I am consulting the practice of the House that there must be something before the Chair.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

SUPPLY—THE LUMSDEN COMMITTEE.

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

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). I intend to say but a very few words upon the subject which has just been engaging the attention of the House. I am awaiting and I hope before long to have an opportunity to deal with all the proceedings of the committee while I remained a member of it. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) takes two positions here. One is that it is the duty of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to go before the

committee, and get this report rectified; the other is that there is no question of privilege. I have very great respect for the opinion of the right hon. gentleman in a matter of that kind, but feeling inclined myself to rise to the question of privilege, I certainly think that my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was within his rights in raising the question in that way, and I shall state why. The right hon. gentleman first says it was the duty of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken to get this rectified. What did he do? He came here before the House, the House to which that report was made, and he complained. What was the result? Instead of any attention being paid to that complaint made properly here in the House, the committee have been going on for about twelve days conducting this investigation, and not making a single report. Why is that? There is no question about the facts. The resolution moved in committee was not a verbal one, and it is printed in the minutes of the committee exactly as my hon. friend from Simcoe has said.

Mr. LENNOX. And reported.

Mr. BARKER. And reported. Every member of the House has got it. There is no question whatever as to what the resolution was. But the chairman of the committee, instead of reporting, according to the resolution in his hand, and the evidence before the committee, reported otherwise. It seems to me that the proper place to bring that matter up is in the House, and when it was brought to the attention of the right hon. gentleman, it was his duty to tell the chairman of that committee to report properly. What did he do? Instead of instructing the chairman to report properly, he appears to have had conferences with him, the result of which is that no report has been made. There is my answer to the right hon. gentleman. He does not deny what my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has said, he does not deny that he was in consultation with the chairman who made this erroneous report; and instead of telling the chairman to correct his report and present a report to the House in accord with the evidence, he apparently advised him to make no report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I never saw the chairman until last evening, and the result of my conversation with him was that the matter was one for the committee to take up and not the House.

Mr. BARKER. Whether a conference or a consultation——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I said I had no conference with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARKER. Probably it was with somebody else, and I do not care so much about that. The other point made is that this is not a question of privilege. Why the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and myself withdrew from that committee because we considered that we were rendered useless by the proceedings of the majority, and we were told at the time by the other members of that committee that we had no power to legally withdraw from it. And we have been waiting for twelve days to have a proper report brought in so that we might state to the House our true position and be relieved from our duties as members of that committee. That, it seems to me, is a question of privilege. It is a question affecting myself and my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr Lennox). We consider that we were fully justified in withdrawing from that committee, but we are not able to get a formal, legal, discharge because there is apparently a deliberate design not to report and thus prevent our bringing up the question. If that be not a question of privilege, I do not know what is. The committee have suddenly become very slow in making their reports. Prior to our withdrawal we had reports from that committee, some two or three of them; but since we retired, we have not had a word. The committee, I am told, have engaged another counsel After we left, they passed a resolution nominating a certain counsel to prosecute this inquiry against the government. These four supporters of the government, who were alone on that committee, carried a resolution to appoint a counsel to conduct the prosecution against their own friends. That gentleman refused and I am told they then appointed another counsel, and all this is done without a word to this House. I appeal, Mr. Speaker, to your sense of fair play whether that is treating the House properly. Does the right hon. gentleman think it is right or proper that these gentlemen, a section of the committee, should appoint counsel, and after the one they first called on refused to accept a retainer that then they should appoint another, and this House be given no opportunity to know anything about it for twelve days afterwards.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Both my hon. friends opposite know very well that it is entirely out of order to discuss the proceedings of any committee before that committee has reported. I do not think it is necessary, for the purpose of this discussion, to go into the proceedings of that committee. Both my hon. friends have been in the unfortunate position, ever since this matter came up this year, of looking for a grievance and trying very hard to find one, and when they could not find a grievance, they invented one. They now complain because the com-

mittee sits every day and they do not attend its meetings. It is unfortunate that the committee should have to do its work without the assistance of these hon. gentlemen, but that is not the fault of the committee. The committee is bound to carry out the mandate of this House. This House directed it to proceed with an inquiry into this matter and the committee is endeavouring to do that—that is the members of it who are attempting to carry out their duties. But these hon. gentlemen opposite have refused to carry out the instructions of this House and they do this without the permission of this House. If they do not want to carry out the instructions of this House, they should have applied to the House, through you, Mr. Speaker, to be relieved of the task assigned to them. My hon. friends are aching for an opportunity to come before this House and have a debate but they have not taken the proper way. They know that they are in contempt of the House by their refusal to attend the meetings of the committee. They know that they should by resolution have asked the permission of the House to withdraw from the committee and be relieved of the duties which they had undertaken to do. As regards the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), he knows that it was purely a catch motion. Unfortunately for him, he did not read it over himself. The proceedings of the committee, which are in his own possession, show that he has given three different versions of what he wanted the committee to do. First he moved that the proceedings of the committee and the evidence should be printed and reported to the House from day to day. As was pointed out, that could not, as a matter of fact be done. He knew very well, when he made the motion, that it could not be carried into effect. The chairman said that the committee would be required to be empowered by the House to have that done. Whereupon the hon. gentleman gave another and a different version of his motion. He said that his motion was not that the proceedings be reported to the House, but that the evidence be printed and reported from day to day. So that he gave a second version of what he meant and ultimately there appeared in the minutes a third statement. Then the clerk of the committee prepared the report, so that we have four versions of what the hon. gentleman wants to have done. Apparently the hon. gentleman did not know what he wanted.

Mr. STAPLES. Was the motion not in writing?

Mr. MACDONALD. He was careful not to read the motion, if it was in writing.

Mr. LENNOX. I did read it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am reading from the stenographic report of the proceedings which is also in the hon. gentleman's hands. According to that report the hon. gentleman gave two different versions of his motion, and on being interrogated the second time, he narrowed his request down so as to mean simply that the evidence be reported to the House from day to day, which is always done, when it is printed. My hon. friend knows that up to date the committee had not been able to get from the printers a single piece of printed evidence.

Mr. LENNOX. There are five separate volumes of evidence actually printed, and I have them in my possession.

Mr. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend has got them, I have not got them, as a member of the committee. Here are my hon. friends lamenting about the great lack of opportunity they have had to do things, and they have got something which I, as a member of the committee, have not got. These gentlemen run away from their duty to attend the committee, and now they come here and give different versions of the proceedings. They refuse to perform their duties, and yet they come here and make complaints of this kind. I say my hon. friend has been playing the baby act in this business from the beginning, his attitude here is playing the baby again today. The evidence here to which he refers shows that. My hon. friend did not manfully and above-board stand up and make the motion that he is trying to show should be presented in this House. But the motion he did make was one which no one had any objection to, that is the one which was reported to the House, that the evidence should be printed and reported to the House day by day. Now my hon. friend from Hamilton alleges that some high principle is being subverted, and, therefore, his conscience would not permit him to attend this committee and take part in its deliberations. All I can say is that the hon. member for Hamilton will search in vain the history of this parliament, or of any colonial parliament, or the English parliament, for any precedent where the minority of a committee were given the control of the appointment of the counsel to control the proceedings. The assertion of this principle, which is made by my hon. friends for the first time in the history of this country, is simply put forward by them to enable them to find a grievance which did not exist, and to afford them an opportunity of making an exit from the committee for other reasons than the reasons they have given.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). I do not understand that this is the proper

time to discuss our reasons for leaving that committee, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) just now began to discuss them. The time will come when it will be proper to discuss our reasons, and then we shall be fully prepared to meet the statements made by that hon. gentleman, or any other member of that committee. Early last week the attention of this House was called to the fact that the report presented on the 22nd of February was not accurate, and on that occasion it was admitted by all parties concerned, that it was not accurate. Now the hon. member for Pictou, sitting as a member of that committee, knows full well that the motion made by my hon. friend from Simcoe was in writing.

Mr. MACDONALD. Not at all.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, it was.

Mr. MACDONALD. It may be he suppressed it; I never saw it.

Mr. CROTHERS. The member for Pictou was sitting at the table, the motion was put in in writing, it was read by the chairman of the committee, and carried in the presence of the member for Pictou.

Mr. MACDONALD. The records do not show it.

Mr. CROTHERS. I have the records here, and they do show it, on page 8 of this report. I may say, in passing, that a copy of this report as printed from day to day, is sent through the post office to each member of that committee, and it is remarkable that my hon. friend from Pictou has not received a copy of it from day to day, as the rest of us have. On page 8 of the report it is recorded that a motion was made by my hon. friend from Simcoe in these words:

Mr. Lennox moved that the committee recommend that their proceedings, and the evidence taken by them, be printed, and reported to the House from day to day, which was agreed to.

I repeat that the motion was in writing, it was read by the chairman of the committee, who declared it was carried, no one dissenting.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Allow me to interrupt the hon. member. He probably does not remember that the motion was not read by the chairman at all. There was a motion read by the chairman, but I cannot remember whether it was written or not. But I know a motion was made, and the chairman said simply: 'You have heard the motion; are you in favour of it?'

Mr. CROTHERS. My hon. friend, the chairman of the committee, having made a statement, of course it would be improper for me to contradict it; I am bound under the rules of the House to accept it. But I have stated what occurred. The House has heard his statement and it has heard mine, and I am in the judgment of the House. However, this matter was before this House early last week. My hon. friend, who is the chairman of that committee, and my hon. friend from Pictou, who is a member of it, have had an opportunity of ascertaining since whether that motion was in writing or not, and of examining the contents of it, if it was in writing. I have no doubt whatever that one of two things happened: If they have forgotten the contents of that motion, I have no doubt they have since examined it in the clerk's hands, and know what it contains; or else they did not find it necessary to examine it because they knew its contents without examining it. The question is as to whether the report made by the chairman of that committee was an accurate report; that is a very serious matter. It is admitted now that it was inaccurate. The Prime Minister says that because that report went through this House, as such reports generally do, without any opportunity of reading them, without half the members of the House hearing them, therefore we are bound by it for all time to come. My hon. friends, including the Prime Minister, knew early last week that the report presented to this House on the 22nd of February was an inaccurate report. Their attention was called to the fact that the motion of the committee required that the proceedings should be, not only printed, but reported to this House day by day, they found that out early last week, if they had overlooked it before. The question naturally arises why have they not, since their attention was called to it, since they admit that the motion carried in the committee required them to report from day to day — why have they not since reported from day to day? We have had the spectacle this afternoon of my hon. friend from Simcoe challenging the chairman of that committee to say whether or not he had had any hand in mutilating that report, and we find the chairman of the committee sitting tight. Further, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, when charged this afternoon with having been consulted by the chairman of that committee, said that he had not seen the chairman until last night, but he did not deny that he had seen other members of that committee. The Prime Minister knew early last week that the report brought into this House on the 22nd of February was an inaccurate one, because the charge was made here in his presence and admitted, all round. So the Prime Minister, since early last week, has known that it was the duty of this committee to report to this House from day to day.

Knowing that, we have the result that the report has not been made from day to

day. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us yesterday that nobody controlled this House——

Mr. FIELDING. Hear, hear.

Mr. CROTHERS. That we were a free parliament. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have sat in this House long enough to know that such is not the case. I have seen the Prime Minister hold up his finger time after time, and his followers obey. Every member of this House knows that all the First Minister required to do, when he ascertained that the report presented to this House was inaccurate, admittedly so, was to say to the chairman of the committee: It is your duty, since your attention has been called to it, since it was the instruction of the committee, according to the resolution of the hon. member for Simcoe, to report from day to day, even though you misapprehended it, even though you were labouring under a mistake even though you did not realize at the time that the motion carried, that it required you not only to print, but report the proceedings from day to day, to report to the House from day to day as instructed by the resolution. It is clearly your duty not only to the members of the committee, but to parliament. But, notwithstanding what was said by the hon. Minister of Finance, it is evident that the Prime Minister does control this House, and the committees of this House when he desires to do so. He has been consulted by members of the committee. Why is it that we have not had reports presented, in order to give the three gentlemen who retired from that committee an opportunity of explaining why they retired? I want to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect to get an opportunity, on the report of this committee, for these three gentlemen to explain the reasons why they left that committee, and I will sit down to give the right hon. gentleman an opportunity to answer that question. The Prime Minister does not propose to answer that question. In the face of these facts, when I give him the opportunity to say whether or not this House is to have the resolution moved by my hon. friend from South Simcoe carried into effect, he sits tight to his seat. He knows that would permit us to bring the report into this House to-morrow, and if the report is brought to this House, and laid on the table, these three members of the committee who retired will have an opportunity in the face of this House, and country to make their statement as to why they retired. I ask the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) when that opportunity will be afforded?

Mr. MACDONALD. Why did you not take it before?

Mr. CROTHERS. We might have put a notice of motion on the order paper, but it would not have been reached until the end of the session, and my hon. friend knows that very well. Can he suggest any reason why this report is not brought down, if it be not to deprive us of the opportunity of giving the people of this country the reason why these three gentlemen left the committee? I repeat the time will come. We will take good care that the members of this House, and the people of this country know just why we retired from that committee, and I have no doubt whatever that when these reasons are given, they will meet with the approbation of every intelligent member of this House, and of the good citizens of this country.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), a few minutes ago, quoted a statement of mine to the effect that the clerk had prepared the report. I want it understood that I do not wish to shield myself behind anybody. I take the responsibility of my acts as chairman of the committee, and I know that if the clerk made a mistake I should have to take the responsibility myself. He is an intelligent and efficient man, and it was my duty if an error was made to see that it was corrected. Some insinuations have been made with regard to myself, but if there is an hon. gentleman in this House who knows that these insinuations are false it is the hon. member for South Simcoe. He will remember, and he will not deny that when that motion was put by himself —perhaps some members of the committee may not recall it—it was at the very last minute when the committee was rising, and everybody was on his feet. Then, the hon. member for South Simcoe submitted the motion. I cannot remember whether it was in writing or not, but I know he read or recited it. Nobody paid any attention to it, but this dialogue passed between the chairman and the member for South Simcoe.

Mr. LENNOX. I move that our proceedings and the evidence be printed and reported to the House day by day.

The CHAIRMAN. Reported to the House day by day, that means at different times.

Perhaps it was not couched in very intelligible or elegant English, but everybody must know that when the chairman said that he evidently meant that it was almost impossible to report day by day, and that he must have meant that it should be reported from time to time.

Mr. LENNOX. As a matter of fact we cannot get it done, but that is the way the motion reads.

What does that mean? The hon. member for South Simcoe evidently meant that it

was impossible for the committee to have that done because it would impose too much of a hardship on the reporters. We could not have the report made every day, and he simply said: Well, that is the motion as it reads, but we will not insist on it being acted upon. That must be the understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. I shall have to be empowered by the House to have it done.

Mr. LENNOX. My motion is that the evidence be printed and reported to the House day by day.

Mr. MACDONALD. The evidence only.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The evidence only. Evidently the hon. member for South Simcoe knew that it was impossible. The insinuation is made that I have been guilty of presenting a false report. It is not my habit to do anything false, and I am always prepared to take the responsibility for my actions. The report in fact, was not presented to myself. I am sorry to say that I was obliged to leave the city, I did not stay to present the report, and it was presented by my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke). He evidently did not read the report. He presented it just as it had been written, and he knew nothing more about it than the hon. member for South Simcoe, or the hon. member for Hamilton. But, where is the great harm after all? I know that the House is jealous of its privileges. If a motion is carried directing that a certain course be taken I know that the House will insist upon its directions being carried out. But, where is the harm? My hon. friends had the report before we had it ourselves. They had the report of the committee printed before we had it, and the committee is open to everybody. What interest had I to make a false report, or to order the clerk, which he would not have done, to change the wording of the report? I think it is all nonsense to insinuate that we had an interest in withholding the evidence. The final report will be made, and it will contain the evidence, and other reports will be made before that time. But suppose we did not, when the final report comes the evidence will be put on the table and an opportunity will be given to every member of this House to study it. For instance, the Hodgins report was laid on the table to give an opportunity to every member to study it, and the motion to have it adopted was not made until a couple of weeks after the presentation of the report. I know that if the motion was properly put, and that it was understood it was to be acted upon, then it was the duty of the chairman to have the report made accordingly. I admit that. But, I did not think at the time—I was of the same mind as the hon. member for Simcoe—I did not think it could be done as he himself said, and then probably the clerk, after having heard that conversation, prepared the report which was not examined by me, and which was presented to the House, and accepted by the House. Of course we cannot do anything about it now until another report is made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask my hon. friend where the difficulty would arise in carrying out the recommendation would it be in the printing of the evidence?

Mr. GEOFFRION. Before that report was made I communicated with the reporters and they said it would be very difficult for them even with two sessions a day, and now that we are trying to get through as quickly as possible and trying to have three sessions a day they said it would be very hard to have the report from day to day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was that after the motion was passed?

Mr. GEOFFRION. It was before that when I had a conversation with the reporters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How did that arise when the motion had not then been presented?

Mr. GEOFFRION. It was in the general course of the proceedings of the committee. When there was a question of having another session in the afternoon the reporters said it was very doubtful if they could manage to have the whole thing reported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Printed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Prepared.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) whether he denies that there has been a change in the recommendation. I do not understand that my hon. friend denies that; I do not understand the Prime Minister denies it, because we have the papers here to show exactly what took place. The recommendation of the committee was in these words:

Mr. Lennox moved that the committee recommend that their proceedings and the evidence taken by them be printed and reported to the House from day to day.

That motion was agreed to, but the report which is made to the House omitted the important words:

'and reported to the House.'

There has obviously been a change. My hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) does not deny there has been a change. Was that change a mistake or was it intentional?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I have already said it could not be intentional. That is an

insinuation that I had ordered the clerk to report differently from the motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not making an insinuation. I am asking a very plain question.

Mr. GEOFFRION. There was no intention at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then it was not intentional and was a mistake?

Mr. GEOFFRION. It must be a mistake.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then if it was a mistake why is it that my hon. friend when he had his attention directed to that mistake on Friday last has not taken steps to correct it?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I have answered that. I said that I was obliged to leave the city, that I was absent, and that it was only last night I could look into the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say he will take the first opportunity of correcting it?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I will take the first opportunity to see what can be done, and if anything should be remedied, it will be remedied as it should be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend take the position that knowing there was a mistake—because he has admitted that—and declaring that that change was not intentional, does he now take the position that he will not correct it?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I say that it is for the committee, and that my hon. friends on the other side, if they wish, can attend——

Mr. LENNOX. You know we cannot.

Mr. GEOFFRION. We will be very glad to see them, and we will discuss the matter and come to a conclusion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) places himself in a very unfortunate position by the way in which he evades a question which can only be answered in one way if there is good faith in this matter. And the very best evidence that there is not good faith in it is to be found in some of the statements which have been made in the House to-day. The right hon. the Prime Minister had this matter brought to his attention; he introduces a great many 'ifs' and qualifications—'if there was a mistake,' he said. Is he satisfied now that he has it out of the mouth of the chairman of the committee that there was a mistake? Will he put in any more 'ifs' in connection with the change in that report? The right hon. gentleman is responsible for fair dealing in this House, and for the decency and dignity of the proceedings of parliament, and does he think that it conduces to the decency and dignity of this parliament that there should be an intentional change of this kind? I am aware that any such intention has been denied. Well, Sir, does the right hon. gentleman think it conduces to the decency and dignity of this parliament that when a mistake has been pointed out—a mistake vitally affecting the rights of certain hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—that he should resort to the kind of argument which I was sorry to hear from his lips to-day. There was admittedly a mistake—

Mr. GEOFFRION. Will my hon. friend allow me. I did not admit there was a mistake; I said if there was a mistake, after discussing it in the committee I would act accordingly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend assert that the recommendation which passed that committee was reported in its terms to this House? Did not the hon. gentleman, not ten minutes ago, admit to me that there had been a change made in that report from the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. GEOFFRION. No, I did not admit it. I could not make an admission that there was a change made in that report because I do not know of any change.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, my hon. friends seem to be remarkably obtuse, but I will read again the recommendation as it passed the committee:

> Mr. Lennox moved that the committee recommend that their proceedings and the evidence taken by them be printed and reported to the House from day to day.

That was agreed to. That is found in the official report of that committee and it is borne out by the stenographic report, because at page 39 of the proceedings on the 22nd of February I find this:

> Mr. LENNOX. I move that our proceedings and the evidence be printed and reported to the House day by day.

Therefore the stenographic report and the report of the committee both agree. It is perfectly true that further down Mr. Lennox is reported as saying:

> My motion is that the evidence be printed and reported to the House from day to day.

Every hon. gentleman knows that the stenographic report of the proceedings in the committee bears the same relation to the record of the committee as signed by the clerk, that the 'Hansard' report bears to the record of this House as kept by the clerk of the House, and the records of the House as taken by the clerk of the House would always be taken of course as a true record of the proceedings. Well, that is

the way in which the motion passed, and it was reported to this House in this way:

Your committee recommends that their proceedings and any evidence taken by them be printed from day to day.

Does my hon. friend deny that the omission of the words 'and reported to the House' is a change? Does he deny it, or does he affirm it?

Mr. GEOFFRION. What I said was that I did not know whether there was any mistake. I said that I had inquired and tried to find the original motion to see if it was as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) said. It may read 'that the evidence be printed and reported to the House from day to day,' or it may read 'that the evidence be printed from day to day.' I cannot tell until I see the original motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am talking about the report, about which there is no doubt whatever, and I ask the hon. gentleman to state whether the omission of the important words to which I have alluded constitutes a change. My hon. friend places himself in a peculiar position before this House when he declines to answer. I would be inclined to think that if he is not capable of determining whether or not the omission of those words constitutes a change, it would be well for him to resign the chairmanship of that committee, because I think we should have some gentleman at the head of that committee who would know and be able to state in a straight-forward way in this House whether the omission of those important words constitutes a change. I think it is high time that we had as chairman of this committee an hon. gentleman who would be in a position to say yes or no, without equivocation or deliberation. There is no need of arguing it. I thought my hon. friend would have been manly enough to say at once that it was a change, and I intended to follow that up by asking him whether that change was due to a mistake or was intentional. I propose to ask him once more, if he takes the ground that it was a mistake, why he has not seen fit to correct that mistake during the week that has elapsed since it was brought to his attention? If he was too busy to devote the necessary time to redress that mistake, why did not the Prime Minister, or some other member of the committee, take it upon himself to redress that wrong and correct that mistake? I think, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most extraordinary instances that has ever occurred in the history of parliament, within my recollection. I cannot account for it. I do not see any occasion for it. Can this be due to a desire that three members of that committee on this side of the House should be silenced? If that is so, it seems to me that it is an extremely awkward and undignified method to adopt for that purpose. I would suppose there was not such party gain as to justify that method. My right hon. friend says he has told the chairman of the committee that this is a matter for the committee. It is not only a matter for the committee, but it is also a matter for him, as the guardian of the dignity of this House, and as one whose position demands that he shall see that such things are done in order, and that nothing that can be regarded as discreditable conduct on the part of any committee of the House shall be brought to the attention of the House without some effort being made to redress it. I am sorry that the Prime Minister has made no such effort. I repeat again that it must have been either a mistake or intentional. I am not charging that it was intentional, but I do say that it is beyond question that a change was made in that report. You have only to read the record of the committee and the record of this parliament to know that, and I say that it was the bounden duty of the chairman of that committee as an honest man, and it was also the bounden duty of the Prime Minister, as the guardian of the dignity of this parliament, to see that that mistake was corrected, and that it was made good at the earliest possible moment after it was brought to their attention.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope that my hon. friend will not shed any tears over my delinquencies in this matter or any other matter. I value very much the attention which he gives me. He wants to keep me right, which is his duty and privilege; but I may say that I am not the victim of the false heroics which he has directed to me this afternoon. What am I to do in this matter? My hon. friend the leader of the opposition and my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) do me too much honour when they say that I am the dictator of this House. I am but a humble member of this House. I do not claim to have any other power or right here than any other member of this House. It happens that I have responsible duties to perform, and I try to perform them. But in this matter, I ask my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, what am I to do?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. See that the mistake is corrected.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know what relations my hon. friend has with the members of the committee who represent the minority in this House. Perhaps he can dictate to them; but I cannot dictate to those members of the committee who represent the majority of this House. They would resent, and properly resent, any attempt of mine to dictate to them what they should do. When this matter was brought to my attention yesterday, I told them very plainly what my mind was—that it was a matter for the committee to look into, to find out whether or not there had been an

incorrect report made to the House. This is the only thing to do. I am sorry that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has dealt with my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), the chairman of the committee, in the way he has done. My hon. friend had no more to do, I am sure, with the preparation of that report than the leader of the opposition himself. He simply signed it as any other man would have done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I made no statement to the contrary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well, then, if the mistake has not been made by the chairman of the committee, but by some one else, is not the natural course and the common sense course simply to bring it before the committee?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my right hon. friend tell me what question there is about the report of the committee?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I look at this matter from an altogether different point of view from that of my hon. friend. He has discussed the report of the committee; I have carefully abstained from discussing it, because it is not before this House.

Mr. LENNOX. If the right hon. gentleman will look at page 5 of vol. I of the proceedings of the Lumsden Commission, he will find that not only was there a second report, on the 22nd of February of the proceedings issued down to that date, but a subsequent report, which brings us down to the 23rd of February; so that so far as these are concerned, we have the right today to discuss this matter. My right hon. friend was probably not aware of that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then I am sorry my hon. friend has not brought it in such a shape that we can discuss it, but has brought it up simply as a matter of privilege. I abstained from discussing what took place before the committee. I am right there, and whether the matter has been rectified by the committee or not, it will then be time for it to come here. If the alleged error in the report has not been rectified, it is by the fault of my hon. friend. Why did he give up his duties? And to crown all that, my hon. friend suggests that the chairman of the committee, my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) should also resign. Resignation after resignation. If an injustice has been done to my hon. friend, I am sure the chairman will see it is corrected.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister says he is not a dictator. He is a dictator whenever he wants to be, but whenever it suits him to pose as a——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister spoke twice.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has spoken, he cannot speak again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister spoke again.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, my hon. friend is all wrong.

Mr. LENNOX. I am very much pleased that we have got as much light on this matter as we have. If the government are satisfied to leave the matter in this way, I do not know that the opposition have from a party standpoint any great reason to complain. The leader of the government suggested to the House a little while ago that I had no right to bring this matter up as a matter of privilege. I have great respect for the views of the First Minister upon a question of this kind, a question of procedure, but I beg to assert that I have ample justification for bringing it up as a matter of privilege because the order of the committee, the solemn resolution of the committee passed on February 22 last, has not been carried out, and by reason of that, three members of the committee are prevented from exercising those rights which as members they have a right to exercise. That is one substantial ground of privilege, and the other ground is that when the hon. the chairman of the committee spoke the other day he made assertions which, as I have pointed out, were not justified; errors I admit, if you like, at all events, statements which were not justified, saying for instance, that the members of the committee had assented subsequently to the handing in of the report in the form in which it was presented to the House. We have a right to speak of this matter as a question of privilege, and I have said on that branch of it all I desire to say. I have given a concise unbroken record of what took place, and I am content to leave it there. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), whose adroitness is marvellous—he is a good second to the Prime Minister in that regard—endeavoured to draw us away a little from the point in discussion, and he submitted that three members of this committee were guilty of contempt, were in contempt of the House, by reason of the action they had taken. I will admit that if you like, I am not particular. If the hon. gentleman thinks that way, he has his remedy, and I would like to have it fought out on the floor of the House. But I would rather be in contempt in this House than be in contempt before the people, and that is what the other members of this committee will be in if they persist in their refusal to comply with the order of that committee regularly passed. I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman in

an argument which did not address itself to the point at issue, but I may say I am not daunted by the fact that he suggested that I am—I do not think he coupled my associates in that regard, so I exonerate them—but he says that I am playing the baby act. I would rather be playing the baby act than some acts I have known my hon. friend to play. He says that history affords no parallel for the action of the minority of the committee in demanding or asking to have the right to name the second counsel, the government already having one. I shall discuss that point and give our authority when the matter comes up properly in the House. But what is more important is that we should pay a moment's attention to the record. First, in reference to what has been read to the House on page 39. I referred to that in bringing the matter before the House a few moments ago. The stenographic report says:

I move that our proceedings and the evidence be printed and reported to the House day by day.

The CHAIRMAN. Reported to the House day by day. That means at different times.

I am reported to have said:

As a matter of fact we cannot get it done, but that is the way the motion reads.

This is almost correct, but not absolutely so. What I did say was: As a matter of fact it cannot get the printing done. But that does not affect the motion in any way. We were to have the report to the House from day to day and we have the evidence as rapidly as it can be printed, and so it was understood by the committee at that time. The only difference is that instead of putting the words 'the printing,' they put the word 'it.' Then I gave a summary of what I meant, wishing to impress on the committee, as I did at that time. that the material point was that it should be reported to the House from day to day. I went on:

My motion is that the evidence be printed and reported to the House day by day.

So that matter was impressed on the committee. What was the other record? I have pointed out to the Prime Minister that the proceedings are reported to us down to February 23. In other words, we have the reports of the committee that cover the matter that we have been discussing to-day, but we have not the report of the committee that covers the matter of the resignation of the three members, and that is what they do not want us to have. It is important, perhaps, that we should look again at the order of events. I moved the resolution that has already been read once or twice. At this point a very peculiar suggestion is made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) and also echoed by the chairman. It may have more significance than we think. If I understand the hon. member for Pictou, he suggests that my motion may not now be in the committee room. I do not know anything about that, perhaps my hon. friend knows more about it than I do. This is followed up by the chairman of the committee, and he hints that possibly my motion is not now on record in the committee. I do not know anything about that, but I do know this, that I presented it, that I read it, that I handed it to the chairman, and that I left it with the chairman and left it with the committee. That is the end of my responsibility there, and if the motion is not there now, as is pretty broadly suggested, it only means, Mr. Speaker, that there is another incident to be explained. But it is only right that I should point out that not only was my motion read in the form:

Mr. Lennox moved that the committee recommend that their proceedings and the evidence taken by them be printed and reported from day to day, which was agreed to.

Not only that, but in the next day's proceedings, which have also been reported to this House, we have this:

Wednesday, Feb. 3, 1910.

The committee met at 11 a.m. Present Messrs. Geoffrion, chairman; Macdonald, Clarke (Essex), Wilson (Laval), Barker, Lennox and Crothers. The committee appointed R. C. Smith, K.C., counsel for the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners. The minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

So that we had the resolution again in committee and again brought to the attention of the chairman that this resolution had been passed the day before, providing that its proceedings should be reported to the House from day to day. That being so, it does not come with very good grace from the right hon. the leader of this House to take the position he does. He is responsible for the conduct of this House and it is his duty to suggest to the committee he appoints that at least fair play should be meted out to all the members of that committee and the public. He must know that there can be no question whatever as to what took place in the committee. He cannot doubt that the committee did solemnly determine that its proceedings should be reported to the House from day to day. He must know, as an experienced parliamentarian, that the dearest right which the minority on a committee possesses is to have the proceedings reported from day to day, because that furnishes the only means for an appeal to the House against the majority. He does know that a serious injustice

has been done to the minority of that committee. He does know that the public is waiting to hear whether or not the minority on that committee were justified in their action or whether a system has been pursued which made it impossible for that minority to continue on that committee. The minority were not on the committee for the purpose of whitewashing the administration. The right hon. gentleman knows all that, and he knows that the minority would be belittling themselves were they to go back and ask the majority to ratify this mistake. He knows that the proper place to ventilate this wrong is, not in that committee room, but in the open, before the public, in the House of Commons. I have brought the matter to his attention and make no apology for having done so. I have done simply what was my duty and I will continue to press this matter, let the Prime Minister take what attitude he likes. I make the demand that this mistake or wrong, which ever you like to call it, shall be rectified now; and if my demand be not granted, I will consider it my duty to bring the matter up again from time to time. What is the object of preventing a rectification of this error or wrong-doing? Is it because the Prime Minister and his following desire that the minority on that committee shall be gagged and shall not have the right to tell this House why they were compelled to leave that committee? Will the right hon. gentleman get up now and say that, regardless of the report of the committee, he will allow us to make our statement to the House to-morrow? If he will do that, I shall not argue any more; if he will do that, I venture to say it will not on his part be good politics or wise administration.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I merely want to say a few words on this matter. We have heard from a lawyer and I wish simply to speak as a layman. This matter, particularly in so far as it concerns the National Transcontinental railway, is one in which the public take great interest, and I may not at all be surprised at the anxiety of the right hon. the leader of the government to prevent a discussion of it. When the question of privilege was raised, a little while ago, he objected to any further discussion at that particular time, and had the opportunity not been given on the motion to go into Supply, we would have been debarred from discussing it at all. The right hon. gentleman knows that the question of privilege applies to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) as well as to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), yet he would not allow the hon. member for Hamilton to explain his position. The right hon. gentleman has told us that he does not control this House, but no sooner does he cry out 'order' than he is echoed by every hon. member at his back. If he had told the members behind him that they could vote as they wished on the Naval Bill, I believe the hon. gentleman would have found himself obliged to go into opposition. At the time when the right hon. the Prime Minister brought in his motion for a special committee, we on this side wanted to have an investigation into all the circumstances in order that we might ascertain whether the contractors had been paid solid rock prices for loose rock, but the right hon. gentleman carefully worded his motion so that it did not give the committee the right to investigate into this. His motion simply read that a special committee of five members, to be named hereafter, be appointed to investigate the charges made by Mr. Lumsden against a portion of the engineering staff. Mr. Lumsden, in his letters, made charges against parties on the railway, and claimed the contractors had been paid much more than they should have been. But the Prime Minister takes a similar course to that he took in reference to the steamer 'Arctic'. At that time he took very good care to limit the investigation so that we could not go into it as we desired. But fortunately, as we proceeded in the investigation, we were able to show that a great deal of wrong had been done, and the Prime Minister had to admit afterwards that we were absolutely right. Now I do not know what is going on in this committee. I have not been at the committee, and one reason is that if I had gone in there and asked a question, I would simply have been ruled out of order. But I read in the newspapers what is going on, I am only referring to what I have seen in the newspapers, and if I can get the correct meaning of what is reported, these four gentlemen who are members of that committee took good care that the gentleman appointed as counsel to represent the people, was practically an official of this government. Now, is that the right kind of a gentleman to appoint to look after the interests of the people? That gentleman is practically a paid official of this government, and he is going to do everything in his power to save this government from trouble. Why, Sir, the Prime Minister remembers when he sat in this House as leader of the opposition, and when charges were made against a member of the Conservative party who were in power, the opposition were allowed the privilege of appointing a solicitor to look after the interests of the public, and Sir John Thompson, who was then Prime Minister, allowed them to choose their own counsel and

allowed the opposition to examine all the records.

Mr. MACDONALD. What case is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. J. D. REID. I refer to the Connolly and McGreevy case.

Mr. MACDONALD. The records of the department show that nothing of the kind occurred. Mr. Tarte brought his own counsel, Mr. Geoffrion, who conducted the matter throughout. Mr. Tarte's lawyer was counsel for the prosecution.

Mr. J. D. REID. What about Mr. Osler?

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Osler and Mr. Henry represented the Public Works Department.

Mr. J. D. REID. They were appointed at the request of the opposition.

Mr. MACDONALD. Let the hon. gentleman go to the records and refresh his recollection.

Mr. J. D. REID. The records show that it was at the request of the member who made the charges, and that member was advised by the Prime Minister, and his party to do so. These are the facts, as I remember them, without looking them up. But an hon. gentleman tells me now that he has looked them up, and that my statement is correct. The Prime Minister knows at that time he was in conference all the time with the gentleman who made those charges, and was advising him what to do, and he knows that that gentleman was carrying out his wishes. He must also admit that Sir John Thompson was willing to give him all the assistance he wanted. Now I ask the Prime Minister if his course in this matter at all compares with the course of Sir John Thompson in the Connolly and McGreevy matter? I think there is no comparison whatever. The Prime Minister must admit that in every case where we bring something before the House, the whole object of the government and their supporters is to try and prevent us from getting at the facts. We frequently see the same thing occurring in the Public Accounts Committee. It is a strange thing that in the matter of these charges, some of the gravest that have ever come before the House, the Prime Minister appoints the hon. member for Verchères, one of his supporters, as chairman of that committee, and he remembers well that the chairman of this committee was the same gentleman whose conduct was complained of in the Public Accounts Committee. The whole thing, to my mind, is simply a put up job, or at least, is an effort to try to squelch the investigation so that we may not be able to get out the facts.

Now in regard to this National Transcontinental railway, I have been over a part of it myself, and when I went along the line I heard it said that part of this work had been put in as rock when, so far as I could judge, it was only sand. I do not know whether that was the case, but if we had a fair opportunity to investigate, we could find out whether that was the fact. Now when Mr. Lumsden's letters were made public, it was surely the duty of the Prime Minister to throw open the books and records, and give the opposition a chance to find out whether there was any truth in the charges. It is absolutely necessary, if the public interest is to be protected, that we should have that opportunity. In England, when investigations are being carried on by the Public Accounts Committee, and whenever any charge is made, the government offer to appoint a member of the opposition as chairman of the committee in order to insure a fair inquiry. I must say that when the Conservative party were in power every opportunity was given to the opposition to ascertain the facts in relation to any charge that was made, but since this government have come to power — the Prime Minister need not smile, because he knows that every word I am saying is true. He knows well enough that in the Public Accounts Committee he picked out four of the ablest lawyers on his side, and each one had his own part assigned to him to stand up and try and block proceedings and prevent anything from coming out. If I were allowed to state what some of his supporters sitting behind him have said about the rascality that is going on in some of these departments, it would shock, I think, even the Prime Minister, and I think he would have to admit that it is a pretty serious affair. But of course hon. gentlemen opposite say: We have got to vote these things through, and if we don't we shall be voting want of confidence in the Prime Minister, even though we were to lose our seats in consequence; so we will swallow the whole thing, even to a saw-dust wharf or something of that kind.

Now, as to the evidence before this committee, the Prime Minister must have read where, in one place, it shows a motion to have been made, and now the chairman makes a different report. When this discussion arose I thought that the right hon. Prime Minister would have stood up and said: If this thing is wrong I shall instruct the committee to at once look into the report and see that it is corrected. But the right hon. gentleman did not want to do that, because, if that report had come down, we could have discussed the whole thing, and it would have been shown why these three gentlemen had retired. The Prime Minister admits that is the reason why he does not want the report to come down. He nods his head. He wants the whole in-

vestigation to be complete before he will allow any discussion. The investigation is being carried on simply by four of his followers, who must do what he says, and by a solicitor from Montreal, a great supporter of the right hon. gentleman, and who will do anything to carry out his wishes, and prevent the government from getting into trouble. These four gentlemen have employed as the solicitor for the people practically another official of this government to look after their interests, and who knows that if he were instrumental in bringing in a report that would censure, or put the government out of power, he would lose his position. Under those circumstances, is it reasonable to expect that justice will be done in the interests of the people? I have just been informed that practically this public official has drawn about $30,000 from this government since they came into power. I would appeal to any man in this country, be he Liberal or Conservative, to say whether we can reasonably expect that man to do what is right in the interests of the people; or is it reasonable to expect that if there was any way that he could help this government he would not do so? I do not believe that the Prime Minister has done what is right and square in the interests of the people in allowing the committee to go on as he has done with four of his own followers, four lawvers, some of whom have been blockers in other investigations, or in other committees of this kind just as they have been on this committee. Therefore I say that justice has not been done on those other committees, and I believe that in this case justice will not be done in such a way as the people have a right to expect.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think it will be acknowledged by every member of the House that the object in appointing this committee, or what should have been the object, was, in the first place, to investigate the charges that were made that there has been over-classification on the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I think we should keep that thoroughly in mind when we consider the result of the action that has been taken by some person in changing, or mutilating the report as presented, whether that change was made through inadvertance, or mistake, or otherwise. It is quite clear at any rate to the members on this side of the House that the motion made by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was in writing, and it is quite clear that in that motion there was a provision that the proceedings and evidence should be printed by the committee, and reported to this House from day to day. That being the case, it was the bounden duty of the committee, and all those under the authority of the committee, to print and report the evidence from day to day. Then it would be only fair to assume that every member of this House would be expecting that the proceedings and the evidence would be reported from day to day. At once, upon a member finding that that was not being done it would be reasonable to expect him to go and ask how it was that the order of the committee was not being carried out. That is as the matter strikes me. Then, upon the matter being brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from South Simcoe again only a week ago it would be natural to expect that the error would have been corrected, but that has not been done, and the matter has been allowed to go on from that time until the present day. That makes it all the more inexcusable, and one would be almost tempted to suggest that there was something of intention in regard to the error that was made in the report. I happened to be sitting in the room at the time my hon. friend from South Simcoe made his motion, and I certainly understood, as he did, that it was intended that the evidence and proceedings should be reported and printed day by day. It is true that the statement was made by somebody that it was quite impossible, but nevertheless that was the order of the committee, and I believe that it was a case in which we did not expect the evidence and proceedings to be actually brought to the House from day to day, but it was supposed to be done as soon as it possibly could be done by the officers whose duty it is to prepare the report. But there has been absolutely nothing done in that line, and the very fact that the matter was brought to the attention of the committee in such a way would leave it in the mind of the committee that it could be done would seem to make it all the more suggestive to them when the proceedings and evidence were not reported to the House from day to day.

I noticed by the press reports that it was suggested that Mr. Wallace Nesbitt be employed as counsel on behalf of the Dominion for the purpose of investigating the accuracy of the statements made by Mr. Lumsden. These newspaper reports said that the Conservative members of the committee objected to the selection of such an eminent counsel as Mr. Nesbitt, and also that they were very greatly surprised because of that objection by reason of the fact that he was alleged to be a Conservative. I do not know the politics of Mr. Nesbitt, but I will say that I have every confidence in his ability and integrity, and I have more confidence in his integrity than I had prior to the time when his name was first mentioned, because I find that Mr. Nesbitt has upheld the dignity of his profession by saying that he will not act as counsel for the people of Canada in this matter, because the government employed him as counsel not more than two years ago, and took his opinion, and that

he gave an opinion directly contrary to the position of Mr. Lumsden.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman say that he was consulted by the government of Canada?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Perhaps not by the government of Canada, but he was employed by the contractors to give an opinion as to the interpretation of the specifications which are the subject matter of investigation before this committee. Mr. Wallace Nesbitt gave his opinion that Mr. Lumsden had made an improper interpretation of the specifications. How could you expect that Mr. Nesbitt would come forward now and endeavour to prove that the opinion which he had previously given was wrong? Therefore, I say it is to the credit of Mr. Nesbitt to say: I will not act as counsel and controvert an opinion which I have expressed, and for which I have been paid by the very contractors whose interests are adverse to those of the people and by whom I was retained as counsel. Then, the right hon. leader of the government, through his majority on that committee, and whose duty it is to protect the public interest, calls in a gentleman against whom I have not one word to say personally in any manner, shape or form, but a gentleman who has been employed by this government since 1896, and has received from the public treasury about $30,000.

He is brought here to prove that this government is guilty of the charges we have laid at their door. Is it human to expect that gentleman to come before that committee and to use the best of his endeavours and ability to prove that the very men from whom he got $30,000 have done anything wrong? I say the position is wholly inconsistent with the public interest, and I say that the three Conservative members of that committee were acting in the interests of the people of this country when they declared they would no longer sit on a committee which first proposed to employ as counsel, a gentleman who gave an opinion directly antagonistic to the interests of the country, and secondly a gentleman who has got $30,000 from the coffers of this country, and who they expect to prove that this government has been guilty of maladministration in connection with the Transatlantic railway.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the three members refuse to act on that committee on account of the employment of Mr. Chrysler?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the chairman of the committee performed his duty and reported the proceedings to the House, I would be able to answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I cannot answer your question until I know what took place in the committee.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the three members of the committee were justified in quitting the committee on account of the appointment of Mr. Chrysler. I now ask him is that the reason?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) says that they retired before it was suggested that Mr. Nesbitt should be employed I accept his explanation because he knows better than I do. I started out by saying that the Reform press of this country stated that the three members of the committee were not justified in retiring because the committee proposed to appoint a Conservative counsel on behalf of the public and were therefore very magnanimous. I say the committee was doing nothing magnanimous because they were appointing a gentleman who they knew had given an opinion in favour of the contractors right in the Hodgins inquiry, which opinion was got through the medium of the office of the Minister of Justice, Messrs. Aylesworth, Wright & Moss, of the city of Toronto.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Was it on account of the appointment of Mr. Nesbitt they retired?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am not a member of that committee and I cannot know what took place there, but if the report of that committee were allowed to come before the House these three gentlemen would have an opportunity to answer my hon. friend.

Mr. LENNOX. We will answer him.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It looks to me very much as if the report of the committee was not brought down, in order to prevent the three Conservative members from answering that question. I now make an appeal to the right hon. gentleman: Having had this matter brought to his attention to-day, and putting the most charitable construction on what has taken place, beyond all doubt there was a mistake made in that report which, if not made, would have enabled these three hon. gentlemen to rise in their places and explain to the House and to the country the reasons why they resigned from the committee; I ask the right hon. gentleman now in his place will he not use his efforts and power as Prime Minister to rectify that mistake and allow the report of that committee to be presented to the House at the earliest possible moment, so that these gentlemen may explain their action in retiring from that committee.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am not finished. I am waiting for the Prime Minister to reply.

Motion (Mr. Taylor) withdrawn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection at all to answer the question of my hon. friend, though it is becoming a practice to interrogate members on this side of the House; a right which for my part I do not recognize. But, the hon. gentleman having put his question, my answer is to tell him that there is no necessity for my interference in this matter because I am sure that the members of the committee will do what is proper and see that the minority shall have all the rights to which they are entitled. I will be glad to hear my hon. friend on that point when this matter comes up again.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I might have thought that the majority of the members of that committee would have done what is right did I not know that nearly a week ago their attention was drawn to this mistake and they have not rectified it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This matter was brought to the attention of the House on last Friday, and the chairman of the committee was not here. At the time.——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman has the right to answer a question, but he has no right to make a speech. He called me to order a moment ago, and I call him to order now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, really I have no objection—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I insist on my point of order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If you rule me out of order, Mr. Speaker, I shall of course bow to your ruling.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am giving you a dose of your own medicine.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I wanted to answer my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro), and it is no fault of mine if I cannot answer him.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. member for Pictou denied the statement that in the Tarte-McGreevy inquiry counsel for the people were appointed and paid by the government of the day.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I said, in answer to the hon. gentleman from Grenville, that the counsel which conducted the McGreevy inquiry was Mr. Geoffrion counsel for Mr. Tarte, who made the charges on his responsibility as a member of this House. I said that Mr. Osler and Mr. Henry were appointed expressly on motion of Sir John Thompson, to represent not the people but the Public Works Department, and I said that the burden of the investigation was carried by Mr. Geoffrion counsel for the complainant.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is not the hon. gentleman aware that Mr. Osler and Mr. Henry were suggested to Sir John Thompson before he made the motion.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am speaking from the records of the committee, which speaks for itself.

Mr. J. HAGGART. You would not find that fact in the records of the committee. You would simply find that Sir John Thompson moved the appointment of counsel, but the truth is that the suggestion was made by the opposition of the day.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I will explain that because I read the debate a few days ago.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. So did I.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In bringing in that report the chairman of the committee said that Mr. Tarte had appointed Mr. Geoffrion—the brother of the chairman of this committee—and he recommended that the government also pay, and the government did pay for the services of that counsel.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. And on the Lumsden committee the minority members are representing the public. You have the Transcontinental Railway Commission represented by Mr. R. C. Smith and the engineers represented by Mr. Moss, but there is nobody there representing the people of this country except Mr. Chrysler, who is a man who has drawn $30,000 from the coffers of the government since 1896.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman make any imputation on the standing and good faith and credit of Mr. Chrysler?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I have already said that I did not and I think it is rather small politics for the hon. gentleman to ask that. But I say that human nature is the same in Mr. Chrysler as in every individual in the Dominion of Canada. And I am saying that the distinction between the action of this government and the action of the previous administration is that in the one case the plaintiffs the people of Canada appointed their own

counsel, and in this case they are not allowed to. In the former case the representatives of the people had consultation with their own counsel, they produced their own evidence in accord with their own idea of the evidence, and these counsel were paid by the government of that day, but in this case we are not allowed to make the appointment of counsel and the appointment of counsel which has been made is of no benefit whatever to the minority members because they are not going to divulge to a paid advocate appointed by the government the evidence which is in their possession. I, therefore, say it is not a fair investigation, and I say that unless counsel is appointed who is nominated by the three minority members of that committee you will not have an impartial inquiry. I am not allowed to refer to the proceedings of the committee because no report has come before us, but any one who attends that committee can see what is going on. There is nobody there taking an active interest on behalf of the people of Canada; all the questions are leading questions put by the counsel for the commission and put by the counsel for the contractors, and they are endeavouring to obtain from Mr. Lumsden the very answer they require. Any one can see that Mr. Lumsden, had he proper counsel there, could prove the charges he has made, and even with all that the evidence so far has been very damaging to the government. It can easily be seen that Mr. Lumsden alone on the one side, and with an array of six K. C's. against him and badgered by experienced counsel, we could not expect that the evidence would come out as it would with counsel acting with the full confidence of the minority of committee and with the consciousness that he was doing his duty for the public and for the public alone.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the debate is adjourned, I wish to say that I do not know that it is a very usual form of tactics to call one to order under the circumstances under which I was called to order a little while ago. The Prime Minister frequently speaks two or three, or even four times on motions before this House. He does that by the courtesy of hon. members on this side of the House. But as he is so careful about points of order, he will have to meet them more frequently in the future than he has done in the past, because what is a good rule for one side of the House is an equally good rule for the other side.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not complain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend has no reason to complain, and he ought always to be ready to take the medicine that he prescribes to others. He had spoken on a question of privilege in defiance of his own statement that there was no question of privilege before the House; and afterwards he took advantage of the Speaker's having brought that debate to a conclusion to refuse to permit me to reply to some personal observations which he had addressed to myself. It was perhaps not very good tactics, in view of the fact that at that very time the government were asking us by consent to give them a vote of twenty-five per cent on account. However, I have no advice to tender to my right hon. friend in that regard. He will, of course, take his own course in regard to that and other matters. So far as I am concerned, I propose to say now what I was debarred from saying a few moments ago. The right hon. gentleman can be a dictator when that is thoroughly in accord with party interest; it suits him also, when that course is not in accord with party interests, to pose as an independent member of this House, having no control whatever over hon. gentlemen who sit behind him. Every one understands how much reality there is in all that. There is just as much reality in it as there is in the pretense that they do not understand that this omission or 'mistake,' was made for a purpose. There need be no such pretense as that. If there was not some object in that mistake, then it would have been rectified. It has not been rectified, and the reason is very apparent. The investigation before this committee is a farce, it was intended to be a farce, and the hon. gentlemen who are members of that committee from this side of the House were perfectly justified in retiring from it, because no man in this House ought to be compelled against his will to take part in such a farce. That is all I have to say on the subject.

Mr. BRISTOL. Mr. Speaker, this matter seems to be one that is very simple if the right hon. the First Minister wants to do what is just. It is quite obvious that three hon. members of this House are having from day to day a great injustice done to them. They have rights and privileges which are affected by the alteration which has taken place in the report which has been presented to this House by the chairman of the committee. Now, it seems to me that the chairman of the committee, having been in this House to-day, and having had brought to his attention the fact that he had made an incorrect report to this House was in a position to have corrected that report, and to have said at once that he would have issued a correct report. There is no question as to the facts, and just for a moment I am going to bring them to the attention of the House. The first report on February 22, made by the clerk

of the Commons, and approved by the chairman, contains these words:

Mr. Lennox moved that the committee recommend that their proceedings and the evidence taken by them be printed and reported to the House from day to day, which was agreed to.

The chairman does not deny that that was so. He quibbles as to whether he read the document out loud or whether it was read to him; but he does not deny the truth of that report which he and the clerk of the committee presented to the members. Nor does he deny any of the facts stated therein. Now, what confirmatory evidence have we that he knew the nature of the motion that was made? That appears at the conclusion of the evidence taken on that day, where it stated:

Mr. LENNOX. I move that our proceedings and the evidence be printed and reported to the House day by day.

The CHAIRMAN. Reported to the House day by day—that means at different times.

Mr. LENNOX. As a matter of fact we cannot get it done, but that is the way the motion reads.

The CHAIRMAN. I shall have to be empowered by the House to have it done.

Now, what does he ask the House to have done? Instead of asking the House for permission to report from day to day, he reports to the House in this fashion:

Your committee recommend that their proceedings and any evidence taken by them be printed from day to day, and that rule 72 be suspended in reference thereto.

After having had the written motion before him, after having read the motion, and after having discussed the matter in the committee with the member who made the motion, he carefully omits these words: 'and reported to the House.' Now, that report is before the House; the chairman who made that report is here to-day, and he is the man who should have stated at once, when the omission was brought to his attention, that he would correct the report, make it in accordance with the facts, and do justice to the three hon. members who for some time have been deprived of certain rights and privileges thereby. But is that all the evidence that he was aware of the nature of this report? We have this fact, that at the meeting of the committee following the meeting at which that motion was carried, it is stated: 'The minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.' So that you have the cumulative evidence of three statements, which put it beyond peradventure that the chairman of the committee knew of the motion, discussed the motion, and confirmed the motion; but when it came to doing his duty and reporting truthfully to this House, we have these important words, 'and reported to the House,' omitted. If it was a layman who did a thing of that kind you might say it was a mistake, but where it is a man of high standing in the legal profession he cannot shield himself before this House or the public on the plea of having made that mistake with the facts before him in writing. Is there any member on that side of the House who believes that was an innocent mistake? How can he believe it in the face of such evidence? Would any jury in this country, whether it be composed of Liberals or Conservatives, if they had these facts, the written motion, the discussion by the judge, as it were, with the witness, that is the person making the motion, the confirmation the following day of that motion, and then the report with the essential part of it left out presented afterwards. Would any jury believe that was done innocently when the effect of it is and continues to be that three hon. gentlemen are deprived of an opportunity of explaining to this House in respect of a matter vitally affecting their honour and their duty to the House and to the country, and so long as the report is permitted to stand in this shape they are debarred from and deprived of certain rights and privileges dear to every member. They are gagged and stand gagged, and the Prime Minister allows his chairman, who admits the mistake and who, when he found the box he had put himself in, presented the spectacle of suddenly saying: Oh, if it is so. Did any one ever see anything more ridiculous, a lawyer of his standing getting up and hedging with 'ifs' and 'ands' and shiftings. The thing is ridiculous, it is a spectacle I am sorry to see in this House, and I trust that the right hon. gentleman and the gentleman who is chairman of this committee will see that what is just and fair and right is done in this matter without delay.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Amendment of Mr. Taylor that the debate be now adjourned, negatived.

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

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Trent canal—construction, $1,750,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I beg to move that this item, No. 113, for the Trent canal construction be reduced by the sum of $150,000, said amount being the intended expenditure upon the Newmarket canal. I

move this in the absence of my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Wallace) who is unable to be present for a few minutes, but we hope to have him here before this debate is over. I object to this expenditure for various reasons In the first place, I believe that all the members of this House, with the exception, perhaps, of the hon. Minister of Justice, are strongly of the opinion that this expenditure is not advantageous to the people of Canada in any degree. I realize that the Minister of Justice may think that it has been advantageous to some people in Canada, because it is the general impression throughout the country and in this House that through the promises with regard to this Newmarket canal, and in consequence of the amount of work that was done, it was railroaded, or canalled, or boated, through this House, and gives him the position here that is so objectionable to this side of the House. I object to it also—I am pleased to see that the First Minister has arrived—I object to it very largely on account of what the First Minister said last year when this matter was under discussion. If I am correct, and if I am not, I want the right hon. gentleman to correct me, he gave as an excuse for the expenditure on this Newmarket ditch that a number of Tories, with a few Liberals, I presume, had come to him as a delegation and asked for the work. I think I am fairly representing what the First Minister said, and I would like to ask him if I am right?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think this time my hon. friend is about right.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am proud that for once, in the opinion of the First Minister, I am right. That was the excuse that he vouchsafed to this House last year—he granted the expenditure on this ditch because some Tories asked for it. But, Sir, he did not tell this House that all they asked for was $43,000, or $47,000 at the outside, which the engineer said the work would cost. He forgot also to tell the House that it was not for a canal, or a ditch, whether the Aylesworth or the Newmarket ditch, or anything else, that they asked for this expenditure, but it was to deepen the Holland river from Lake Simcoe up to Newmarket. That is what they asked for. I think that when it comes to expenditures of vast sums of money, hon. members on the government side ought to be able to get up and forget their politics and, vote as men, forget that they are partisans and vote for what they know is right. Every hon. gentleman on that side of the House who knows anything about this Newmarket ditch, knows that it is an absolute waste of money, and no reason other than a partisan reason can be given for it. I defy any man to get up and honestly say that I am wrong in what I am saying. The First Minister knows that I am right, and he is ashamed of the fact that I am right. I heard the argument used last year, when he whipped his followers into line, that they had already expended so much money on that canal that it would be a tower of folly, and that they must now go on and complete the work, even though it would be of no use. But they were whipped into line last year to vote for a continuance of the folly. I trust now that we have seen the last of partisanship in that connection, and that the First Minister will not use that little influence he has over his followers to induce them to vote for this item, knowing as he does, and as every one of them does, that it is against their conscience. Seldom have we seen a project criticised so adversely by the press of Canada. I think it is time for this House to forget partisanship and do the proper thing, and relegate this Newmarket ditch to the scrap heap. No hon. gentleman on the government side can get up and show by facts and figures that elevations, and quantities of water, and all the necessary requirements to a canal service are present in this case and will justify the House in voting this item. Even if the canal were built, and even if there was any need of a canal, no hon. gentleman can show that there is any boat service there at present, nor can they show in pounds and tonnage that there is ever likely to be navigation sufficient to justify the expenditure of this money.

I regret that he is not here because, were he here he would put before this House very much more clearly and more succinctly the various points in regard to this matter than I can do; but in his absence, I ask the House to forget that last year hon. gentlemen were whipped into line, and made to vote against honest sincere wishes in this regard. It may be said by some one who will follow me that that is not so, but I say it absolutely knowing that it is true, because I heard many of the members of this House say, before the vote came on that they would not vote for it because they did not believe it right. But, they voted for it because they had to. Surely it is time that we forgot this partyism, and that in matters that pertain to the public interest we should vote honestly and decently.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Campbell):

YEAS

Messieurs

Arthurs,	Lortie,
Barnard,	Macdonell,
Best,	McCall,
Blain,	Maddin,

Blondin,
Borden (Halifax),
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Crosby,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Donnelly,
Elson,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Gordon (Nipissing),
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Lake,
Lennox,
Middlebro,
Nantel,
Northrup,
Paquet,
Perley,
Price,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche,
Sharpe (Ontario),
Stanfield,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox (Essex),
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wright.—46.

NAYS

Messieurs

Allen,
Aylesworth,
Béland,
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Demers,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Girard,
Gladu,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hodgins,
King,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McCoig,
McColl,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Richards,
Robb,
Ross (Middlesex),
Roy (Dorchester),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Sperry,
Stratton,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turriff,
Verville,
Warburton,
Wilson (Laval)).—91.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Lemieux,	Barker,
Fisher,	Lewis,
Paterson,	Henderson,
Graham,	Haggart (Lanark),
Brodeur,	Porter,
Templeman,	Hughes,
Murphy,	Foster,
Low,	Smyth,
Harris,	Beattie,
Gordon (Kent),	Osler,
Reid,	Doherty,
Ecrément,	Lancaster,
Kyte,	Sproule,
Martin (Ste. Mary's),	Armstrong,
Bickerdike,	McCarthy,
Tobin,	Sexsmith,
Chew,	Boyce,
Mayrand,	Broder,
Gervais,	Ames,
McLean (Sunbury),	Worthington,
Clark (Red Deer),	Staples,
Rivet,	Forget,
Talbot,	Owen,
Douglas,	Thoburn,
Todd,	Kidd,
Law,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Devlin,	Marshall,
German,	Russell,
Beauparlant,	Edwards,
Turgeon,	Rhodes,
LeBlanc,	Meighen,
McMillan,	Magrath,
Sinclair,	Monk,
Major,	Cowan,
McCraney,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Lafortune,	Herron,
White (Victoria),	Schaffner,
McGiverin,	Jameson,
Ross (Rimouski),	Daniel,
Lapointe,	Maclean (York),

Amendment negatived and item agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That towards making good a supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1910, the sum of $70,000 be granted out of the consolidated funds of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1911, the sum of $42,333,023.58 be granted out of the consolidated fund of Canada.

He said: This is the sum which the committee has voted, as made up by the clerks of the House in the usual way.

Motion agreed to, resolutions reported, read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and the second time.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Charges of management—removal of foreign and uncurrent coin from circulation, $2,500.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to carry out an arrangement for encouraging the exportation of foreign silver, both for the convenience and improvement of our own currency, and also because there is a profit involved in silver coinage which we might as well have in our treasury as to leave in the treasuries of other countries.

Post Office Department, contingencies—sundries—further amount required, $1,500.

Mr. LAKE. Would it not be possible to make the official post office guide more convenient for reference? A better system of indexing would facilitate matters greatly.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will see that we get a better index next year.

Saskatchewan and Alberta Buildings—	
Moosejaw—immigration building.. ..	$ 3,500
Regina—immigration building..	3,900
Biggar—immigration building..	2,800
Phillips (Alberta) — immigration building..	2,700
Battleford—immigration building ..	2,700
Saskatoon—public building	300
	$15,900

Mr. U. WILSON. I would like to have an explanation about these immigration buildings.

Mr. OLIVER. Regina requires a new building. The old building was removed and a basement put in and other repairs. The building on the former site was merely a temporary matter without a basement. There is a new building erected at Regina, also at Phillips. At Battleford, the building was erected two years ago. At Saskatoon, repairs are required.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How is it that it cost $3,000 to remove the building at Regina, when the old one only cost $2,800?

Mr. OLIVER. When we removed the old building, we put in a basement on the new site. There was no basement on the new site. There was no basement in the former one. We also improved the buildings generally, so that the cost of its removal and repairs amounted to more than the old temporary building cost.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I have no objection that these items should pass provided that we may get information on the main estimates if required.

Mr. FIELDING. There will be no objection to discussion of these items on the main estimates.

Mr. FIELDING.

Sault Ste. Marie wharf — dredging approaches, $14,600.

Mr. BOYCE. With regard to the approach to the wharf at Sault Ste. Marie, of which I spoke some days ago, is the dredging of that included in this amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That remains to be done. This is to close up the work done during the current year.

British Columbia—Skeena river—improvements, $762.38.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have been engaged in removing snags, such as drift-wood, from the Skeena river. The work begins with the opening of navigation, and after the commencement of the fishing season, and will last till after it is closed. The river is a navigable river.

Dredging—maritime provinces, $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are asking this sum to close up the accounts which are due for dredging, both by the operation of government dredges and for contract work in the maritime provinces. But there is a sum of $25,000 which has not yet been adjusted, and I move that the vote be reduced by $25,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Would the minister state who this is due to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an amount due to W. J. Poupore & Co., for dredging in the Miramichi bay, $19,083; to the Dominion Dredging Company, for work at Cheticamp, $19,610; to Beasley Bros., $1,478; to A. & R. Loggie, at Caraquet, $3,162; to the Cape Breton Company at Fourchu, $9,963; to A. & R. Loggie, at Dalhousie, $31,362; to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Com- $19,610; to Beazley Bros., $1,478; to A. & R. Loggie, at Bathurst, about $10,000. There is a further claim which has not yet been adjusted, and I only ask for about $10,000; to Peter England, $1,975. These make altogether about $121,000. The amounts for Bathurst and Loggieville require to be adjusted, and I am not asking for an amount to cover these at present.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did A. & R. Loggie receive these contracts by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They received contracts for Dalhousie, Loggieville, and Caraquet by tender. Then they were allowed to do work at Bathurst at the same price as at Caraquet, forty-one cents.

Mr. J. D. REID. When we were discussing dredging last year we expected that all the dredging contracts would be let by tender, but it appears from what the minister says now that some of them were not let by tender. I suppose the minister knows that some contracts were practically let before the tenders were advertised for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. There were some cases of urgent work where parties were put to work temporarily pending tenders.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows that this Maritime Dredging Company got contracts given them before tenders were advertised. They were to get the contract at whatever the lowest tender would be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. That was at Gaspereau, and we are not asking for anything at Gaspereau. Let me refresh my hon. friend's memory. In that case the work was urgent, and their dredge was coming down from the St. Lawrence to the Bay of Fundy, and they were asked to stop there and go to work immediately, with the understanding that if they were the lowest tenderers they would get the work, but if they were not, they would be paid for the work they did in the meantime at the price of the lowest tender. My hon. friend will remember that I stated to the House last session that I should probably renew the contracts of the previous year. We did renew the contracts, because our experience of previous years had been that we lost money by putting them up to tender again. Our experience has rather been that where contractors have their plant upon the work, and where they are doing the work satisfactorily, at reasonable prices, it is better to let them continue, rather than call for new tenders. In the previous year, by calling for new tenders, we lost about $200,000, which we would have saved by extending the contracts. So last year, in most cases, we extended the contracts.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister's statement would be all right, if I understood it as he does. My understanding of the Gaspereau matter, as I read it in the newspapers——

Mr. PUGSLEY. In which newspapers?

Mr. J. D. REID. In the Toronto ' Globe ', the Montreal ' Herald ', and even in the St. John ' Sun '. The minister says that the Maritime Dredging Company had a dredge coming down from the St. Lawrence, and that this work was urgent. I understand there was practically no Maritime Dredging Company before that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they had a dredge before that.

Mr. J. D. REID. They may have had a dredge a few weeks before. But the Maritime Dredging Company was made up hurriedly, consisting of a Mr. Moore, the gentleman who, I suppose in conjunction with the Minister of Public Works, owns the St. John ' Telegraph '.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the hon. gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am only stating what I read in the Toronto ' Globe ' and the Monreal ' Herald '.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say that I do not own the St. John ' Telegraph ', I wish I did.

Mr. J. D. REID. Now, this Mr. Moore forms a company called the Maritime Dredging Company. He purchased this dredge at Montreal in July, knowing that the very minute he purchased the dredge, all he had to do was to get it to Gaspereau. He had in his possession the instructions to take it there, and practically to do the work at his own price. The minister told the department that they were to give this contract to Mr. Moore, and of course they did. That means the Maritime Dredging Company. We would not have known what the Maritime Dredging Company was had we not learned from the Toronto 'Globe' and the Montreal 'Herald' that it and Mr. Moore are one and the same. The minister knows that before the tenders were advertised for the contract was let to Mr. Moore at the price that the lowest tender would be. Work was being done long before the tenders were received.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only a few days.

Mr. J. D. REID. The dredge went down there about the 1st of August, and of course it got to work. That makes me a little suspicious of these dredging matters. The minister had an engineer who, as far as I understand previous to this, was considered to be a pretty respectable man and his reputation was pretty fair. This man told the minister that 20 cents a yard was a good, fair price for the work. I take it for granted that he understood his business when he said that 20 cents a yard was a fair and reasonable price, but when the tender of Mr. Moore came in at 90 cents a yard the same engineer changed his mind in a day or a night. He went to bed one night with a contract at 20 cents a yard, and next morning he got up and said that he thought it was worth 90 cents, and got this price of 90 cents. There is a sample of the changes in dredging prices. I do not hesitate to say that at 20 cents a yard Mr. Moore made money and that the other 70 cents a yard went into the St. John 'Telegraph', that the people of the country paid 70 cents a yard in order to give the Liberal party a paper in St. John. That is what happened in that case, but that is not the only case. The work was given to Mr. Moore at Gaspereau because it was urgent. The minister knows that after the work has been done the harbour is in no better shape than it was before because this is only a part of the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They could not work after the season closed.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has there been anything done since?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. The work was stopped and the dredge taken away.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the winter?

Mr. J. D. REID. But even then they stopped work and did not proceed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because they thought they could not afford to go on at that price, and we put the government dredge to work there the next year.

Mr. J. D. REID At 90 cents a yard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr J. D. REID. I suppose they wanted more money to buy the St. John 'Sun'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. But they did not get it.

Mr. J. D. REID. But they were put in another place where they would probably make more money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the very same dredge went to work at 37½ cents at St. John, rather than continue at 90 cents at Gaspereau.

Mr. J. D. REID. At all events it gets back to the same point. I understood from the minister that the tenders that were being called for would be let in a fair, open manner.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. J. D. REID. When I wanted them opened in public, the minister assured me that they were to be opened in the presence of himself and one of his officers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is right; that has always been done.

Mr. J. D. REID. If that has always been done, how is it that in this case the minister wrote to the deputy and told him that the contract was to be let at the lowest price in answer to this advertisement? I cannot see how the minister can explain that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was long after the tenders had been received and opened.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of course, as the minister knows, I have got the information out of these papers, but we will take it up on the report. As far as the interests of the people are concerned, I do not think it right that the minister should let a contract to any person unless every one tendering has a fair chance of bidding on the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is right.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows that there was no use of any person else putting in a price for this work, because the dredge was already at work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is entirely erroneous.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I think that when this item of $150,000 was up instead of it being reduced by $25,000, as the minister states it ought to be, it ought to be almost wiped out, considering the way that these dredging matters have been carried on. The fact of my bringing the matter up here has saved the country $25,000, because it seems that it was the intention to put it through. We were led to believe that A. and R. Loggie got nothing at all, yet here are three contracts on which the following payments were made to them; one of $3,162, another of $31,362 and another of $11,000. It is no wonder that this man would travel all the way up here to give evidence in connection with saw-dust wharfs and such things as that.

Mr. CROSBY. Is that the man who bought the saw-dust wharf?

Mr. J. D. REID. That is the man who was willing to buy the saw-dust wharf and pay $500 more for it. We are voting him this session $45,000, and I would not hesitate, if I were making money like that, to buy a saw-dust wharf. He could afford to pay $10,000 for a saw-dust wharf and still be money ahead. This is the man who is giving evidence. We are paying him money to-night. We pay for this saw-dust wharf. He is buying a part of this wharf for $3,500. We are going to vote it right through because this man cannot wait.

Mr. CROSBY. Will you not give him the wharf?

Mr. J. D. REID. We give him the wharf, but in an indirect way. It is matters of this kind that make a person hesitate when he sees money going in this way, and I want to tell the minister that I am going to protest in the strongest terms against the way these contracts are being let. The minister stated a few minutes ago that he had had some experience, after we had brought this matter up, and that when the contracts were let they had cost the country $200,000 more. Of course, at that time it was very easy for these men to combine because they had got this work. They practically had it. The minister told them that they could have the work, and they combined and fixed the prices as they liked. I would hesitate if I were the minister to acknowledge that. The Dominion of Canada could be held up by a few dredge men. A great many of these works were not pressing, and as there was no work elsewhere for these dredges, they would not

tie them up, and the minister could have said he would not give the contract unless the prices were fair. The minister might easily have saved $200,000 to the people of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman think that having called for tenders and the chief engineer having certified the price to be fair, I would have been justified in refusing to give the contract to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister is a business man, and if he were getting the work done for himself and knew the contractors were asking an enormous price he would not have accepted the tender, and he should not have allowed the country to be robbed in this case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not think it was an enormous price.

Mr. J. D. REID. If you did not I would not hesitate to say you did not know your business. In the Gaspereau case the engineer certified 20 cents a yard a fair price, and it would seem as if the minister did not know his business when he let the contract at 90 cents a yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineer and two other experienced men said it was worth 90 cents.

Mr. J. D. REID. Certainly, because he knew if he did not certify he would be out of his job the next morning. The minister knows that all he has to do is to give these men a hint; of course, he would not say it openly; in this case he would say: John E. Moore is going to buy the St. John 'Telegraph,' and if you don't certify to that you will be out of a job the next day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be sorry to say that to the engineer.

Mr. J. D. REID. I don't suppose you would say it, but you could give him a hint.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be as bad as saying it to him.

Mr. J. D. REID. Oh, no.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. A Conservative might do that, but not a Liberal.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would be sorry to call myself a Liberal and support a minister who does that kind of thing. If the hon. member (Mr. Turcotte) thinks that right I hope he will always remain a Liberal and never come over to this side of the House. I must admit that the Minister of Public Works is a pretty good sinner, but he has some other confreres just as bad in the other departments. So far as these contracts are concerned, I will protest as hard as I can to prevent the public being robbed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not complain of the hon. gentleman bringing the matter up to-night, but when the report of the Public Accounts Committee is submitted I shall welcome in the strongest way the very fullest discussion into these dredging matters. If there has been any remissness on the part of myself or any official of the department I shall be very glad to have it pointed out. I have endeavoured to do the very best possible in connection with all these contracts.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. If this item is going to be discussed let it stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not wish to discuss it now.

Mr. J. D. REID. I will not let any of these items through without proper discussion.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Then let it stand. We are anxious to get the money voted and the Supply Bill assented to before the Senate adjourns so that the Civil Servants may be paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let the item stand.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia, $9,000.

Mr. GOODEVE. Is there anything in this estimate for telephone lines on the Arrow lakes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is for work already done.

Mr. BARNARD. What is the mileage of telephones in British Columbia?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make a note of it and give the information on the main estimates.

Mr. BARNARD. Has the minister had an application for the extension of government telegraph lines to Stewart?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. We are considering the question of either extending the line from Fort Simpson to Stewart or building a branch across from the mainland. There are difficulties in the way. It is possible we may establish one or two wireless stations, which would be considerably cheaper. I intend to ask my colleagues for an appropriation in the supplementary estimates for establishing that connection.

Mr. BARNARD. The work will be done in the coming season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope so.

Telegraph lines, Saskatchewan and Alberta, $2,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are you going into the telegraph business in the other provinces?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government owns a telegraph line in British Columbia, in Alberta and Saskatchewan, in Quebec, and

in the lower provinces in portions of the country where a commercial system would not be established.

To pay for the services of administrator of the Yukon Territory for five months, $2,500.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is getting that?

Mr. OLIVER. I think Arthur Wilson is the name. The governor was called out on business here, and this gentlemen administered while he was away.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is Arthur Wilson?

Mr. OLIVER. He was in the employ of the local Yukon government for some time, but is not in that employ now.

Mr. J. D. REID. We were paying two salaries while the governor was here?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was there not any other government official employed by the year who could have acted in that capacity while he was out?

Mr. OLIVER. There was no other person in the government employ whose position and responsibilities were such as to warrant his appointment as acting administrator.

Mr. PRICE. Why was the administrator called out?

Mr. OLIVER. For the purpose of consultation with the government. There are many intricate matters coming up that cannot be handled satisfactorily by letter or telegraph, and it is thought desirable that the commissioner should come to headquarters for consultation.

Mr. PRICE. Does it generally take five months for consultation?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but owing to climatic conditions, when the commissioner came out, it was not unreasonable that he should make a considerable stay.

Mr. PRICE. As a matter of fact, was he not after another job?

Mr. OLIVER. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. PRICE. Is he not likely to receive a position as collector of customs or something else at Vancouver?

Mr. OLIVER. Not to my knowledge. In fact, to my knowledge, it is quite the contrary.

Mr. J. D. REID. Perhaps the Minister of Inland Revenue can tell us whether or not there is to be a vacancy at Vancouver?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The report in the newspapers regarding the intended retirement of Mr. Bowell, at Vancouver, is absolutely untrue and unwarranted. Mr. Bowell has not the slightest intention of retiring, and, if he had, I am sure Mr. Henderson would not be an applicant for the position.

Allowance to the widow of the late John Gordon, labourer on repairs staff of the Sault Ste. Marie canal, who was killed while in the discharge of his duties, $1,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. I do not propose to object to this item, but I am sorry that the Minister of Railways is out of the city, because I wish to call his attention to an accident that happened on the Intercolonial a few days ago at Folleigh, in which three men were killed—an engineer, a fireman and a brakesman. The engineer leaves a family of five small children, and the brakesman a family of seven small children. These families, I believe, are left almost destitute outside of a few dollars which they receive from the insurance fund. I would ask the Minister of Finance to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the matter, and see if he cannot put something in the supplementary estimates for these people.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be glad to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the remarks of the hon. gentleman.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING. I desire now to move concurrence to the items which the committee have passed this evening in order that the clerks may be able to prepare them for inclusion in a Supply Bill for to-morrow's house. I shall then ask you to allow me to drop the Supply Bill from the record in order that I may reintroduce it to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall these items be concurred in?

Mr. FIELDING. It is understood that we shall drop the Supply Bill previously introduced and that a more comprehensive Supply Bill will be brought in to-morrow.

Items concurred in.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. Immediately after the Supply Bill we shall take up the Bills of the Minister of Agriculture standing as items Nos. 19 and 20 on the order paper, and probably also the Bill of the Minister of Inland Revenue (No. 18) on the order paper, and the Bill of the hon. the Minister of public Works (No. 22) on the order paper. After that the House will be again moved into Committee of Supply and the Minister of Public Works will take up his estimates.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The Immigration Bill will not go on to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the Minister of the Interior will not be able to be present.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 17, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 166) respecting Insurance.—Mr. Fielding.

Bill (No. 167) to incorporate the Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 168) respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 169) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Timiskaming.—Mr. George Gordon.

Bill (No. 171) respecting the Dominion Bank.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 172) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Black.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER TRANSMISSION COMPANY.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I ask leave to lay on the table the report of the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works, the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, and the chief engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, upon the original petitions and plans submitted by the St. Lawrence Power Company. This is dated Ottawa, December 15, 1908. I lay this on the table at the suggestion of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) and, as there is great interest taken in this matter, and as the original report of the amended plans has been placed on record in 'Hansard', I will read the present report that it may appear in 'Hansard' also:

Department of Public Works of Canada,
Chief Engineer's Office,
Ottawa, December 15, 1908.

Sir,—We have the honour to report in regard to the petition of the St. Lawrence Power Company, Limited, to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, for permission to erect certain dams on the St. Lawrence river, as follows:—

No detail plans are before us and our report is predicated upon the information submitted.

First. A rough computation shows that it is possible to develop, approximately, 800,000 effective horse-power by the proposed dams; and that the creation of such an enormous quantity of power would be of great importance to the district in question, as experience has shown that in the proximity of such large developments of power, great industries are created; towns and cities grow up. The objections which arise, however, are somewhat serious.

First. The plans as submitted, contemplate interfering with the present Cornwall canal, and this, we take it, cannot be tolerated. The integrity of the Cornwall canal must be preserved, without any alteration whatever, and consequently, the plans submitted would have to be modified so as to preserve intact this most important navigation channel. It is true that the company contemplate the building of a separate lock above lock 20 to enter into the proposed new level, but such a lock requires navigation to pass along parallel with an over-flow weir dam which, necessarily, must take care of the great bulk of the discharge of the river; in consequence thereof, the side currents would be so great as to render navigation exceedingly dangerous. Furthermore, an accident to any of the dams would throw the whole system of navigation out of gear for a long time.

Second. The plans contemplate a single lift-lock on the American side, in the south channel, to take the place of the Cornwall canal. The channel from this proposed lock to the foot of Cornwall island has such a swift current and is so crooked as to render such a route dangerous; and it is not, therefore, in our opinion, a suitably located lock, having regard to the difficulties named. It does not seem needful at this stage to point out a more suitable site where a lock might be had, and where the difficulties of navigation would be lessened.

Third. The upper dam provided for in the proposed plans, running from the Long Sault island to the upper end of Barnhart island, is practically parallel with the thread of the stream, and is intended to be an over-flow weir, with ten stony sluices at each end of it. There can be no doubt whatever that this dam will, of necessity, have to take care of the regulation of the level of the river above it. The lower dam at the easterly end, which is in the form of a letter 'A,' connecting the mainland on the Ontario side with the lower end of Barnhart island, would not, in our opinion, be of material assistance for regulation.

Every advantage has been taken of the natural channels for the purpose of providing an economical development of the power, practically closing up the entire Canadian channel by this means and throwing the whole of the discharge into the American channel on the south of Barnhart island, the

water to the north of Barnhart island being thrown into a pool.

The discharge over the upper dam in conjunction with the stony sluices would be of such volume, and the cross current so great, as to make it risky for a steamer to attempt to pass parallel with this dam, through the channel south of Sheik's island.

Fourth. The effect of ice and frazil on the up-stream end of the river is one upon which it would be most difficult to express any decided opinion. There is no doubt that frazil forms in the Galops rapids, and the Rapide du Plat; and that a large mass of more or less broken ice floats down the river continuously. The channel in the vicinity of Brockville is usually kept open for the ferry; but after the dam in question has been built, a field of board ice would be formed above its crest, and it will be difficult to say where the small cakes of ice, frazil, and anchor ice would go, if it did not fill up the space above the dam. The report of the Montreal Flood Commission of 1889, states that on the 8th of April two or three feet of board ice and from ten to twenty-four feet of frazil were found; that between the Lachine rapids and Varennes, in March, 1887, a distance of twenty miles, there were 99,216,000 cubic yards of field ice, and 252,601,000 cubic yards of frazil, and water amounting to 467,212,000 cubic yards, or a total of 819,029,000 cubic yards; which gives some little idea of the relative proportions.

The conditions for the creation of frazil were greater in the district just above described, than in the one we are considering. Nevertheless, there is ample opportunity for the creation of great quantities of frazil and broken fragments of solid ice at the points named, so that the up-stream effect likely to be created is something that no one could very well predict, but would, no doubt, be approximately similar to that found by the commission, with resulting damage at the foot of the Rapide du Plat and the Galops.

Fifth. The Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company run a daily line of steamers from Kingston to Montreal, and do a fairly large tourist business, which, we understand, is increasing. One of the features of the trip is running the Long Sault rapids, which, of course, would be destroyed by the proposed dam. Aside from this we question if a boat could make the trip from Kingston to Montreal, in a day, provided she had to be locked through the Cornwall canal or the proposed lock on the American side. Strenuous objections have been raised by the interests in question against the project.

Sixth. The possible destruction of the proposed dam by natural forces, or by the malice of any evil-intentioned person; (an earthquake might be the means of destroying the dam) certainly a very few pounds of dynamite in the hands of an intelligent man would be most disastrous. The volume of water which the dam would contain would be sufficiently great, if liberated in the form of a wave to at any rate destroy the greater portion of the town of Cornwall; certainly the canal, or that portion of it below the dam; and without doubt, the means of flooding Lake St. Francis and a large section of the land on the river bank protected by the Hungry bay dyke; besides unquestionably the Soulanges canal, as well as the villages fronting the river between Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis. Whether the effect of such a sudden break would be taken care of in Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis, is a question. Experience had on a very much smaller scale would lead one to expect that the damage would be continued on through the lower portion of Montreal, with the possible destruction of the Lachine canal as well.

Seventh. The plans show a very small percentage of development on the Canadian side; we should judge that over eighty per cent (80 per cent) is contemplated to be developed in the United States; and of course, this would be a very unfair distribution of the power in question. In any event, should the project receive consideration, considerable revision of the plans would have to be made, so as to secure a more equitable division of the power development.

Eighth. A vital point in connection with the whole scheme would be that all the plans of the dams, locks, &c., on the proposed works must be approved in advance by engineers responsible to Canada and to the United States, respectively, and upon which they must agree; the detail of the works in question should be passed upon by the joint approval of engineers from both countries. Whether this is a practical thing to secure we are unable to say, but it is obvious that the interest of Canada is such that no portion of the work in question could be allowed to be gone on with unless it received a most strict examination and inspection by engineers acting for this country. No doubt the United States authorities would take a similar attitude with regard to the question, although their interests are trivial compared with ours, on account of the fact that they have so little land on the St. Lawrence below the power in question.

Ninth. No private corporation should be permitted to have under its control the regulation of the height of water in such an important river as the St. Lawrence.

We are, sir,
Your obedient servants,
(Sgd.) EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,
Chief Engineer, Department of Public Works, Canada.
(Sgd.) M. J. BUTLER,
Chief Engineer, Department of Railways and Canals.
(Sgd.) WM. P. ANDERSON,
Chief Engineer, Department of Marine and Fisheries.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 175) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to make liable to seizure a proportion of the wages earned by any person employed in any shape, manner or form by the government. There is something intolerable under the present

system. A man earning a dollar and half a day as a labourer, doing sometimes the most painful work on the street or elsewhere, is liable to have his wages seized if he owes any person, while a public official earning a much larger salary in a much easier way may laugh at his creditors. A few days ago there was lying sick in the hospital a poor man to whom were due three small bills. These bills were presented to the three debtors employed in the public service and earning from $1,200 to $2,000 a year, and not one of them would give even a penny to this poor man. I contend that the law should prevent such a denial of justice. I am aware that there are some objections to this legislation, but notwithstanding those objections I believe that the principle of justice and equal rights to all should prevail. I have studied the question somewhat and I intend to speak more fully upon it at the second reading. I contend we ought to end the present system, and in my opinion the best way is to amend the Civil Service Act, chap. 15 of the statute of 1908 by adding section as 4a the following:

All moneys or salaries due or accruing due to any person employed by the government of Canada shall be liable to attachment in each and every province in the Dominion of Canada according to the laws and rules of procedure in force in such province.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 174) to amend the Railway Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The House and the public are aware that the legislation of last session providing for the slowing down of trains at level crossings where accidents have occurred within the last ten years, has been a cause of great inconvenience not only to the railway people, but to the travelling public. The commercial travellers and others have objected to the delay caused, and those who are engaged in the receiving and despatching of freight are experiencing great difficulty by having their freight delayed a week or ten days because of this clause which was enacted last year, perhaps hurriedly. The section in the Act now reads:

No train shall pass over any highway crossing at rail level at a greater speed than ten miles an hour, if at such crossing an accident has happened subsequent to the first day of January, 1900, by a moving train causing bodily injury or death to a person using such crossing, unless and until such crossing is protected to the satisfaction of the board; and no train shall pass over any highway crossing at rail level at a greater speed than ten miles an hour in respect of which crossing an order of the board has been made to provide protection for the safety and convenience of the public and which order has not been complied with.

The Bill which I now move proposes to add in the first line of that clause the words:

If so ordered by the board.

The majority of those crossings where accidents have occurred are crossings at which the train can be seen half a mile both ways, but through carelessness of individuals, possibly through drunkenness, an accident has occurred, and automatically under this section the railway companies have to slow down their trains. The amendment which I propose would give the Railway Board authority to order the railway company to run at slow speed at certain crossings which have been pronounced dangerous, until such time as the crossings are protected. I think this provision will meet with the approval of the House, and my reason for presenting it now is that it may be considered when the Minister of Railways brings down his amendment to the Railway Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

DREDGING—A. & R. LOGGIE.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. How much has been paid to the firm of A. & R. Loggie for dredging at Dalhousie, Bathurst, Caraquet and Loggieville, since March 31, 1909?

2. Has the firm been fully paid for the dredging done at these places during the season of 1909? If not, how much is still due them on account of last season's work?

3. Did the firm do any dredging during the season of 1909 at any other places than those above named? If so, at what places, and how much has been paid to them on account thereof?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1.

Bathurst	$ 5,366 48
Caraquet	10,000 00
Dalhousie	Nothing.
Loggieville	Nothing.
	$ 16,366 48

2. (a) No.

(b) Caraquet, $3,162.64. Dalhousie, $31,352.50. Loggieville, amount claimed, $10,691.10. Bathurst, amount claimed, $24,710.29; the two latter items are in process of adjustment, the amounts not being admitted by the department as correct.

3. (a) Yes.

(b) Campbellton, N.B.

(c) Nothing paid.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved that to-morrow the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council, may, from time to time, advance and pay to the harbour commissioners of Montreal, hereinafter called the corporation, in addition to the money, if any, heretofore authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by any Act, and which has not at the date of the passing of any Act founded upon these resolutions been so advanced, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of six million dollars, as are required:—

(a) to pay off and retire debentures of the corporation of the par value of one hundred thousand dollars, maturing in the year 1910, and,

(b) to enable the corporation to complete the construction of the terminal facilities of the port of Montreal, for which plans, specifications and estimates have been approved by the Governor in Council, and to construct such additional facilities as are necessary to properly equip the said port, and in respect of which plans, specifications and estimates have, previous to advances being made, been approved by the Governor in Council.

2. That during the period of construction of the terminal facilities mentioned in these resolutions the interest payable on the debentures receivable by the Minister of Finance in exchange for such advances shall be deemed to be money required to complete and to be part of the cost of construction thereof, and such interest may be paid out of the said sum of six million dollars.

3. That the corporation shall upon any advances being made deposit with the Minister of Finance, debentures of the corporation equal in par value to the advance so made, repayable within twenty-five years from the date of issue, and bearing interest payable half yearly, at the rate of three and one half per centum per annum.

4. That the principal and interest of any sums advanced under any Act founded on these resolutions shall be payable, subject to the second of these resolutions, out of the revenue of the corporation mentioned in section 8 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896, and shall be charged thereon as if the sums so advanced had been borrowed by the corporation under said chapter 10.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF GLASSWARE IN MILK TESTS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER moved that to-morrow the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the testing, marking, sale and use of glassware used in connection with the testing of milk, and to authorize the Governor in Council to make regulations with respect thereto, and for the impostion of penalties for offences in contravention thereof.

Motion agreed to.

VACANCY ON MANITOBA BENCH.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Before the orders of the day are called I wish to question the government on a matter of some urgency. Some weeks ago, in answer to a question upon the order paper, the answer was given that representations had been made by the bar of Manitoba that there was urgency for the appointment of a judge, and that the arrears of litigation were increasing. Those who are suffering, the profession, and interested litigants, would now hear with respect, any further statement which the government has to make as to when they will take the necessary legislative, or executive action to fill the vacancy.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). This is not by any means the first experience I have had in the short time I have occupied the position of Minister of Justice, in which upon a provincial legislature providing for the appointment of another judge, a desire for great haste has developed on the part of people interested, that the appointment should be made without delay. This judgeship in Manitoba, to which the hon. gentleman alludes, was created, I think, more than fifteen months ago. I may not be exactly accurate as to the time, but certainly it is not of any recent date. It was created by a provincial statute which was to come into force upon its being proclaimed by the provincial government; and having been put on the statute-book of the province in that condition, it so remained without anybody hearing of any grievance or difficulty in regard to the litigation of the province until the 9th of February, of this year, when it was proclaimed, and on the same day I received a telegram from an official of the Manitoba government stating that the Act has been brought into force. Every one knows, I presume, that upon provincial legislation taking place establishing a judgeship, no appointment to that position can be made until the salary is provided. Such an appointment would be very liable to be nugatory if there were no salary assigned to the position by competent authority. The salary can be attached only by legislation of this parliament, and I would respectfully submit to the consideration of the hon. gentleman that there has not been any undue delay since the 9th of February last, on the part of this parliament in passing such legislation, which is a step necessary to be taken before it would even be a proper thing on the part of the government or the Minister of Justice to consider the selecting of an individual to fill this position. I have no doubt that in

due course this parliament will take such legislative action in the premises as to it seems right, but I do think that if the Manitoba legislature, which created this judgeship, or the Manitoba government, which contains the Attorney General of the province who is responsible for the administration of justice in the province, could sit quietly for more than twelve months with this statute on the books inoperative before any action was taken to bring it into force, there should not be any particular outcry if this parliament waits two months before it passes the necessary legislation to make the provincial statute effective.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask when I may expect two returns to orders of this House, one of December 15, and one of November 24. One is in reference to the appointment of a government weigher in the port of Montreal, and the other, I imagine, is in the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. FIELDING. We will have the information looked up.

NEW YORK STATE CANALS.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the short debate which we had the other day on the New York State canals, I have received a letter from the deputy superintendent of public works at Albany, which I have shown to the Minister of Justice, and which he has suggested should be put on 'Hansard.' Therefore, with the permission of the House, I will read it:

FREDERICK C. STEVENS, Superintendent.
WINSLOW M. MEAD, Deputy.
State of New York,
Superintendent of Public Works,
Albany, March 15, 1910.

Discrimination against Canadian boats.

Mr. Geo. H. Perley,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

My dear sir,—I am in receipt of a copy of the House of Commons debate of Friday, March 11, and have noted the discussion which appears on page 5323, with reference to the subject of discrimination against Canadian craft by the New York State canals, and I note with pleasure that the communication which I sent you bearing on this subject under date of February 16, which I endeavoured to have clearly stated all the facts, was placed in the records by you.

As additional information I would state that there are no navigable canals in New York State which are not owned and controlled by the state. The Delaware and Hudson canal, which was formerly owned by the Delaware and Hudson Canal Company, which later became the Delaware and Hudson Company, operating a system of railways, has passed out of the hands of the Delaware and Hudson Company, and is not at the present time operated as a canal. There are numerous other small canals in different parts of the State, but these are all power canals in which your government would be in no way interested.

If after your full statement as to the attitude which this department takes there is any question in any one's mind as to the fair treatment which would be accorded Canadian-owned craft I can only suggest that your Canadian interests put the matter to test by offering Canadian-owned craft for clearance upon the State canals. I can assure you that no discrimination would be shown, but that all that would be required would be compliance with the provisions of section 172, of chapter 13 of the laws of 1909, known as the Canal Law, and whose provisions apply to boats owned in other States of the Union as well as to Canadian craft. Certainly the provisions of the Act referred to are not difficult of compliance.

Yours very truly,
WINSLOW M. MEAD,
Deputy Supt. Public Works.

I understood that the Minister of Justice would have his department look into this question and report to the House concerning it. I therefore thought that, if agreeable to the minister, this letter should be considered by the department at the same time.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

The House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. The House yesterday, in Committee of Ways and Means, made the necessary provision by two resolutions to cover the appropriations which had been voted in Committee of Supply, up to that time. Subsequently the Committee of Supply took up some further estimates, and these were dealt with late last night. It becomes necessary that we should, in Committee of Ways and Means, pass a resolution covering the appropriations so made. I beg to move:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1910, the sum of $630,767.27 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

This simply covers the items voted yesterday in Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, resolution reported, read the first time and the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 173) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1910, and the

31st March, 1911. He said: This Bill includes both the items dealt with previously. We did introduce a Supply Bill yesterday, but later withdrew it in order to introduce a Bill in a more comprehensive form this afternoon.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

INSECTS, PESTS AND DISEASES ACT.

Bill (No. 20) to prevent the introduction or spreading of insects, pests and diseases destructive to vegetation—Mr. Fisher—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FISHER. I gave some explanation of this measure at its introduction. On a former occasion, an Act known as the San José Scale Act was passed by this parliament for preventing the introduction of that particular pest. That Act has proved effective, but within the last year we have been menaced by some other pests, notably the brown tail moth, which was introduced into the United States from Europe, and has already created a great deal of damage to orchards and trees in that country. Fortunately, only a few have got into the Dominion. Last year we were threatened with an invasion of that pest, and I appealed to the importers of nursery stock to allow their stock to be inspected and any of it destroyed on which the eggs or nests of this moth were discovered. To the credit of our nursery men, they co-operated willingly with the experts of the department. At the same time I had no authority to proceed by Act of parliament, and we were not able to do what I think is right and fair, that is pay compensation to the men whose stock we destroyed. The same condition has obtained this winter. I have had several men out examining the importations of nursery stock, and again the importers showed their willingness to acquiesce in the necessary steps taken in their own interest and that of the country. I consider it necessary, however, that there should be power given the department by parliament to act in this matter, because at any moment any individual importer might refuse to take the steps necessary and we would be powerless to compel him. Such refusal might result in the introduction of the pests and thus render almost completely useless the sacrifices of other people. Under these circumstances, I had this Bill drawn up, after consultation with the law officers and the expert officers of the department on entomology and botany. I might add that by reason of the fact that we never can tell what form these insect menaces will assume, we cannot define in the Bill clearly and distinctly the steps necessary to be taken. Certain steps are required to protect us against the San José scale and certain others against the brown tail moth, and in the case of other insect pests, we would have again to take different steps. Therefore, I ask that power be given the Governor in Council to define what is necessary to be done and authorize the department to do it. In that respect we have followed very much the line of an Act which has become law in Great Britain recently, and which I believe has worked satisfactorily there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this necessitate the appointment of a number of officials at different ports, and if so, how many will be appointed? Will any of the government officials now at these ports be able to undertake the work without making new appointments?

Mr. FISHER. I do not anticipate the appointment of any officers at the ports of entry. We would have to frame regulations so that we would be notified of the arrival of packages of nursery stock and would then have to send some one to inspect the stock before it was forwarded through the country. We have now stations at which nursery stock is permitted to be imported and fumigated against the San José scale. We might have to take some steps, perhaps by proclamation, that in cases where there was danger of the importation or the invasion of an insect, nursery stock from an infected country could only come in at these ports, and then the officers who are now at these ports dealing with the San José scale would be able to deal with the nursery stock. Sometimes we might have to send an expert entomologist to a port when occasion arose, but there is no expectation or intention of appointing a large number of officers for this purpose.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help feeling that the Bill is a step in the right direction.

Mr. FIELDING. It will facilitate the passage of the Supply Bill if I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was received from His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General by the gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House, in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that his honour the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.
An Act respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.
An Act respecting the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.
An Act respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.
An Act respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Saint Maurice Valley Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Eastern Townships Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Merchants' Bank of Canada Pension Fund.
An Act for the relief of George Robert Buttonshaw.
An Act for the relief of Hope Eileen Moreland Drinkle.
An Act respecting the Union Life Assurance Company.
An Act to incorporate the Merchants and General Insurance Company.
An Act respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Seed Control Act.
An Act respecting a patent of the Mond Nickel Company, Limited.
An Act respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
An Act for the relief of Jessie Maud Mary Maxwell.
An Act for the relief of Frederick Joseph Gustin McArthur.
An Act to incorporate the Northern Mortgage Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Improved Paper Machinery Company.
An Act to incorporate the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.
An Act to incorporate the Congregational Union of Canada.
An Act respecting the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.
An Act respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.
An Act respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.
An Act granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1910, and the 31st March, 1911.

INSECTS, PESTS AND DISEASES ACT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 20) to prevent the introduction or speading of insects, pests and diseases destructive to vegetation.—Mr. Fisher.

Mr. BURRELL. The object of this Bill, as I gather, is to give the Minister of Agriculture greater power to deal with insects and all pests and diseases destructive to vegetation. The Bill, by section 10, repeals the San José Scale Act of 1898. This Bill gives very much larger powers, is wider in its scope and it is possible that in the exercise of those powers there may be some clash with the provincial jurisdiction. I would, therefore, like rapidly to run over the considerations that one is anxious to put forward with regard to a measure of this kind. About the year 1895 the San José scale was first discovered on this continent, or rather in the eastern part of the continent, by Professor Howard, of Washington, and those of us who are interested in commercial horticulture are aware how rapidly this particular insect spread all over the United States and Canada. It was about 1897 or 1898 that the first case was discovered in Canada, not very far from where I lived in the province of Ontario. The second case happened to come under my personal notice about four miles from St. Catharines and it proved that this insect had become established in Ontario. After some discussion, which I do not want to go into now, and after all the information that Professor Howard and other authorities could give with regard to the danger involved in the establishment of an insect of this kind, the government introduced what was called the San José Scale Act of 1898. There have been some steps taken to try and control this insect pest by the provincial government of Ontario, and very vigorous measures were adopted which have cost the government of Ontario a great many thousands of dollars since. But the Bill introduced by the government in 1898 dealt

only with this one insect, the San José scale, and the operations of the Bill were directed against it in only one way, that is to say, by the inspection of importations of nursery stock at certain points of entry designated by the minister. Therefore, as far as federal powers go, the only method under which they dealt with inspection or with any comprehensive system of inspection with regard to insect pests and diseases was that which I have outlined. This Bill, now before the committee, gives power to inspect and deal with all insects, pests and diseases destructive to vegetation, and it gives wide powers which, if exercised indiscriminately, may perhaps lead to unfortunate results. We have these powers given in sections 5, 6, 7 and 8. The minister may appoint inspectors and other persons to perform this work and may exercise certain other powers which are set out clearly in these four clauses. The minister, under this Bill, would have ample power to deal in a very comprehensive way with this matter in any province in the Dominion. I may add that I am aware that the jurisdiction is concurrent, that is to say that while the various provinces have power to deal with all these things, apparently the power lies also equally with the Dominion authorities. Of course, the minister will understand that I am not speaking in any spirit of hostility with reference to Dominion regulations or to the powers given under this or any other Bill, but I just want to make clear to the minister and to the committee what the position is in British Columbia in regard to these various matters. The minister himself is familiar with many of the conditions there. In British Columbia 21 years ago we established what is known as the Board of Horticulture. There was a special Act passed for that purpose and that Board of Horticulture was composed of three members representing the various portions of the province and also having as members the Minister of Agriculture and the deputy minister of agriculture. We have two statutory meetings a year, but during last year we held about five meetings. The members act in an advisory capacity to the government, that is they advise them on every kind of question and every piece of legislation with regard to horticultural matters. They formulate and alter regulations from time to time in the best interests of the horticultural industry. We have also established under the authority of the Act and under the authority of the board, fumigation stations, a central inspection office with a chief inspector and something like thirty sub-inspectors. I have been a member of that board for something like four years and I am fairly familiar with its operations and what was aimed at in its creation. We have been so careful and so rigid in our methods and in our control of the fruit industry under this Act and under this board that I think I am safe in saying that it has resulted in a cleanliness in our orchards and fruit production that places them second to none on the whole continent. We have followed the practice of systematically inspecting, examining and fumigating nursery stock from any part of the world or from eastern Canada, because, although it is true that the Dominion government has fumigating stations we do not take that as a sufficient safeguard of our own horticultural interests. Then, we also have a thorough system of inspecting every tree that comes in because the tree itself may be a medium of danger and infection either by fungus or insect pest. We, also, examine all the fruit which comes in from the Orient, the United States, Australasia, Eastern Canada, or any other point. We met with a great deal of opposition from the wholesale importers of fruit in the establishment of a thorough system of inspection, and that opposition was so strong at times as to be unpleasant. It is not uninteresting to our eastern friends to know that the result of our efforts has been the importation of a better class of fruit than formerly; the growers are not exposed to the same danger of infection, the dealers have been benefited by handling a superior class of fruit, and the consumers get a better quality. The horticultural Board Act has been recently amended so as to increase the membership of the board in recognition of the continually increasing development of the industry in our province. We have appointed several trained inspectors, entomologists and horticulturalists who have been trained in the eastern colleges, and in this way we have strengthened very much the machinery with which we are working. As a result of all this, the status of the British Columbia fruit industry is now so high that I do not believe there is another fruit area of equal extent—we have 100,000 acres now under orchard—in America or in the world that is so free from the leading fungus or insect pests. The Minister of Agriculture has been through our province, and he has had excellent opportunities for seeing our virtues, and perhaps our faults. I may say that it is a matter of very much regret to us that the minister was not able to visit one or two of our prominent districts, such as Kelowna, of which he only got a cursory glimpse, for reasons which he himself understands. I regret that all the more, because at Kelowna we have a large acreage under tobacco, and a very interesting tobacco industry there. I think the minister will admit, from his experience in British Columbia, that every word I have said is true, and that we are producing a

remarkably fine commercial product which will hold its own in any market in the world. By the way, there is one little touch I would like to give to the Minister of Agriculture, and I do not think it will do any harm. I quote from a horticultural magazine which has been recently established, the following excerpt from a leading article:

The 'Star' of December 11, in its report of a meeting of the Pomological and Fruit Growing Society of the province of Quebec, held in the Macdonald College on the 10th ultimo, quotes the Hon. Sydney Fisher as saying that 'the prairies offered a great market for apples, and British Columbia was recognizing this. But the flavour of the British Columbia apple was not to be compared with that of the province of Quebec.'

Of course it is just possible that the Minister of Agriculture regards the British Columbia apple as so much superior to that of Quebec that it is not to be considered in the same class. But considering that it was a Quebec audience to whom the minister was speaking and that he referred to British Columbia in the negative sense we are forced to conclude that Mr. Fisher, if correctly reported, intended his audience to understand that in his opinion the British Columbia apple was very inferior to that of Quebec.

If one of Mr. Fisher's subordinates were to commit an indiscretion like that he would not only be promptly called to account by the press of the country who knew better, but in all probability he would be severely reprimanded for a breach of etiquette by the minister himself.

Of course, we have to make allowances for the Minister of Agriculture giving an ex parte utterance to an audience in his own province, but as a British Columbian, he cannot expect me to assent to any such heretical doctrine as he lays down there. As a matter of fact, the questions as to the superiority of fruit are in a sense rather dependent upon local conditions in every province, and these local conditions make enormous differences. I venture to think that I could go into one province and take certain samples of fruit and say they were superior to anything produced in another province, and similarly in another province, I could find the result reversed. This, of course, depends altogether on the conditions under which the fruit was grown. I am very certain, however, that the Minister of Agriculture had no ground for making such a sweeping statement as is attributed to him here.

Mr. BLAIN. Did he say anything about the Ontario apple?

Mr. BURRELL. That was probably too delicate a question for him to touch. I would like to call the attention of the minister, and of the committee, to what we have done in British Columbia in the matter of inspection and fumigation, because it will be of interest to the country as a whole. Under the provincial methods of inspection, from January until May of last year we inspected 660,000 seedlings and grafts, and 250,000 standard trees, and a large amount of mixed nursery stock. Out of this amount we condemned—and the committee will understand that except those which came from eastern Ontario, all were fumigated in the Dominion station—we condemned 12,500 standard fruit trees.

Mr. FISHER. What were they condemned for?

Mr. BURRELL. I have not the information here to answer that. No doubt some of them would be condemned because of fungus and insect diseases.

Mr. FISHER. It is only fair to say that the Dominion fumigation station only fumigates for the San José scale and does not pretend in any way to deal with any other disease.

Mr. BURRELL. I quite understand that, but there is a general feeling that the strength of the fumigation required for the San José scale would practically insure safety against all other insects except perhaps the brown-tailed moth.

Mr. FISHER. Unless the hon. gentleman can show that his organization found San José scale on the plants that went through the Dominion fumigation station, it is not fair to cast any reflection on the work of that station.

Mr. BURRELL. I will touch on that point in a moment. From the month of January to October we inspected 96,600 boxes of fruit and condemned 12,200 boxes, and in addition to that, we have also carried the work of inspection to rice, for the weevil, and out of 163,000 sacks of rice we fumigated 14,500. I hope the minister will understand that I am not particularly reflecting on the work of the Dominion fumigation station, except that I would point out that for other reasons (unless a change has been made within the last year) that station has never been satisfactory. To my mind, and to the mind of a great many of our leading fruit growers, the Dominion fumigating station has not been quite up to the mark in the past. We do not want to run any risks in the province of British Columbia, and when we established our fumigating station, we took care to get all the latest methods and improvements to effectually meet the evil, not only in regard to the actual fumigation itself, but also in regard to packing and unpacking, drying out, subjection to frosts, and things of that kind. The actual fumigating room in the Dominion station is 8 by 8, 16 by 8 by 6 by 4 high, and as I think the minister knows, a great part of the platform where the stock is unloaded from the railway cars is exposed and open, and there is

comparatively little room to move along it. The consequence is that only a small quantity can be fumigated at a time in a chamber of that kind. The stock has to be put on the floor, generally in bundles, and fairly tightly packed, and it is pretty hard for the gas to penetrate, in a thoroughly effective way, all the nursery stock under these conditions. Then there is the further disadvantage of the stock being exposed to drying out, and the difficulty of handling it. The minister apparently did not want to trust us entirely with the duty of fumigating, probably he saw difficulties in the way. However, when we put up our fumigation station we consulted Dr. Willis Johnson the state entomologist of New Jersey. The fumigation station has four rooms. The actual fumigation room was 11 feet by 16 feet by 18 feet. The stock is put on racks, where the fumes penetrate it very freely. The rooms are all air-proof and frost-proof. So that we have a good many advantages in that way. I do not say whether or not we discovered the San José scale alive after the stock passed through the Dominion fumigating room, though I think we did. However, we did discover the borers, the aphis and other pests; so that we have had to make a very thorough and systematic inspection of the stock after it passed the Dominion fumigation station. I do not want to delay the discussion of the Bill now, as it will be taken up later clause by clause. I simply say that we have all this elaborate provincial machinery, and we hope for development on sound lines of our valuable and increasingly valuable fruit industry. I have endeavoured to get into as close touch as possible with the leading men connected with the fruit industry in the province, and there is a strong feeling among them that although the jurisdiction is concurrent, we should be very loath to relinquish any of our organization or our methods or our efforts, and we hope that under this Bill, which gives the minister much larger and wider powers, there will not be any clash between the federal and the provincial authorities. I desire to say here that I recognize that the minister, in bringing forward this Bill, is earnestly desirous of coping with anything injurious to the fruit industry of Canada. I frankly make that admission; but I thought it well at this stage to point out what our general attitude was, so that the minister might give a full explanation of the modus operandi of this measure in order that we should have a clear understanding of it before it went into actual effect.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate fully the position which the hon. member takes, and I take no exception whatever to any of his statements. In fact, I rather welcome them, because I think that his description of what is being done in British Columbia is one of the best proofs of the advisability of a Bill of this kind being introduced and made applicable to the whole of Canada. I will not delay the House by any reference to my hon. friend's personal opinions of British Columbia fruit, and that of Quebec; but I do not hesitate here, in the face of my hon. friend and others, to maintain the character and quality of the fruit of the province from which I come. I consider the apples of Quebec, as far as quality and flavour are concerned, to be infinitely superior to anything produced not only in British Columbia, but in the whole world.

Mr. BURRELL. I cannot allow that.

Mr. RHODES. What about Nova Scotia?

Mr. FISHER. I am not going to make an exception of even Nova Scotia. My hon. friend must not accuse me of having made ad captandum statements to the people of Quebec, because when I was in British Columbia I told the people there that if they obtained great prizes abroad, for their apples, it was only because the fruit of Quebec had not been shown at the same exhibition. I appreciate the quality of the fruit of British Columbia, I recognize the great fruit-growing capabilities of that province, and I congratulate it not only on the quality and beauty of its fruit, but on the fact that in recent years especially the increase in fruit-growing in British Columbia has been enormous, and that its prospects in the near future are still brighter. Under these circumstances I do not hesitate, while standing up for my own province, as far as quality is concerned, to recognize the superior producing character of the great province of British Columbia in regard to actual production. My hon. friend twitted me with not having visited Kelowna. I could not visit every place in the province, and the connections were such that I could not make it convenient to visit Kelowna; but I can assure my hon. friend and the people of Kelowna that I have not forgotten them nor their hospitable intentions, nor their great interest in fruit-growing, and tobacco-growing, and I hope very soon to give an evidence of the value I place on their tobacco-growing work by aiding it in some substantial way. Having disposed of these extraneous matters, let me come to the Bill before the House. I accept my hon. friend's compliment in the spirit in which it is given; but I have introduced this Bill in the interest not only of fruit-growing, but of tree-growing in the Dominion of Canada. Insect pests attack other things than fruit trees and fruit, and it is just as important to protect our forests and shrubbery as our

orchards, and our fruit trees. But I recognize also the good work being done in British Columbia, under the Provincial Act. If as good work were done all over Canada as has been done in British Columbia, under that Act, the necessity for this Bill would be to a large extent removed. I believe that the inspection under the British Columbia Act is as good as any on the continent of America, or perhaps, even better. I have watched it with great interest, and have sympathized with the efforts of the British Columbia people to legislate for the protection of their orchards and forests. I think the work done there has been excellent for the province, and has had excellent results. In that respect my hon. friend and I are absolutely at one.

I would like to remind my hon. friend that when the fumigating station at Vancouver was established, the importations of nursery stock into British Columbia were far less than to-day, and the station was then established on a scale which Dr. Fletcher considered sufficient. I am aware that its capacity and arrangements are to-day not quite what they might be, and had it not been for my expectation of passing this Bill this session, I would have taken steps last year to re-arrange and improve that station. I thought it possible however, that when this Bill came into force we might have to provide for other work besides fumigating the San José scale. In these fumigating stations we have not attempted to more than protect against the introduction of the San José scale and for that purpose there is just one kind of fumigation. But in dealing with other pests, we may have to use other methods, because that which might be effective in the one case might not necessarily be in others. I am not sufficiently familiar with the insect pests to say what these are, but it is quite possible that there are other pests which the fumigation would not destroy. It is therefore quite possible that the provincial government inspectors may have found in nursery stock that passed through our fumigating stations in Vancouver other insect pests. My hon. friend seems to think it possible that they have found the San José scale. I do not think so. Since the establishment of these stations, not only in British Columbia but in the other provinces, not one case of San José scale has been in any way traced to imported stock, and all imported stock goes through our fumigating stations.. Under these circumstances, I am justified in assuming that these stations have been effective and that my hon. friend's impression is not founded on fact. I can only regret extremely that if, on any occasion, the inspectors of the provincial government found anything of the kind, they did not take trouble to report to us, so that we might investigate and remedy any deficiency or carelessness which might have occured at any of our stations. We have no report that anything of the kind has occured, no complaint has been made to us, and I think that I am justified in assuming that the impression under which my hon. friend labours is absolutely unfounded.

The provisions of this Bill are very similar in a general way to those of the British Columbia Act which my hon. friend has praised. I did not take that Act particularly as my model although it was thoroughly studied by us. What we took was rather the Act of Great Britain which seemed to suit our purposes here. and we have drafted a Bill which we think will cover the same ground and accomplish the same purposes as the British Act.

The conflict which my hon. friend thinks possible between this parliament and the provincial legislature I trust will not arise. As far as I am concerned, wherever it can be shown that the provincial authorities are taking all the necessary steps, I shall be very loath to interfere. I am not at all anxious for unnecessary work, and I have no desire to assume any responsibility or labour which does not fall naturally to my lot. If a provincial legislature takes the necessary precautions and carries them out efficiently, as I think the British Columbia people are doing, I shall not interfere with its work or try to overlap or duplicate it. But at the same time I think that an Act of this kind should, in the interests of the whole country, be passed and applied to the Dominion at large and not merely to one province. Otherwise while British Columbia might be very well safeguarded, the rest of the Dominion might not, and the danger of spreading infection elsewhere is entirely outside the purview of the British Columbia authorities. By means of a general law we can protect the whole Dominion much better than it can be by any number of Provincial Acts. I do not understand that my hon. friend objects at all to the passage of this Bill. I am sure he recognizes that it is quite within the competence of this parliament. That opinion I do not presume to give on my own authority, but I have the assurance of the Department of Justice that this Bill is absolutely within our jurisdiction. British Columbia may have no doubt a similar jurisdiction within the limits of that province, but I understand that by the British North America Act, where jurisdiction is given to both provincial and federal parliaments, and a conflict arises, the federal authority must prevail. I can, however, assure my hon. friend that I shall not undertake to interfere in any way with the provincial work. It would be only when I found it necessary in the interests of the country at large, that anything should be done in any province, that I would take

such steps as this Bill empowers me to take.

As the results of our work, done with the concurrence and assistance of the importers, willingly given to us—but possibly given to us because they anticipated a Bill of this kind and felt that the sacrifices they made this year would be followed up by continuous safety in the future—by reason of that work, we have been able to inspect 1,700,000,000 seedlings since the first of January, and found 293 nests of the brown tail moth. I have no doubt that each nest contained 200 to 300 caterpillars which would mean some 60,000 caterpillars or more, and if these had gone abroad throughout Canada and had been able to reproduce themselves in the way these insects do, we might easily have had this coming season a very severe and expensive visitation of this pest. That was done by volunteer work with only one official in addition to our regular staff, and I have no doubt we will be able to do our work more efficiently by having it legally recognized.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have already said I am in favour of this measure, and since the minister has given us to understand it is not going to be interfered with in any way by the provincial governments, we can more readily acquiesce in it. I was sorry to hear the minister say that he has stated that the apples of the province of Quebec were very much superior to those of any other part of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. Of any other place in the world.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I consider that that statement is a very narrow statement for a minister of the Crown to make. I certainly feel justified in criticising and condemning it in the strongest kind of language.

Mr. FISHER. Go ahead.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Because while the minister may take the position that the apples of Quebec are superior, and may believe it, yet such a statement from a minister of the Crown sent broadcast throughout our land, and possibly through other lands, is not justified. It would be wise for him to retract that statement and place himself in a correct position before the people.

Mr. MILLER. Why should the minister be asked to retract it? I do not think there is anything narrow in it. If he believes it to be true that is the statement he ought to make.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. gentleman believe it to be true?

Mr. MILLER. It does not make any difference whether I do or not. If the minister believes it to be true he had a right to say so. I have no doubt that if the minister had been speaking in the Northwest Territories, or in Quebec, or in Ontario, of the wheat of the west he would have said there is no wheat grown in Canada equal to the No. 1 hard.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman forgets that the apples from the county which he represents bring the highest price in the English markets of any Canadian apples.

Mr. MILLER. I am not arguing that because I have not sufficient knowledge. If the Minister of Agriculture thought that the apples grown in Quebec were the best it was not narrow to express that opinion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) is in a different position from the Minister of Agriculture. It is quite right for the hon. gentleman to make a statement about fruit grown in his riding, but the Minister of Agriculture is a prominent man to whom the apple growers look for reasonable, and fair statements, and for him to make such a statement is narrow.

Mr. MILLER. An opinion expressed by the Minister of Agriculture has more weight than a statement by a private member, but I think the Minister of Agriculture has just as good a right to be frank and honest in the statements he makes as any private member, and it seems to me rather a sign of narrowness to criticise the statement than to make it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The minister has said that the apples from Quebec are the best in Canada, or in the world. That is his individual opinion.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. He should get the English buyers, and the buyers of the world to agree with him on that point. The apples from the upland in Grey, over to the Georgian bay are known as Georgian bay fruit in the apple markets in England and Scotland, and bring the best price, except the hand-picked apples from British Columbia. These are facts that cannot be gainsaid, and it ill becomes the hon. member for Grey to speak as he did. I consider that comparisons of this kind are very odious, as we used to write at the head of our copy books, and I am surprised that the Minister of Agriculture would begin making comparisons as between the products of different sections of the country when they are not borne out by the facts. Does the minister not think it would be better, instead of bringing in a Bill providing for an inspection of, at the most, a casual kind, to stop the importation of seedlings or fruit trees, except those of a special kind that should be admitted by special instructions of the Department of Agriculture? We all

know that some years ago the black knot was introduced in that way, and it has destroyed all the plum and cherry trees, and is to-day to be found in the wild trees along the roadside. Moths of various kinds, the San José scale, and other pests have been introduced, and the only way to prevent this is to prevent the importation of seedlings. We can produce plenty of them in this country, and if we keep out the foreign seedlings and grafts of trees of this kind we will be doing the farmers a great benefit. The fruit growers can buy Canadian trees as cheaply as American. The only reason they buy in the United States is because they get the trees cheaply, and to prohibit the importation of seedlings would encourage the nursery business, especially in the province of Quebec, where, I believe, they could grow better nursery stock than can be grown in New York state or any state where they produce this stock. Shut them out for a given time, five or ten years.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is perhaps not familiar with the facts of the case. In the first place this stock came from France, not from the United States. Of the nursery trees grown in Canada, I am well within the mark when I say that not one-tenth of one per cent of them are not grafted on imported stock. Now, if my hon. friend's statement were to be carried out, it would absolutely put a stop, for a number of years, to the growing of nursery stock in Canada. My hon. friend is not aware, perhaps, that this stock is imported by the nurserymen of Canada in the form of little seedlings, and on these are grafted, when they arrive, the scions taken from Canadian trees. They have not got this stock in Canada.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Why?

Mr. FISHER. Because they do not grow it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That is, they can buy it abroad cheaper than they can grow it.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE But these seedlings can be grown here.

Mr. FISHER. But, if the nurserymen were debarred from bringing them in, it would stop the growth of Canadian nursery stock for several years. They might get back to it, but they could not do it at the present time. That is the first point. The second point is that the suggestion which my hon. friend makes was carried out with the introduction of the San José Scale Act. At that time, we absolutely prohibited the importation of any trees or stock from the countries infested with the San José scale. But the very men on whose behalf my hon. friend is now speaking petitioned this government and parliament to relax the law and make arrangements by which they could import nursery stock.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Who did that?

Mr. FISHER. The nurserymen, the farmers, the fruit growers—everybody concerned. And the result was that during the next year—I feel confident that it was within eighteen months of the passing of the Act—we had to amend the Act so as to provide stations at which this nursery stock could be imported. I sympathize with the view taken by my hon. friend, but if he will go to the people who are engaged in this business and make the proposition he makes here, I am sure he will find them unanimously against it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That may be so. But it is because it happens to enable them to make a few dollars. Many of these institutions are quite willing to sacrifice the fruit industry of the whole country to make a few dollars for themselves. But the minister should look at it from the point of view of the whole country, and not from the point of view of a special interest. Another point I would like to ask about is whether the minister has taken steps to prevent the importation of potatoes from Newfoundland? For I understand that, according to the report of his own department, the potatoes of Newfoundland are infected with a disease which would ruin the crops in Canada in a very few years.

Mr. FISHER. All the steps have been taken that I have power to take, and I am asking for this Bill to be enabled to take further steps. I have notified the customs authorities, and have asked them to inform my department immediately when entry is made of potatoes from Newfoundland. I do not think that any have been made, but if any should be made I will send my inspector there to destroy them. I have notified the people of the maritime provinces, who sometimes do get potatoes from Newfoundland—they are the only people in Canada who do—and have told them of the danger and warned them against using any such potatoes. So, I have taken every step that it is competent for me to take. I have not been able to forbid the entry of potatoes from Newfoundland, for the very reason that I have not an Act such as is here proposed. It is because I wish authority to go further that I am asking the House to pass this Bill.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. So far, so good.

Mr. FISHER. There are conditions when absolute prohibition may be necessary, but there are others when inspection is necessary, and still others when fumigation is sufficient. This proposed measure will en-

able me to take whichever of these steps seems necessary. I must trust to my expert advisers, the entomologist and the botanist of the experimental farm, who are men of eminence in their several domains, first for information as to the existence of a danger, and second, as to the means to be taken to meet it. Among other things, I ask authority to destroy any infected or infested stock or vegetable matter which may come in, and, when necessary, to destroy packages, and also to grant compensation, as is only fair and right, in some cases to the people who lose thereby. I repeat that if absolute prohibition were exercised to-morrow and the bringing in of these seedlings for the purpose of grafting were completely prohibited, it would paralyze the nursery trade of Canada for some years. I am sure my hon. friend would not wish to do that, and I have no doubt he has spoken without full consideration and without the intimate knowledge which, by reason of my connection with this work, I have necessarily acquired.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would also ask whether the minister intends to cover grain under this Bill. He might as well take power in relation to seed grain as well. Medical men claim that the corn grown in certain of the states, especially in the southern states, is at present giving humanity a terrible disease known as pellagra. Also, I believe, a great many of the noxious weeds brought into Canada are brought in with foreign grain. The minister should be empowered under this Bill to stop this traffic, as a policeman on the corner stops the road traffic in order to prevent danger.

Mr. FISHER. The Bill covers that. It provides in relation to 'any vegetable matter.' As to weeds, the Seed Control Act applies pretty thoroughly to that, as it covers seeds imported as well as seeds grown in Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I hope the minister (Mr. Fisher) will retract the statement made as to the province of Quebec and the apples grown there. It seems to me a narrow, provincial view for a minister of the Crown of this Dominion to take. The hon. minister represents the whole Dominion, and not one province or a part of a province only. On what authority does the hon. gentleman base his statement? Let the hon. minister come into the western part of Ontario, even into the district of Grey, represented by the hon. member (Mr. Miller) who took exception to the statement I made some time ago, and he will find that the apples grown there are being disposed of in the markets of the world at prices above even those that the apples of the province of Quebec can command. And, if he will look at the returns, he will see that a very small proportion of our apples are grown in the province of Quebec. I am really surprised that the minister should take the position he does. As an instance, take my own district. The men who are engaged in the fruit industry there have to take into consideration this fact, that the Minister of Agriculture says that the best apples that can be grown are grown in the province of Quebec, and I suppose he means to infer that the best place to engage in that industry is the province of Quebec. If that is not a narrow, provincial policy for the minister to take I do not know what a narrow, provincial policy is. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) would not dare to go up in his riding and confirm the statement made by the minister.

Mr. MILLER. I will dare to make any statement in my riding that I dare to make here, no matter what it is, and I say again that the hon. gentleman is not as wise on this question as he really thinks he is. I wish that the Minister of Agriculture would come into my riding and say anything that would spur up the agriculturists there to pay much more attention to their orchards than they do.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That has nothing to do with this statement.

Mr. MILLER. It has this to do with it, that it shows that the hon. member for East Lambton does not know the condition in my riding as well as I know it myself. I believe that in my riding they can grow apples to very good advantage, and I believe that if the Minister of Agriculture will come up there, as I trust he will, and say something that will spur the farmers there to greater activity and cause them to take a greater interest in their orchards, it would be very much better for them, and when he comes I want him to be as honest in my riding as he is in the province of Quebec, and if he tells them that while they can grow good apples in Ontario, they can perhaps grow apples of a somewhat better flavour in Quebec, I do not believe that any one will object.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many thousand barrels of apples were shipped out of your county?

Mr. MILLER. Not very many from my riding. In the northern part of the county there may have been a larger quantity shipped. I do not think that the farmers pay anything like the attention to their orchards, as a general thing—there may be exceptions—that they ought to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The statement made by the hon. member for South Grey is far from being in line with the statement made

by the Minister of Agriculture. The statement made by the hon. member for South Grey is that he will ask the Minister of Agriculture to come up into his riding and tell them that they ought to get to work and improve their orchards and perhaps improve the quality of fruit. But what would he think if the minister came up into his riding and said: Gentlemen, though you can produce apples in a way, this place cannot compare with the province of Quebec, because we can produce much better fruit in the province of Quebec than you can here? I have asked the minister, and not the member for South Grey, to answer the question or take back the statement.

Mr. FISHER. I really do not know whether it is worth my while. I am amused by the hon. gentleman's reference to this matter. I cannot imagine that the hon. gentleman, although he looks so serious, is serious.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, Sir, I am serious.

Mr. FISHER. Well, all I can say is that I am sorry for his narrow-mindedness and small comprehension. I have no hesitation in repeating what I said. I may be wrong, the hon. gentleman is welcome to think otherwise, and everybody else is welcome to think otherwise, but I still believe, as far as flavour and quality are concerned, some of the apples grown in the province of Quebec, and the apples generally in Quebec, are the best in the world. I am going to repeat it and repeat it to the hon. gentleman, and I do not care what he thinks about it, one way or the other. He and everybody else may think differently, but I repeat it, as I have repeated it everywhere. I have done it a thousand times, and I am going to do it a thousand times again, whether I am Minister of Agriculture or not, and whether the hon. member criticise me for it or not. I do not think it makes the slightest difference. Wherever I am, and whenever I am dealing with matters of this kind, I will say just what I think, I will give expression to my opinion to the farmers as to everybody else, and I will defend the interests of the people of Canada in regard to agricultural production to the fullest extent possible. I have my own opinions, and I have my own tastes in regard to things, and I am not going to deny them or withhold them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that after listening to the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, I feel that the vigour of my own remarks was justified. A paper has been read here this afternoon condemning the minister in the strongest possible way, and I cannot help but think that not only will that paper condemn him, but that practically every paper interested in agriculture throughout the country will be strong of the condemnation of his action in this House. The hon. gentleman knows that he has adopted a narrow-minded policy. What authority has a minister of the Crown, who is supposed to represent the people of the Dominion and all of the provinces, to say on the floor of this House that as far as his opinion of the apple growing industry is concerned, the province of Quebec is the place to grow apples?

Mr. FISHER. I did not say that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is practically what it meant.

Mr FISHER. Confine yourself to what I say.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is all right, but the minister knows that that is practically the idea that the people in general will get out of the remarks he has made here this afternoon, and I myself emphatically wish to say that it ill-becomes a minister, who represents the different provinces of the Dominion, to get up and make such a narrow provincial statement as that.

Mr. MILLER. I think the farmers of my own riding, and even the farmers of the riding of my hon. friend from East Lambton, are sufficiently intelligent to want from the Minister of Agriculture, when he addresses them, either by going before them, or through the press, or from the floor of this House, not flattery but truth.

Mr. BLAIN. I rather agree with my hon. friend from East Lambton, and I must say that I am very much surprised at the cautious Minister of Agriculture in stating to us that the province of Quebec is the province in Canada that grows apples of the best flavour. I am not quite sure whether my hon. friend is discharging his duties as Minister of Agriculture in the best possible way when he makes a statement of that kind on the floor of this House. I am not going to offer any criticism as to whether he should hold that opinion or not; that is a matter for himself. Before the Agriculture Committee occasionally very pointed questions are put to the officials of the department who are there giving their evidence. When a pointed question is put—such as, which province grows the best wheat?—the official hesitates and says: I do not wish to make any comparisons; I am only here to make a statement of facts. Some of the lessons that my hon. friend has been giving to his officials in the department perhaps might be learned with advantage by himself, and while my hon. friend may say that it is his right to express an opinion, and while it may be endorsed by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), who comes from a part of the province where, as he states himself, they

do not pay any very special attention to apple growing, my hon. friend must remember that there are parts of Ontario where they are devoting a great deal of attention to apple raising, and where there are very large exporters, such as there are in one part of my own county, where men have a thousand trees, some a great many more, and where they sell the output of their orchards for $2,500 and $3,000. These men are very much interested in the apple export trade. I am not quite sure that my hon. friend is giving fair play to other parts of Canada when he allows it to go abroad from his high position in the government of this country that he has no hesitation to state on the floor of this House from which province the best apples come, which are being sent to the old country. I think my hon. friend has rather forgotten his usual caution. For myself, I agree with my hon. friend from East Lambton, and I do not agree with the hon. member for South Grey in this matter. It may be that my hon. friend's constituents require a little prodding up. I think they do in many ways. If the agricultural interests of his constituency are not taken care of, he must blame either himself or the Minister of Agriculture, and not the member for East Lambton, who is advocating the principle that the Minister of Agriculture, having a better opportunity than any other single man in Canada to protect agricultural interests, should not single out any one province and say that it produced the best apples for export trade and home consumption, thus instituting an invidious and injurious comparison. That is going a little beyond his duties, and I do not think it will be endorsed by the people. The hon. gentleman is used to having the commendation of the people of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. Hear hear.

Mr. BLAIN. But there were other days--

Mr. FISHER. Before they had the experience.

Mr. BLAIN. But there were other days coming, and perhaps the Minister of Agriculture will learn by experience later on.

Mr. GOODEVE. I certainly would not have spoken on this question were it not for the statement which the Minister of Agriculture has made on the floor of the House. I can quite understand that as a minister for the province of Quebec, and speaking to a Quebec audience, he might assume an optimistic tone as regards the conditions in that province, and I would not take exception to what he said then. But, when he speaks from his place in parliament as a minister of the Crown and when in cold blood he reiterates the statement that the province of Quebec does grow the best apples, thus making invidious comparisons between the provinces of the Dominion, I do think it is at least an error of judgment on the part of the minister. Naturally my people will see these reports in the press, and coming as I do from what I think to be the best fruit growing district in the best fruit country in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, you ought not to say that.

Mr. GOODEVE. Coming as I do from what I believe to be the best fruit growing district in Canada, my people would very properly want to know why I allowed an expression of that kind to pass without protest. I do not pretend to be an expert as is my friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) but I would direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that within the last two years they have established in the city of Spokane what is claimed to be the largest exclusively apple show on the continent of America and perhaps in the world, and at that show at which apples from all parts of the continent competed, my particular district received a large number of the first prizes in many lines. The district of Kootenay, my own particular district, received the first award for apples at the Spokane apple exhibition. Again, the minister well knows, (for if I am not mistaken I have seen it in one of the government reports) that the province of British Columbia took the gold medal at the British show, and only last year that province was awarded a special medal for the best 50 boxes of the best fruit and the best packed fruit. I do not know if the province of Quebec was represented there, but if so I would be only too delighted to hear that it also received an award, because, I do not think that in a great country such as ours there is room for these small jealousies and invidious comparisons. I feel that the remarks made by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) were only fair and I was rather surprised at the attitude assumed by the Minister of Agriculture in replying to him. I like to hear a minister representing a province in this great Dominion giving words of encouragement to his own people, and I would not take very great exception to what was said by the hon. gentleman in his own province of Quebec, but when the minister reads in Hansard, the statement he has made on the floor of the House and which he does not withdraw, that there is no other province in which they grow apples on the whole equal in quality and flavour to the apples grown in the province of Quebec, I think the hon. gentleman will, on reflection, admit that from his own standpoint and the standpoint of the country, he has made a mistake.

Mr. FISHER. I would remind my hon. friend that although I am Minister of Agri-

culture I am still the representative of a county in Quebec; and if the hon. gentleman is permitted to say that his part of British Columbia grows the best fruit and is the best fruit growing district in Canada, I do not see why I should not be permitted to make the same claim for my own province.

Mr. BLAIN. There is a great difference and the minister knows it. It is one thing for a private member to say that in his opinion his district grows the best apples in Canada, but while the Minister of Agriculture represents a county in Quebec he has a wider field and is a minister of the Crown for the whole Dominion He can very well see that when the English importers of apples, having British Columbia fruit on hand, advertise the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture in parliament, it might be a serious detriment to the fruit coming from other provinces. Then, the minister has not attempted to support his statement by any documentary evidence.

Mr. FISHER. I simply gave my own opinion, my own taste.

Mr. LENNOX. Your taste may be vitiated.

Mr. BLAIN. If the minister could show that in competition with the fruit of other parts of Canada the apples of the province of Quebec had carried off all the awards, then he might have some foundation for the statement.

Mr. FISHER. I told the hon. gentleman over and over again that I gave my own opinion and my own taste and nothing more.

Mr. BLAIN. I have nothing to do with the hon. gentleman's taste, but I have something to do with his opinion as Minister of Agriculture. When my hon. friend repeats and re-repeats in this House that in his opinion the best apples produced in Canada are from the province of Quebec, he makes that statement as Minister of Agriculture, and in so doing I have no hesitation in saying that he is not giving fair play to every other province in Canada. I would have no hesitation myself in expressing my opinion that the best apples to be found in the world are to be found in the province of Ontario.

Mr. FISHER. Just the same as I have.

Mr. BLAIN. No, I occupy an entirely different position. I am merely a humble representative of a constituency in the province of Ontario, while my hon. friend is Minister of Agriculture. When the people of the world are looking for a statement in regard to the agricultural capabilities of this country, they are not looking for it from an ordinary member of this House; they look for it from a man in authority like the Minister of Agriculture. Time and again, in the Committee on Agriculture, when questions have been put to officers of his own department, as to which province produced the best of this or the best of that, my hon. friend has always said, you must not make comparisons, and the committee endorsed him; because it would not do for any official, who is an official of all Canada, to make a statement, even in the Committee on Agriculture, that one province produced better crops of fruit or potatoes or anything else than another province. My hon. friend recognized the propriety of that, and he would not go through the country and make statements of that kind. He is too good a politician for that. And if my hon. friend will not allow the ordinary officials of his department to single out one province as being superior to another in this respect, my hon. friend as Minister of Agriculture should not on the floor of this House single out one province, and say that it produces better apples than any other province in Canada.

Mr. CROSBY. In the absence of Sir Frederick Borden, representing Kings county, and in the absence of Dr. Black, representing the county of Hants, and in the absence of Mr. Pickup, representing the county of Annapolis, I am bound to stand up for the province of Nova Scotia; and the first thing I want to say is that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has no right to assume that he occupies the same position as the hon. member for Peel or any other member who represents a county in this House. The Minister of Agriculture represents the whole Dominion. I am sorry for him, but nevertheless he does.

Mr. FISHER. We cannot help it.

Mr. CROSBY. I cannot help it now, but I hope some day to help it. My hon. friend, however, need not feel so safe that he can come here and make any statement he likes. My hon. friend said a moment ago that he had as much right to say that the best apples were grown in Quebec as the hon. member from British Columbia had to say that the best apples were grown in that province. I say that neither has the right to say anything of the kind unless he has the facts to back up the statement.

Mr. FISHER. How about Nova Scotia?

Mr. CROSBY. My hon. friend knows enough about Nova Scotia to know that it is a straight statement that the best apples in the world come from Nova Scotia. Any man who knows anything about fruit knows that Nova Scotia apples do not take second place to any apples in the world.

If the hon. minister had said that the apples grown in Quebec, were as good as any grown anywhere else in the Dominion of Canada, no one would find fault with him; but to say that the best apples are grown in Quebec is I think, quite unfair and unreasonable, in view of the fact, which he knows himself, that apples from Nova Scotia are at least not second to any grown in Quebec or in the world. I am not an apple grower, but I am an apple eater, and I think I have a better taste than the Minister of Agriculture. I think his taste must have been interfered with when he was eating those apples.

Mr. LENNOX. What time of the evening was it?

Mr. CROSBY. I do not know what time of the evening it was, but I always eat apples in a reasonable hour. I have not had the pleasure of eating any apples grown in Quebec, but I have eaten apples grown in Nova Scotia, and I am quite sure that the province of Quebec cannot beat the province of Nova Scotia in the production of apples or in their quality.

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CROSBY. And the Minister of Agriculture agrees with me; so he has taken back what he said. I have no desire that Nova Scotia apples should be stated by the Minister of Agriculture or anybody else to be the best that are grown, but I say that they are equal to any that are grown, and anybody who watches the market knows that there are none that bring a higher price; and that is not a question of taste, but a question of ' money talks.'

Mr. PRICE. I am very sorry that I have to differ with members on this side of the House who have spoken. I quite agree with the Minister of Agriculture that the best apples are grown in the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) talks about taste. I really thought he had better taste. But I must say that I think the Minister of Agriculture has better taste as regards apples than the hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. BURRELL. I ought almost to apologize to the House for throwing an apple of discord into this debate. Let me say that I do not feel called upon to indulge in any lofty panegyrics of British Columbia apples, although I hold my own opinion, as other gentlemen hold theirs. But as a matter of fact we who know the results recognize frankly that the Nova Scotia Gravenstein, the Ontario Spy, the Quebec Fameuse and the Cox's Orange or Jonathan of my own province—any of these apples, grown under the best conditions, will satisfy any taste, perhaps even that of the Minister of Agriculture. I think it is a mistake to make these comparisons. There is one common ground on which we can all stand, which interests those who are not apple growers, but apple consumers. By striving in the best way we can to give the consumer what he wants we shall hasten that millennium described by Oliver Wendell Holmes—and this may appeal to the lawyers in the House—a millennium which will arrive:

> When legislators keep the law,
> And banks dispense with bolts and locks,
> And berries, whortle, rasp and straw,
> Grow bigger downwards through the box.

Whatever else we dispute about, I think we in British Columbia, not only so far as flavour goes, but by the excellence of our packing, have the satisfaction of getting our fruit to the consumers in such shape that we can give pointers in this respect to most of the other provinces. I regret these sectional differences, because in my opinion we should all join together in making this industry a national one, and give it predominance in the markets of the world, and I credit the hon. minister with having the like intention.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. This discussion has been a revelation to me because I thought it was thoroughly and generally understood that the best apples in the country were produced in the county of North Grey and that it was one of these which caused the mischief between Adam and Eve, but I must admit that the British Columbia members have the best of us because I understand that the apple which Eve ate was B. C.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have here a photograph which I want to show the Minister of Agriculture of apples shipped to my constituency this year. I think this photograph is really worth being presented to this House. This photograph was taken not by myself, but under my direction, of apples packed in Ontario and sent out to the northwest.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I really think the hon. minister should withdraw the statement he has just made. There is no reason in the world why a minister of the Crown, representing the whole Dominion, should make a statement of that kind. Such a statement will be used in the markets of the world as an advertisement. Is it statesmanlike on the part of the hon. gentleman to advertise certain districts where apples are grown in this country, and have it go out to the world on his authority that Quebec is the place where the best apples are grown in the Dominion?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was the apple of discord, apparently.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Apple sauce as far as the Minister of Agriculture is concerned. I hope that he will have the decency to withdraw that statement. He is well aware that in Ontario we raised some 15,000,000 barrels last year, which is the largest amount of apples grown by any province; but if the Quebec shippers can put a stamp on the apples they send to Great Britain to the effect that the Minister of Agriculture of this country stated emphatically on the floor of parliament that the apples grown in that province are the best in the Dominion, you may depend upon it the Quebec apples will thereby gain an advantage over those of the other provinces. I would like the hon. minister to at least state whether he is going to withdraw that statement.

Mr. FISHER. Carried.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask him what authority he has for making it?

Mr. FISHER. Carried.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have asked a reasonable and fair question, and I think the minister ought at least to give an answer.

Mr. FISHER. I have answered the hon. gentleman and am not going to answer him any more on that subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is certainly a very strange position to take. We are well aware that the hon. gentleman has made some statements ill becoming a minister of the Crown. I am sure that when he sees those statements in print to-morrow, he will regret having made them. I represent a large agricultural district where quantities of the very best apples in the Dominion are grown, and I feel it my duty to point out to the minister that he has been making statements contrary to the best interests of the apple growing industry. I sincerely hope that during recess he will take the opportunity to reflect and that when we resume at 8 o'clock he will have come to the conclusion that he had better admit he has made a mistake and is willing to show fair play to the whole of the Dominion.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I hope since the minister has had his dinner he will be in a little better humour, and will withdraw the remark he made in reference to the apple industry, and also the insulting remarks he made about myself. I did not know until after the House had risen that he had made use of the words that I was narrow-minded, and of small comprehension. If he thinks that is becoming to a minister of the Crown, it is high time we placed him where he belongs. He considers that he is at liberty to come into this House and bulldoze, and browbeat members as he would perhaps some of his own constituents in the province of Quebec. It is high time he realized the position he holds in the House. I will ask the minister if he will be good enough to withdraw that statement.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then I say his words ill become a minister of the Crown in the House of Commons. In referring to the hon. gentleman I took care not to make a personal reference, I said that his policy on this question was a narrow and provincial policy. In the face of that the hon. gentleman says: Your remarks are narrow-minded, and of small comprehension. Will he say the same about the Montreal 'Star' or this 'Fruit Journal', or the dozens of fruit journals or agricultural papers that will attack the statement of the minister, and criticise it in its proper light. Are they narrow-minded and small of comprehension? If the hon. gentleman will look over his record he will see what a narrow-minded policy he has been carrying on ever since he took office. Let him go back to his position as manufacturing squirt guns to feed chickens and scissors to cut peaches off the trees, and his primitive cold storage apparatus. Follow him all down through his career, and you cannot come to any other conclusion than that it ill becomes him to make such statements of an hon. member. Has the hon. gentleman seen this statement in this paper referring to his statement in Quebec, and in British Columbia?

> That certain varieties of the apple are more successful in certain parts of the fruit-growing area of the Dominion than in others is true, but to make the broad statement that 'the flavour of the British Columbia apple was not to be compared with that of the province of Quebec,' or vice versa, is certainly taking a rash plunge into the deep and chilly waters of odious comparisons.

The hon. gentleman made use of these words this afternoon:

> I consider the apples of Quebec, as far as flavour and quality are concerned, to be better than anything produced not only in British Columbia but in the whole world.

If the hon. gentleman was a private member of the House it would be a very different question, but he is a minister of the Crown, and has to deal with the different districts throughout the Dominion. Let us carry that to its legitimate conclusion, let him, if he dares, pick out certain qualities of agricultural products produced on the farms of Canada, and say that they are

adapted altogether to one certain province. He knows he would not dare to take any such position as that, but he thinks it proper to take that position in reference to the great apple industry. Only a few years ago we produced 20,000,000 barrels of apples and 15,000,000 of these were produced in Ontario, and the minister would place a stigma on the apples of that province by stating that those of Quebec are superior; he is simply as it were, advertising, or booming the products of one province in direct opposition to the products of another province. If the minister has not the manliness or backbone, or good judgment to withdraw the words he used, I leave it to the judgment of the House as to who is the man of narrow mind and little comprehension. I am satisfied they will leave it not very far from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. JAMESON. I was, I must confess, a little surprised this afternoon to near the statement of the Minister of Agriculture in respect to the apples of Quebec. While I have a very high admiration for the various farming communities and horticultural communities of this Dominion, at the same time I do not think it is wise or seemly, or fair, that a gentleman occupying the position of Minister of Agriculture of Canada should single out any particular province for his commendation. His statement was: 'I consider the apples of Quebec, as far as flavour and quality are concerned, to be infinitely superior to anything produced, not only in British Columbia, but in the whole world.' So long as this difference was only between the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) and the hon. minister, and affected only the provinces of British Columbia and Quebec, I felt it no duty of mine to make any comment with respect to it; but when the minister made so broad and sweeping a statement as he finally did, it seemed that in justice to the province of Nova Scotia, which has an enviable record with respect to the fruits produced there, I should enter a protest. I do not know whether the minister has visited that province of recent years, and has seen the fruit which is grown there?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. If the minister has, I fear that his observations of the Annapolis valley, and other sections, must have been of a very cursory nature, or else he has done an injustice to that province with his eyes open, because the Annapolis valley, as a fruit growing district, is not excelled by any part of Canada. I feel it is only right, on behalf of the fruit growers of the Annapolis valley, and other sections, that I should enter a protest against the statement of the minister, and say that I do not think that their fruit is excelled in any part of the Dominion.

I make that statement, of course, as a private member. I have not had the same opportunity as the minister to visit all parts of the Dominion where fruit is grown, but I make the statement as the result of reading such reports as have been available, and after such investigation as it has been within my power to make. I think it would be well if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who represents that province, the hon. member for Hants, (Mr. Black), the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), representing, as he does, the county of Kings, and the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Pickup), were to rise and endorse the statement I make that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has, possibly all unwittingly, done the province of Nova Scotia, and particularly the Annapolis valley, and other fruit growing sections a grave and serious injustice in the sweeping statement which I have just recited. Such a statement, coming from the Minister of Agriculture, comes as an authoritative statement; and it goes out not only to the people of Canada, but to the people of the whole world as the statement of one who might well be said to be in the position of an expert, and to make the statement as a result of investigation, and inquiry, and with the very fullest knowledge that it is possible for any man in Canada to possess. And because of that, it becomes my duty to challenge, and I do challenge the statement which the Minister of Agriculture has made, so far at least as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned. The fruit-growers of the Annapolis valley and adjoining sections about which I am specially concerned, and about which I know most, have been doing a splendid work during the past few years. They have been raising an excellent variety of fruit, and placing that fruit on the market in the best of condition, gaining thereby a most enviable reputation. I do not think it fair or just—yes, I agree with the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) in saying that I think it is not seemly—for the Minister of Agriculture to discriminate in his remarks against the fruit-growers of Nova Scotia, as he did. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will not misunderstand me in making that statement. He will understand that I am merely doing what I believe to be my duty to the people of Nova Scotia, and the fruit growers of the districts I have mentioned. It may not be a very agreeable task for one to gainsay a statement of an hon. minister who should have full knowledge of the subject on which he speaks, but I only regard it as a duty, and I trust that other hon. members from the apple-growing districts of Nova Scotia will endorse my statement

and will join with me in asking the Minister of Agriculture to modify at least, if he will not withdraw, the statement he has made in view of the fact that it is undoubtedly a discrimination against the province of Nova Scotia, and an unfair discrimination, and that it will prove a detriment to these apple-growers when they seek to place their fruit on the market.

Mr. BLACK. This appears to be a little worse than a tempest in a tea-pot. When I came in, and heard the excited and exciting declamation of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), I thought that surely the Minister of Agriculture had been guilty at least of high treason. Surely, for a man to praise the fruit of his own county is no crime. I myself represent the county that grows the best fruit in the world, yet I do not imagine for a moment that the Minister of Agriculture or the member for East Lambton is going to take offence at my saying so. I think it is a very loyal thing for a man to believe that his own country is the best, and that the apples grown near his own door are better than any others.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. member (Mr. Black) think that the influence his statement will exert will be as widespread as that exerted by the statement of the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. BLACK. Some of the members on the other side are cultivating a very bad habit. The moment a man gets up on this side to speak, they immediately ask questions. Now I like to make my speech in my own way. I do not speak very often, and I think I set a very good example to some of the newer and younger members on the other side who rise on every question. I would not take part in this discussion were it not that—I say it truthfully and without boasting—I represent one of the best fruit counties in Canada. Indeed, as a pastime, I have been a fruit grower myself. It is a very profitable business in my county. I would as soon own a good fruit orchard in the county of Hants as own stock in the Bank of Nova Scotia. I am sorry I was out for a few minutes this afternoon, so that the apple industry had to be defended by that eminent fruit grower the hon. member for the city of Halifax (Mr. Crosby). I am sorry also that this duty of defence had to be assumed by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson). If it had been a question of Digby chickens, or smoked herring, or dried fish, the hon. member for Digby would certainly be in a good position to speak. But I have always noticed, as soon as I crossed the line of Annapolis county going west, that the apple blossoms cease and the apple trees were nowhere to be found in the county of Digby.

Mr. JAMESON. The hon. gentleman must have had his eyes closed.

Mr. BLACK. No, I have gone there many times, and I have not seen much farming land there. They have a splendid summer resort, they have the magnificent Annapolis basin to look at, and many other fine things, but they do not grow fruit, and it is not a farming county. The Annapolis valley would seem to be the fruit growing district of Nova Scotia according to the hon. member for Digby. But the Annapolis valley is a little strip of Nova Scotia about twenty-five or thirty miles long; the great fruit-growing belt takes in the county of Hants and the county of Kings, neither of which have anything to do with the Annapolis valley. Indeed, there are four or five great apple growing valleys in Nova Scotia. There are the Annapolis valley, the Cornwallis valley, which, perhaps, produces the greatest quantity of any part of Nova Scotia, and which is in the county of Kings, the Gaspereau valley, which is noted for its beauty and its apple growing all over eastern Canada; the Avon valley in my own county, and many others where fruit is grown. I will not take up time now; this is a trifling discussion, and almost unworthy the members taking part in it. I take no offence at what the Minister of Agriculture has said concerning the apples of his province. He deserves credit for standing by his own. I say as much for the apples of my own province, and I do not think that anybody would take offence at that. I am glad that so many parts of Canada can show to the world such splendid results in apple-growing. We export from Nova Scotia 750,000 barrels to London alone, and we are increasing that year by year, and are capable of growing at least twenty times the quantity we now grow. Orchards are increasing and new orchards are being set out. Men come in to buy the apples, in fact, they will advance you money on your fruit. They tumble over one another in trying to get your apples.

Mr. SCHELL. I do not propose to discuss this question at any great length. Of course, in Ontario, we think we grow the best apples that are grown in the Dominion, especially in the county of Oxford. I know that in Nova Scotia they grow very fine apples. I think their Gravensteins will compare favourably with some of our best apples. They have very beautiful looking apples in British Columbia. I think they beat us as far as appearance goes; I will not say as far as flavour goes, because I never tasted many of their apples, but certainly they grow nice looking apples. I know that they grow exceptionally fine apples on the island of Montreal, and especially the Fameuse, which is perhaps equal to anything grown in Canada in more

ways than one. I was not here this afternoon, and I am not very well posted on what has been said, but evidently there is some feeling regarding a statement that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has made with respect to the quality of apples grown in the province of Quebec. I think the question is viewed entirely from the wrong standpoint, and that is the point I wish to make. If the province of Quebec is growing the very best apples in the Dominion of Canada so much the better for the rest of the Dominion. If the province of British Columbia has better apples than any other part of the Dominion so much the better for Ontario, Nova Scotia and Quebec. If we have the best apples in Ontario it is better for every other province that we have the best or at least good apples. The better the apples we produce the better it will be for every province in the Dominion. If the minister says that the apples grown in the province of Quebec are the best, he has not done us any injury in Ontario, but he has done us good. Place 100,000 barrels of apples on the market in Liverpool and if they are all good you can get rid of them at a good, big price, and follow them with another 100,000 barrels and get another big price for those. But if half of them are poor all the good apples the following week will bring less money, because there were poor apples placed on the market the previous week. If we can give the impression abroad that any other province is producing better apples than we are it will only be an incentive for us to do better and to try and produce good apples in every province of the Dominion. Instead of the minister being open to criticism he has a perfect right to say that apples in one province, for some reasons, suit his taste or idea better than the apples of another province. I would not hesitate to express an opinion myself regarding the apples of any province if I thought they were the best, whether it was in Nova Scotia, British Columbia, Ontario, or Quebec.

Mr. CROSBY. It is not the question of which province grows the best apples that we are here to discuss. The Minister of Agriculture is not the Minister of Agriculture of Nova Scotia, Quebec, or Ontario or any other province, but of this Dominion, has made a statement without producing anything to back it up or to show that it is a statement of fact, and that is the question that we are discussing at the present moment. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) has said that he was sorry that the defence of the fruit-growing industry of Nova Scotia had been left in the hands of the hon. member for Halifax. I can only tell him that there was no member from that part of the province on that side of the House to look after the matter when it came up. I confess that I am not an apple grower, but I am an apple eater. If the hon. member for Hants had the facts before him as had the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) he would have understood distinctly what the hon. gentleman had said.

Mr. BLACK. I heard the Minister of Agriculture, because I was here when he made the statement.

Mr. CROSBY. Then you should have been here to defend your province.

Mr. BLACK. I was glad I was out when some of the speeches were made.

Mr. CROSBY. The hon. member for Hants was born and brought up in a county that is noted for raising peaches. The Minister of Agriculture makes himself a judge for this whole Dominion and undertakes to declare that the best apples are raised in Quebec. I am not here to say a word against the apples in Quebec. I have no doubt they raise as good apples in Quebec as they raise any place else, but the minister has no right to make that statement in this House. If he were to make that statement in the province of Quebec we might forgive him, because he is given to saying one thing in one province and another in another. But we cannot forgive him when he comes into this House, and, in cold blood, makes a statement such as he did make and which is without foundation. I believe that if the Minister of Agriculture made a slip he should not be so stubborn as not to stand up and say: Well, boys, from all the other provinces, forgive me; I did not know what I was saying and I will take it all back. One of two things he must do; he must take that statement back or prove it by some facts, because he is not supposed to be a judge of apples. He may be constituted as Minister of Agriculture, through no fault of mine, but he has never been appointed by anybody as a judge of apples, and he must either take the statement back or produce evidence to show that it is a statement of fact. They do have fish in the county I come from, and I would advise some hon. members on the other side of the House to eat a little fish. If what they say about fish is true, they need a little. We raise apples in Halifax county, but we have so many other things that we pride ourselves on that we do not particularly worry about our apples. It is unfair that the statement which the minister has made should go abroad. We forgive the minister when he goes to Quebec and makes a statement of that kind, and I believe that they will forgive him there for it, he might make it when he goes to Ontario, but I do not think he has any right to make it in this House.

Mr. M. MARTIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that many members of the opposition who have discussed this matter should ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture to withdraw the statement he made last fall at the pomologicial convention, that the best apples in Canada and even in the whole world, are raised in the province of Quebec.

Everybody knows that the 'Fameuse,' an apple grown in the neighbourhood of Montreal, has the preference on the English market and that it is the English consumers themselves who have styled it 'Beauty of Montreal' and looked upon it as the best apple in the world.

If the best apple be raised in the province of Quebec, that is no reason to find fault with Quebec.

I regret, however, that the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is not in his seat, because these apples are largely grown in his constituency; I am certain that for once he would have given credit to the minister on account of that statement.

On section 4, scope of regulations.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What kind of inspection will be given to these articles when they are brought in?

Mr. FISHER. I would certainly consider that for the purposes of this Act any inspection to prevent disease of insect pests must be made by a qualified entomologist or botanist. I would not like to trust to anybody who had not these qualifications to decide as to whether an insect pest or disease existed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister gave us to understand this afternoon that he did not expect to have any new employees in connection with this matter.

Mr. FISHER. Hardly that; but still I may say to my hon. friend that I already have in the service of the department several officers who have the necessary qualifications.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the minister has sufficient employees to undertake this work, what is the need of clauses 5 and 6? Why not wipe them out altogether?

Mr. FISHER. There might at any time occur an outbreak, which would be a very dangerous menace to the country, and in that case I would have to employ additional officers to be in a position to carry out the purposes of the Act. I would only do so, of course, in case the staff in the employ of the department were not sufficient to cope with the situation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Could not the minister employ them in the department or use the employees he has? It seems to me that if this is left in the Act, it only gives the minister the opportunity to use his handiwork and give places to his own pets.

Mr. FISHER. Additional officers will be appointed only in case the situation demands them, and they will be appointed only because of their qualifications for the work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then why not appoint them in the department instead of under this Bill?

Mr. FISHER. Because they may not be needed all the time. I propose to employ men only when it is necessary, and only so long as it is necessary.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister any officers such as he has suggested at the ports of entry at the present time?

Mr. FISHER. Not at the present time. I have not power to have them.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister, in introducing this Bill to-day, referred to an insect known as the brown-tail moth. This insect has been in some way introduced into the western part of the province of Nova Scotia within the last three or four years, and has been giving a good deal of trouble there. I do not know just how it was introduced. I do not think that it was traced to any fruit trees that were brought in. The statement was made to me by some people who had made very careful investigation of the matter that so far as they could learn it was brought in by some steamer trading between some United States port, I think Boston, and one of the ports in western Nova Scotia. It secured quite a foothold there before it was recognized, and thereafter some efforts were put forward by the provincial authorities, which although they were fairly vigorous, do not seem to have altogether checked its spread and development. The question suggests itself to my mind that as there is a danger of the introduction of this pest in some other way than by bringing in of fruit trees, possibly the minister may have some information in regard to the matter generally which would be useful if it were placed on 'Hansard' at this point.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite correct. I am not able to say offhand just when the pest was introduced into Nova Scotia, and I do not think I have had any knowledge of how it was introduced. But I think the cause suggested by my hon. friend is quite probable, because this moth has been known to obtain a foothold in the New England states some years before it was known in Nova Scotia. The Nova Scotia government has, I think, now three men employed in trying to stamp out the pest. The entomologist of the department

here is in constant touch with them, and is giving them advice, and the late Dr. Fletcher, the late entomologist of the department, visited Nova Scotia, and described the moth and its habits and helped the people there by advice, information and instruction to combat it; but up to the present time there has been no law under which we could take any steps to stamp it out. This law will provide the necessary machinery for that work. I wish, without in any way interfering with or depreciating the effort of the provincial government, to help them in every possible way, and as soon as this Bill passes into law, I think we shall be able to work very effectively. Such a case as that mentioned might be one in which I might have to appoint an officer to aid the local authorities, or to carry out the provisions of this law, which might be more effective, especially in a case of the introduction from abroad of an insect pest, than a provincial or local law would be.

Mr. JAMESON. I am pleased to hear that statement of the minister. I think it will be of very great assistance if he does make a move along that line. The pest was not very much known in this country until it was introduced into Nova Scotia three or four years ago, and the seriousness of it was not realized until a year or two had elapsed. It is a very serious pest, and any measures that would tend to stamp it out should be taken. In the county of Digby, although my hon. friend from Hants does not seem to have remembered it, we raise a good many apples, and I may say that the fruit is of a very excellent quality, particularly in the districts of Bear river, Hill Grove, Acaciaville, and other places. In these districts specimens of this moth have been found; and so far as I have been able to learn it has not only been spreading amongst the fruit trees, but is believed to have taken hold of the general forest growth. I do not know whether that is really the case or not, as I am not sufficiently well informed respecting the habits of this moth; but at all events there is a very suspicious looking insect, which bears a close resemblance in many particulars to the brown-tail moth. I would like to ask the minister whether this moth has been discovered in any of the other provinces of Canada, and if so, what measure of success has been met with in the endeavour to stamp it out?

Mr. FISHER. I would say to my hon. friend, in the first place, that this moth does not attack only fruit trees. It attacks all forest trees and shade trees just as much as it attacks fruit trees, except that it does not attack conifers; but deciduous trees it does attack. The moth is not known to exist anywhere except in that region. Nests have been discovered in some nursery stock, and this has been destroyed. I think my hon. friend was not here this afternoon when I explained that this year and last year we have been fighting this pest without any law. We have been aided, and very handsomely aided, by the importers of nursery stock, who have been willing to have our inspectors inspect their importations, although we had no authority to do so, and they consented to the destruction of such stock as was affected. It was stated that this winter, during the importing season of nursery stock, we have inspected 1,700,000 seedling trees, and that 293 nests were found, in each of which there might have been from 200 to 300 caterpillars. These were all destroyed. Similar work was done last year. If they had been allowed to come in, there is no doubt that by this time the moth would have been thoroughly established in different parts of Canada. The permission of the people to allow us to do that work was purely voluntary. It is in consequence of that experience that I am introducing this Bill. I have here the last farm report for 1909, and it says:

In 1902, Mr. William McIntosh, of St. John, New Brunswick, took a single male specimen of the brown-tail moth (euproctis chrysorrhœa, L.) about 20 miles from St. John, New Brunswick. About the same time another specimen was taken by Mr. Gordon Leavitt, at St. John; and in July of 1905, Mr. John Russell took a third specimen at Digby, Nova Scotia. Up to the present time these have been the only authentic records of this much-to-be-dreaded insect having been taken in Canada. Recently, however, I have received from Mr. C. Perry Foote, of Lakeville, Nova Scotia, one of the winter nests of the brown-tail moth, filled with the living caterpillars, thus proving that this insect has established itself at one place at least in Canada.

Dr. Saunders, in his report, says:

With the exception of the San José scale, there are no two insects which have attracted so much public attention, nor with regard to which so much money has been spent in America by the state and federal governments of the United States, as the Gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth. Both of these are pests introduced into America from Europe—the Gypsy moth about 1869, and the brown-tail moth somewhere about 1890. Millions of dollars have now been spent on fighting the Gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth in Massachusetts and the adjoining states. Dr. Howard, when treating of this insect and of an effort which is being made to introduce European parasites says, in the Year-book of the Department of Agriculture for 1905: 'The brown-tail moth has become even more abundant and injurious than the Gypsy moth, and, owing to the fact that the female flies readily, whereas the female of the Gypsy moth does not fly at all, the brown-tail moth has far exceeded the Gypsy moth in its spread.'

It is this we are trying to fight against, and it is necessary to give us the power to do this effectively. I again give credit to the importers of nursery stock for the manner in which they have co-operated with us in keeping the moth out, but at the same time in case of objection, we must take power to do this authoritatively.

Mr. JAMESON. I am glad the Minister of Agriculture has read that statement from the report. If the seriousness of this pest were fully understood by the nurserymen and orchardists of this country generally, as we are beginning to understand it in Nova Scotia, I feel sure that their assistance would be given to the department and to the minister in every effort he makes to stamp it out. If it got a foothold in this country, it would mean that the work of years, I might say the work of generations, would in a measure go for naught, so far as fruit raising is concerned. I am glad to know that an energetic effort will now be made to destroy this pest in the country. I understood the minister to say that when he gets the legislative authority he thought it likely he would appoint an officer who would act in Nova Scotia, either in conjunction with or independently of the provincial authorities. I trust the minister will appoint that officer, and appoint him as soon as possible, so that the most vigorous measures will be taken to aid the provincial authorities in reducing, in numbers, if not altogether exterminating this pest.

Mr. FISHER. I may be able to do the work with my present staff, but if the present staff is not sufficient, I will consider it to be my duty to appoint an officer. Last year, and again this year, circulars were sent to a list of about 25,000 orchardists, which we keep in the department, drawing attention to the dangers of this moth and how to detect it. In the agricultural press, and in the press generally throughout the country, information of a similar kind was published, and I believe it is largely due to our efforts that during the last few years, so far as we know, the moth has not become established in Canada.

On subsection (d),

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why does the minister propose to give compensation to those who are sending in nursery stock from the other side, which is not fit to come into the country?

Mr. FISHER. The loss would generally fall upon our own people. We believe that the cases and the packing in which the nursery stock comes will be pretty sure to contain moths, and consequently we think it necessary to destroy them. The owners complain that they would have been able to use this packing again and that its destruction was a serious loss to them. If these things are destroyed in the interests of the public at large the owners ought to be compensated in the same way as we compensate owners of animals when we order their destruction. If we did not give compensation, it is not likely that our efforts would be very enthusiastically seconded.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would not the granting of this compensation be just as likely to make them careless about the goods they pack? If it is only the boxes and casings that are involved, they would only amount to about $2.

Mr. FISHER. It would include compensation for the stock also if that were destroyed.

Mr. BURRELL. In our province we have never given any compensation but of course I am not referring to exceptional cases such as the brown-tail moth. Where we destroy, as we do sometimes, quite a heavy percentage of nursery stock importation, we give no compensation, and the importers usually insist on the goods being sold under a guarantee to pass inspection.

Mr. FISHER. The brown-tail moth has been discovered in shipments which come almost altogether from France, and the practice in the French trade is that the goods must be paid for before shipment. The importers have these two seasons suffered very considerable loss, which they have voluntarily undergone, although they protested very strongly that it was very unfair that they should not only lose the stock itself but the packages as well. But we found it absolutely necessary to destroy the packages as well as the stock because the eggs might just as well come in the packages. If no compensation be given, the temptation would be great to avoid the law, and it would be impossible to indentify these packages when used in enveloping other goods.

Mr. BURRELL. Is the minister applying compensation only to this particular case of the brown tail moth?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to say that. That would depend on the conditions and circumstances. I might find similar reasons for compensation in other cases.

Mr. BURRELL. The hon. gentleman will see that if the Dominion is going to compensate for all the nursery stock destroyed, that would make it rather embarassing for our province which gives no compensation, but of course, I admit that in certain circumstances it would be only fair to compensate.

Mr. FISHER. Suppose, for instance, a certain potato disease, which has been discovered in Newfoundland, should find its

way to Canada, it would be my duty to destroy any crop of potatoes infected in order to prevent that disease from spreading; and it would be rather hard to enter on a man's farm and destroy his crop without giving him some compensation.

Mr. BURRELL. I am not opposing the principle because I admit that in certain special cases, it would be only just to compensate, but I would like to know whether that compensation is to be general. In the case of the San José scale, for example, the hon. gentleman would not compensate. What other particular cases are there in which he would?

Mr. FISHER. I would not undertake to say what cases absolutely should be compensated and what not. That will have to be decided by order in council.

Mr. WRIGHT. Why should not the inspection take place in the country from which the importation comes? How would it do to have a regulation requiring a certificate from a qualified inspector in the country where the goods were bought? That certificate could be forwarded with the goods.

Mr. FISHER. We would then be at the mercy of inspectors over whom we have no control. When the San José Scale Act was introduced, it was suggested that we might accept the certificate of United States inspectors, but I was not quite prepared to do that. I prefer to have our own inspection than accept certificates from a class of men of whose appointments and qualifications we knew nothing.

Mr. WRIGHT. Suppose you had your own inspection in addition when the goods arrive?

Mr. FISHER. I have just been informed that in seeding stock imported from France, in which were found a large number of nests of the brown-tail moth, every case was stamped with the official statement that the brown-tail moth had no existence in the region from which that nursery stock was shipped.

Mr. WRIGHT. Was the certificate by some qualified appointee of the France government?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it is the certificate of the Minister of Agriculture for the arrondisement from which the shipment came.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is it not a little out of the usual to compensate importers who bring in diseased stock? I would suggest that the importer should be responsible and that any fruit trees imported from France or the United States, which did not pass government inspection, should be destroyed and no compensation paid. Then the exporters of these fruit trees would be more particular. If we are going to compensate to the extent of two-thirds of the value, these people would send over any amount of diseased stuff which they could not sell in their own country and get two-thirds of its value. I think the importer should be held responsible and should look to the man from whom he is buying to sell to him an article that would pass government inspection here, making that a condition of payment. Then, if no compensation for stock destroyed was granted, a better quality would be sent to Canada.

Mr. FISHER. We do not destroy the stock but only the packages and packing.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is there no danger of this brown-tail moth escaping from the packages before the shrubs are inspected?

Mr. FISHER. They could not get out of the packages.

Mr. SEXSMITH. They should be inspected immediately on arrival here to avoid that.

Mr. FISHER. They are inspected as soon as possible.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I move that no compensation be received for the boxes in which they are packed or the packings. It seems folly to attempt to pay foreigners for boxes and packing which amount to only $2 or $3.

Mr. SEXSMITH. If this moth is as dangerous as the minister has represented, would it not be better to entirely prohibit the importation of trees or shrubbery from infected countries altogether? That would not only keep out the moth but would give employment to a large number of people and encourage a new branch of industry.

Mr. FISHER. This Bill gives me that power which I have not at present. That stock is raised by the million in France and exported to the United States and Canada, and as I have said the prohibition of its importation would put a stop to the nursery business for some years. We tried the prohibition of importation when first combatting the San José scale, but as I have explained the fruit interests made such strong representations that we were obliged to establish stations where stock could be imported and fumigated.

Mr. GOODEVE. If the exporter were required to make good to the customer in Canada stock destroyed on account of this moth, the exporter would be very careful in the stock he sent to Canada. But, if the importer were allowed compensation

and the exporter were thus freed from the loss, he would not take the same care. I think it would be worth the minister's while to consider whether it would not give better results if no compensation were allowed. I think this was a little different from the Diseases of Animals Act cited by the Minister of Agriculture, for in such cases the disease develops through no fault of the exporter, and yet may affect the whole country. But, in the case of this stock, the exporter is directly responsible. There is competition among the exporters whether in France or in any other country, and, if a man sends out stock that has to be destroyed on reaching Canada, knowing that the importer will probably try to find some other sources of supply, he will be more likely to grant compensation to the importer. Looking at it purely as a commercial transaction, I think it would be a mistake for the country to decide to give compensation as a general thing. It would probably encourage rather than discourage carelessness in the shipping of stock into the country. I may be wrong, but that is the way it appeals to me.

Mr. FISHER. Some of the older members of this House will remember Mr. E. D. Smith, of Winona, who was a member of the last parliament and, I think, of some parliaments before that. I have his letter applying for compensation for the cases which he burnt last year. I felt a good deal of sympathy with Mr. Smith who, in this public-spirited way, destroyed these cases without hesitation. I have the invoices and statements and find that the loss from these importations came to $92. Of that, under this proposal we should pay about $60. When this application came in, Dr. Saunders, director of the experimental farm, wrote to the chief of the bureau of Horticulture of the State of New York, and found that under their old law they could not pay nursery men for cases burned, but they found so many instances of hardship and such a movement in regard to the matter that they were amending their old law so as to authorize the Commissioner of Agriculture to pay for such losses. I believe that the amendment has since been made. I am perfectly satisfied, from my experience both with the San José Scale Act and the Contagious Diseases of Animals Act that we are likely to secure the much more hearty co-operation of nurserymen and importers in our work by giving compensation. The small cost that is likely to be involved will be amply repaid by the greater willingness on the part of these people to give us information. My hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) speaks of the effect of the commercial system. I dare say that works in some ways, but I am informed by those importers that, as a matter of fact, they have to send the money before they get the goods. These are perishable goods, and the people who ship them, I suppose, do not want to run the risk of the voyage and handling. There may be cases where compensation can properly be given —I mean a general class of cases, not individual cases—and others in which it would not be necessary or proper. It is for that reason that we take the power to do this by order in council. That order in council, of course, will not provide that John Jones shall get compensation, and Peter Smith shall not get it, but will declare what line of occurrences would call for the payment of compensation. I considered this matter very carefully before deciding to put it into the Bill, and, for the reasons I have given, I think it in the interests of the efficient carrying out of the Bill that we should have power, under certain circumstances, to pay compensation.

Mr. GOODEVE. I can see why exporters should sometimes demand payment in advance. Fruit stock is perishable and the handling may easily cause loss. But, from my own experience of the commercial side extending over a good many years, I should think that if a man were importing from a house, doing business with them from time to time, and wrote back making a claim, pointing out that through their own fault the loss had occurred, he could secure payment for the damage. Where the fault was their own in sending diseased stock any reputable exporting firm would make an allowance. In the cases cited by the minister, where the importer voluntarily destroys cases, I agree that there should be compensation. But what I contend is that the general order allowing compensation would work along the lines I have indicated. If the importer has the government's own certificate that the stock has been destroyed because of disease, he has final evidence that his claim for compensation is just. I am not sure that an absolute legal claim could not be made, though that would depend upon the conditions of the bargain. But, on general principles, I believe compensation could be had from the importer. I can see that granting government compensation might give rise to difficulties on the lines I have suggested.

Mr. SEXSMITH. It seems to me we are running great risk in allowing this to go on. A gentleman who had raised some of this stock, speaking to me a year or two ago, said that if it were not for the competition from European countries, we could create quite an industry in this country. But, owing to the cheapness of labour in Germany and France, they could produce this stock at very low rates and our nurserymen insisted on buying it there. I do not see why we should run the risk of im-

porting any further tests into our country when we can produce this stock equally as good if not better at home. If something were done to encourage the nurserymen or to compel them to raise in Canada the natural stock of the country we would not be taking any chances of importing the brown-tail moth or any other pest.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend knows that there is a duty on these things which gives the home producer an advantage.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Not so much as the difference in labour.

Mr. FISHER. It is twenty-five per cent, if I remember rightly.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help but feel justified in taking the position that I have. It would be a good thing if this clause could be amended so that people in Canada would receive a payment of two-thirds of the value of that which was destroyed.

Mr. FISHER. Nobody but Canadians would receive it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, the minister said that he would like to have the privilege of paying the Canadian for his potato crop.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is all right, but if we pay the foreigner two-thirds of what his goods cost, I think we are going a little beyond what we should do. I feel that we would be justified in amending this clause so that the foreigners sending his goods into this country would lose the boxes, and the packing, which would only amount to a few dollars in each case, but which would make him more careful.

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid that the foreigners will not lose anything at all. The Canadian importer will have to pay the foreigner the full value, and he will not get anything back from him. He, and not the foreigner, will lose it. If the goods are destroyed in Canada in consequence of the existence of disease under this clause, the Canadian importer will lose the full value of them, and by this clause he may be compensated to the value of two-thirds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. He will be more careful.

Mr. BURRELL. This Bill gives the government the power that they never possessed before, not only of dealing with trees, and vegetables, and of entering upon any man's premises, but of destroying his crop, or orchard. This provision is followed by power to appoint inspectors, and by penalty clauses. While I am not personally familiar with the legislation in the various provinces, I know that Ontario is doing a very great deal of good work of this kind, and that Nova Scotia is doing something. With Quebec horticultural methods I am not at all familiar, but I am thoroughly familiar with what we are doing in British Columbia. I recognize that it is in the interests of horticulture that if any province is not carrying on work of this kind, and if there are serious inroads being made by fungus diseases, and insect pests, it will be helpful to have power to do these very things; but where, as in British Columbia, we are doing these things with thoroughness and have a large body of officials, and knowing also, as I have reason to know, the difficulty in getting qualified men always to ascertain what is the real source of injury, the question arises as to the advisability of duplicating these services. When in 1898, 1899, and 1901, the province of Ontario appointed a large corps of inspectors under the San José Scale Act I do not suppose that there were half a dozen in the whole body who knew the difference between an armoured, and an unarmoured scale. There is the difficulty. If the minister should appoint a lot of inspectors to carry out this Act there may be the same natural difficulty from their want of technical knowledge. But where we have, as in British Columbia, a large body of inspectors, while we are anxious to co-operate with the Dominion, I think we want some reasonable assurance that this clause will not be put into effect in our case, as long as we are carrying on that work. I would like to see any possible clash of jurisdiction avoided.

Mr. FISHER. I quite sympathize with my hon. friend. I tried to say this afternoon that where a properly constituted provincial authority is doing work of this kind, I should shrink from entering upon the field. I should only do so where I felt it was absolutely necessary in the interests of the whole country. As far as British Columbia is concerned I do not wish either to relieve the provincial government from the responsibility of this work, or to interfere with it. I would take great pains to see that we do not overlap where it can possibly be avoided. I take the words of the hon. gentleman as being almost authoritative, because I know the influence that he would have with the British Columbia government, and I am quite sure that his influence would be in the direction of procuring thorough co-operation betweeen the officers, and authorities in British Columbia, and my own officers, and myself. I would welcome that not only from that province, but from all other provinces. I said to the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) that I knew what the provincial government of Nova Scotia were doing in connection with the brown-tail moth. If we can aid them in any way I shall see to it that we do so, but I shall not think of interfering with, or trying to override any

action that they have taken. I think, however, without absolute knowledge, that this Act gives a little greater authority than any of the provincial Acts do, except that of British Columbia, and that the machinery created, or to be created, by this Act, and the regulations under it will give me a little better facility for carrying out certain things than is in existence in any of the provinces, with the possible exception of British Columbia. The Ontario government has passed several Acts covering somewhat the same ground, but I do not think any one of them is quite so complete, and I am not speaking with the idea of imputing any blame, or censure in the matter. I am simply speaking from having examined these Acts, while drawing this up, and I think perhaps this Act is a little more complete than theirs. From the fact that the regulations under this Act will apply to the whole country it gives a greater safeguard than could possibly accrue from the Act of any one province.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister consult the different local governments when he was preparing this Bill? There is a feeling in Canada that there is too much overlapping legislation between the Dominion and the provinces, and that a great deal of expense and much trouble would be saved if there was more concurrent action on matters of this kind.

Mr. FISHER. We sent to Mr. C. C. James of the Department of Agriculture, Ontario, a copy of this Act, and communications have passed between us on the subject.

Mr. BLAIN. I commend the minister for that, and I trust that the example will be followed in the future under similar circumstances.

Mr. FISHER. I recognize the assistance such interchange of views has always been to me in my departmental work.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

ELECTRICAL MEASURE.

On the order being called for the second reading of Bill (No. 7) respecting units of electrical measure.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN. Since this Bill has been introduced, the department has ascertained that the provision with regard to electrical units does not meet with the unanimous approval of the international committee, and it has been suggested that it should be deferred for another year. I move that the order be discharged.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What are the reasons?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have stated them briefly. At the congress of electrical experts held in London, representing nearly all countries in the world using electricity, a sub-committee was appointed to prepare a description of electrical units which should be uniform throughout the world, and that description is contained in the Bill before the House. Later, the sub-committee disagreed in respect to one or two of the measures of electrical units and they have recommended that this Bill shall not be proceeded with until after a meeting which within a few months will be held in Washington. In all probability the Bill will be introduced next session.

Motion agreed to, and order discharged.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order being called for the second reading of Bill (No. 49) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. After this Bill was introduced, further representations on the subject came to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he has asked me to move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to, and order discharged.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 103) to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act. He said: This Bill repeals sections 4 and 5 of the Navigable Waters Protection Act, chapter 115 of the Revised Statutes, and substitutes the following:

No bridge, boom, dam, aboiteau, wharf, dock, pier, or other structure of any kind, shall be built or placed in or across any navigable water, unless the site thereof has been approved by the Governor in Council, nor unless such bridge, boom, dam, aboiteau, wharf, dock, pier, or other structure is built and maintained in accordance with plans approved by the Governor in Council.

Section 5 is as follows:

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

I will read the sections of the present Act so that hon. gentlemen will see in what particulars the changes are made. Section 4 of chapter 115 is as follows:

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

It will be seen that that is limited to bridge, boom, dam or aboiteau. It makes no reference to a wharf, dock, pier or other structure. Then, strange to say, section 5 of the present Act simply refers to a bridge. It says:

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

It will be seen that the object of this Bill is to give a larger measure of control to the Governor in Council over navigable waters. Section 4 of the present Act, while limited to a bridge, a boom, a dam, or an aboiteau, simply provides that it shall be constructed so as not to interfere with navigation. That leaves it doubtful as to what authority is to determine whether or not any structure of this kind does interfere with navigation. I have had a number of cases brought to my attention where bridges have been erected across navigable waters. This has been so particularly in our western provinces, where, as would naturally be the case in the early development of the country, there would not be steamers operating on the navigable rivers, or where, by reason of the necessity of certain improvements, navigation, while good in some parts, would not, on the whole, be suitable for the larger steamers; and some of the provincial governments have built bridges without coming to the Department of Public Works for approval. I have in my mind a notable instance of a bridge being erected by a provincial government across the South Saskatchewan river. That was erected without any provision for navigation and evidently on the theory that as there was no navigation of the river by steamers at present, it could not be said that the bridge interfered with navigation.

Mr. BLAIN. Near what point is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Near Saskatoon, and a very unfortunate accident happened about two years ago. After the bridge was built, telegraph and telephone companies stretched wires across the river, which interfered with navigation to the same extent as the bridge; and a gentleman who owned a small vessel—I think he had built it further up the river—came down the river, and his vessel was caught in the wires and wrecked, and he sustained a loss of $11,000 or $12,000, for which he has not been able to obtain any redress. He could not obtain it from the Department of Public Works, because we had given no authority for the construction of the bridge or the stringing of the telegraph or telephone wires across the river. It seems to me that in view of the great importance to this country of preserving navigation as far as possible, it is very desirable that there should be no works of any kind constructed in navigable waters without the plans being first submitted to the Department of Public Works, and approved by the minister and the Governor in Council. It is also rather extraordinary that section 4 of the Act at present makes no provision for wharfs, yet in most cases it has been recognized that the Department of Public Works has control over wharfs, and over and over again we are asked to approve of the location of wharfs in navigable waters. This is, I think, as it should be. As the Dominion government is invested by the British North America Act with the control of navigation, it is most desirable, in the interests of the whole country, that when any person or company purposes to construct a work in a navigable water, that person or company should be compelled to come to the Department of Public Works and submit plans, and have those plans approved of before proceeding with the erection of the structure, whether it be a bridge, a wharf, a pier or any other structure that might interfere with navigation. I think the department and the Governor in Council ought to be the judge whether or not the work as proposed to be constructed would interfere with navigation or not. Of course, if it will not interfere with navigation it will be the duty of the department to grant its approval of the proposed work. The Bill contains only the two sections which are to be in substitution of sections 4 and 5 of the present Act.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister refers to docks and wharfs in addition to the structures mentioned in the old Act. I would like to ask him whether he is quite sure that in adding these words he will not interfere with private rights. The words are not confined to public docks or public wharfs, but refer to all wharfs and all docks. It may be difficult at times to know whether the property of a private individual alongside of a navigable water might or might not come under the Bill. If this parliament is undertaking to interfere with private property in that respect, it may be a somewhat serious question in some cases. The department might undertake to dictate to the owner of valuable property alongside of a navigable stream what he should or should not do with his own property. Does the hon. gentleman think that this government should control the property of individuals alongside such waters, if in its opinion the structures might interfere with navigation? If they were public

docks or wharfs which he intends to deal with, that might be another question, but the language of the Bill, as the hon. gentleman has explained it, would seem to cover everything in the nature of a dock or wharf adjoining navigable waters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see how we could properly safeguard navigation and make provision for the proper control over navigable waters unless we made the law general in its application. The present section provides that no bridge, dam or aboiteau shall be constructed so as to interfere with navigation. That gives the government control over work of that character, even although they might project from a shore belonging to a private individual. Of course the owner of a foreshore has no right to interfere with navigation because that is under control of the Dominion government, and therefore it is not unreasonable that before a private individual be allowed to build out into a navigable water a wharf or pier, he should come to the department and submit his plans. Let me give a case in point. A short time ago application was made to the department for approval of a wharf which the Grand Trunk Pacific proposed to construct in front of its property in the harbour of Victoria. That is just such a case as my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. BARKER. That goes outside the Grand Trunk Pacific property as I understand it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not any more than if a private owner proposed to build a wharf out into a navigable stream, and that is the only case to which this Bill would apply. That is what the Grand Trunk Pacific proposed to do. That company recognized that if the department had no control, it ought to have. They therefore took their plans to the Public Works Department for approval. I directed that their application should be referred to the resident engineer, and he conferred with the other wharf owners, more especially with the Canadian Pacific railway and the harbour association of Victoria, and I think also with members of the board of trade. The objection was taken that if this wharf were allowed to be built as the Grand Trunk Pacific proposed, it would narrow the harbour and make it exceedingly difficult for steamers coming to the Canadian Pacific railway wharf to be handled with safety. The resident engineer then recommended that the dimensions of the proposed wharf should be cut down somewhat. The Grand Trunk Pacific agreed to this, the Canadian Pacific railway was satisfied, and so was the inner harbour association of Victoria, and the wharf, instead of being an injury to navigation, will be an aid to it. I only mention this as an illustration of a case where it is very desirable in the public interest that a plan of that wharf to be constructed in front of the property, owned by a private individual or a company, should be submitted to the department. Take the case of an individual owning property abutting upon navigable water and alongside of whom there was another individual also owning property. Each might propose to build a wharf out into the navigable water and the result might be a very serious interference with navigation; but if application had to be made to the department, our engineer would have to examine and report and the wharfs would have to be so constructed as to be an advantage instead of a hindrance to navigation. I think, therefore, that if the Dominion government is to properly discharge the duty it owes the public in this connection under the British North America Act, it is necessary to have the law amended as proposed. No public difficulty would be created and no private injury would be done because we must assume that the department would be reasonable and only exercise its power to prevent navigation being injuriously affected.

Mr. BARKER. The case to which the hon. minister has referred is not one of those to which I alluded. He refers to a case in which the Grand Trunk Pacific propose to extend a wharf into navigable waters, not building upon its own property solely, but going beyond that into the property of the Crown. That was not the case I was putting. I asked whether the language of the Bill would enable the government to dictate to the proprietor of land adjoining a stream and prevent him constructing a pier or wharf on his own property without the approval of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the structure were not to project into navigable water, this section of the Bill would not affect it because it says: 'Shall be built or placed in or across any navigable water'.

Mr. BARKER. There are a great many crown patents which extend to navigable waters and where a person building a wharf will build it on the margin of a navigable stream. It would be an infringement on civil rights if the government should say to him: 'You must not build your wharf except under our approval, you must build a particular class of wharf, we propose to build a wharf along there, and you must build yours in accordance with that.' If the government wish to interfere with civil rights, with the property of individuals, with the right of an individual to build a wharf or dock on his

own property adjoining a navigable stream, almost in the stream, but on his own water line, however much that may be in the interests of the public, it seems to me such interference should not be allowed against rights already acquired without expropriation and compensation. I do not say that the Bill goes that far, I merely call attention to the matter which I would like to have discussed before the Bill passes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the words are such as will not raise this difficulty.

No bridge, boom, dam, &c., shall be built or placed in or across any navigable water.

If a man was building just upon the line of the navigable water, he would not come under the provisions of that section, but where he builds out into the navigable water, he would come within the section.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not extremely difficult to determine in any navigable stream where the navigability begins? I take it that every drop of the St. Lawrence river is navigable water from bank to bank. No private ownership of the bed of a navigable river is recognized. Any ownership in the bed of a river is subject to the superior control of navigation, and it cannot be used however inconvenient it may be to the private owner, and however much it may interfere with his private rights. The whole of the water is navigable, and I do not think it is wise to say that to a depth of perhaps three feet it is not navigable and at ten feet it is. You have to recognize that in any navigable harbour or stream every drop of water is navigable water, and all private rights are subject to the superior control of navigation. The argument of the hon. member for Hamilton strikes the harbour of North Sydney, where we have a string of wharfs along the shore, and I realize this Bill will be putting people building wharfs along the water to inconvenience. However, I recognize that the bottom of that harbour is subject to navigation, and that private rights, as far as these private rights can be exercised, must not interfere with the higher right of navigation.

Mr. BARKER. On the Detroit river, for example, there are most valuable properties where the freehold runs out into much more than two or three feet of water. There are properties at Windsor and Sandwich, and all along the river, where I fancy the owners would be very much surprised to hear they had no private rights although there were only two or three or even more feet of water. It is only that point I am guarding against. I think we must have a little regard to rights that have been acquired and perhaps enjoyed for a century.

Mr. BARKER.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we get into committee, I will be very glad to receive any suggestions as to amendments.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

GAS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend the Gas Inspection Act. He said: The only important amendment in this Bill is the taking power to test for the calorific quality of gas. Another amendment is to substitute the word 'district' instead of 'city, town or place,' to conform with the districts of the Inland Revenue Department. Another amendment is to decrease the permissible limit of error in the testing of gas meters. At present the permissible limit of error is three per cent in favour of the producer and four per cent in favour of the consumer. That is being narrowed down to two per cent and three per cent, thus giving us better meters. The other amendments are merely substituting the word 'district' and repealing the clause respecting inspection, which will hereafter be by regulation.

Mr. STEWART. In Hamilton we have believed that there was no provision to protect the users of gas, that they could furnish us with any quality of gas, and that there was no provision whereby the city could have the gas tested.

Mr. BEATTIE. Every city has a proper protection for its gas supply, and it is tested for quality frequently. In London the gas is tested regularly.

Mr. STEWART. Are you speaking of artificial gas?

Mr. BEATTIE. Yes, that is artificial gas.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Under the present Gas Inspection Act all artificial gas is inspected as to its quality, and its illuminating power. One of the best inspectors we have in Canada is in Hamilton, and I have never heard any complaint from there as to the inspection of artificial gas. Natural gas is not inspected as regards its illuminating qualities as, under the law, it is not supposed to be used as an illuminant, although it is so used. It is inspected for the purpose of determining that it does not contain sulphuretted hydrogen, which is a deadly noxious gas. The gas Act now on the statute-book was passed long before natural gas was in use in Ontario, and it does not recognize the use of natural gas as an illuminant. Under this Bill, we seek authority to test natural gas for its heating power, which authority we do not now possess. I think it is a fact gas is less

and less used as an illuminant, unless it is used with mantles, and when it is used with mantles, the quality it requires to possess is heating rather than illuminating power, as the mantle is made incandescent by the calorific power of the gas, and it is this calorific power which should be the basis of the test of natural gas.

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

On section 1,

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I desire to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue an explanation with regard to certain matters. For instance, the law provides that there shall be no sulphuretted hydrogen or ammonia in gas. Then, the section here proposed provides that something must be added to the gas to give it an odour. I ask the minister to explain what authority he has for stating that sulphuretted hydrogen in gas is more deadly than ordinary gas itself or methane?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I did not say sulphuretted hydrogen is more deadly than other gas; I am not enough of a chemist to know that. But I said that under the law sulphuretted hydrogen was not allowed to form part of gas used as an illuminant. It does not appear in artificial gas anywhere in Canada that I am aware of.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The advantage of the presence of sulphuretted hydrogen in natural gas is that it gives the peculiar odour that enables people using it to detect a leak.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know that it gives its peculiar odour to natural gas altogether. But I say that, under the law, it must not appear in gas used as an illuminant.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I am taking issue with the minister. That clause was put into the previous Act to prevent, so far as possible, the use of natural gas.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I happen to be a little acquainted with this matter. What I want to know is why there is an objection to sulphuretted hydrogen?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My information is that sulphuretted hydrogen is a deadly poison. If used in illuminating gas, and there is any escape into the room, it is extremely dangerous. The object of the provision of the law which has been on the statute-book for thirty or forty years is to prohibit the use of gas characterized by this dangerous quality. That is entirely different from the department having power to make an odorless gas odorous. I do not know that gas is made in Canada which is inodorous. I would suppose that the object of making gas odorous is that you can smell it, because inodorous gas escaping into a room would be an extremely dangerous thing. It could not be detected. Death might result, but, as a matter of fact, I think all gas is odorous more or less. My deputy says that he has not been required to compel any manufacturer to put anything into the gas to make it odorous.

Mr. BEATTIE. Of course natural gas is inodorous. You cannot detect it when it escapes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What makes the gas odorous is the sulphuretted hydrogen, and that sulphuretted hydrogen is not a particle more deadly than the natural gas itself. It does not form a new combination different from that which already exists?

Mr. BEATTIE. How is it put in?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. It comes there naturally. It is born in the gas the same as sulphur is in petroleum. There is a certain amount of sulphur in petroleum. There is a certain amount of sulphur in natural gas which is merely a higher fraction than petroleum. This provision was inserted in the Bill a number of years ago to prevent the people from using natural gas. Some artificial gas makers said that natural gas was dangerous, and for that reason they compelled the producers of natural gas, when the gas was to be used for illuminating purposes, to put it through a process. I cannot understand why if natural gas is deadly when it escapes into a room, it is any more deadly than sulphuretted hydrogen.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know enough about the peculiar properties of gases to debate the question with my hon. friend. My understanding is that if sulphuretted hydrogen in artificial or natural gas escapes into a room or is burned in a room it is an extremely dangerous thing; in fact, fatal. There is not a particle of sulphuretted hydrogen permitted in any artificial gas made in Canada. If one of our inspectors found its presence there he would immediately notify the manufacturers, and a change would be made, or the manufacturers would be fined if they allowed such gas to go into consumption. It is a fact that in many natural gases sulphuretted hydrogen is present. As a matter of fact, some of the wells had to be closed down because of it. We do not recognize the use of natural gas as an illuminant. There has been a continuous contest between the department, and some of the owners of wells in western Ontario, but we have not recognized it. The owners of wells do not undertake to sell their gas as an illuminant. They sell it

for heating purposes, and the parties who buy the gas light their houses with it. Recently we have been endeavouring to get the owners of some of the gas wells, particularly around the city of Chatham, to use a small purifier, which I think is working satisfactorily. I have not caught the point of my hon. friend. We do not permit sulphuretted hydrogen in gas. The law has not permitted it before, and it is not proposed to permit it now. My hon. friend says that this is put in the Act for the purpose of preventing the use of natural gas. I do not think that is so. My deputy assures me it is not so. The Act is older than the use of natural gas as an illuminant, which is of recent date. Therefore, it could not have been put in for that purpose. The amendments that we are making now are for the purpose of still further strengthening the Act. We are going to take power and that is the principal amendment—to test the heating, or calorific power of all gases. As gas is coming into universal use for heating purposes, and as it is disappearing as an illuminant it is very necessary that we should have that power. It is not absolutely disappearing as an illuminant, but where it is still used it is used with a mantle, and you very seldom see an open flame now. Where the mantle is used it is the calorific power, and not the illuminating power that is important, because heat has to be produced to make the mantle incandescent.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The original idea of preventing sulphuretted hydrogen in gas was to prevent gas makers from selling water gas. Now the world is going largely into the manufacture of water gas, and producers are able to sell Mond gas at a very low figure, and it will continue to be sold as heating gas. I do not think that this sulphuretted hydrogen, which is contained in the gas is any more deadly than the gas itself, any more than fusil oil is more deadly than whisky. Either one will kill a man if he takes enough. I cannot understand why this clause is put into the Canadian Act, except to compel the sellers of natural gas to put the gas through an expensive cleaning process. You have to use iron filings to take the sulphur out of it, and it must go through a purifier. This gas is just as safe as the gas that is used in a gas engine. The producer gas used in a gas engine has that sulphuretted hydrogen in it, and if you are going to have it taken out of illuminating gas you might as well say that a factory should have it taken out of the gas that it uses for industrial purposes. With what little knowledge I have of the practical use of gas in engines and of the use of natural gas, I am led to the conclusion that this is a fool provision. It is a fool provision that was put into the Act away back fifty years ago, and is still held on to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What does my hon. friend want changed?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The objection I have to this Bill is the provision in paragraph (d) of section 31. We have not reached that yet, but you are dealing with it in clause (b) of the first section. You compel them to take the nasty smell out of the gas by clause 31 by removing sulphuretted hydrogen, and in clause 3 you compel them to put something else in the gas to give it a smell.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Subsection 3 has been the law for many years, and I am advised that none of the gas made in Canada is inodorous, and every one knows that inodorous gas would be very dangerous if it leaked. In subsection 3 we have added 'for testing the calorific power of gas,' which is a very necessary provision. There is no inspection now for testing the calorific power of gas, and it is coming into general use for heating purposes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Do you fix a standard?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We will fix a standard by regulation.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. You have power to test and inspect in the Act, but so far as I see, you have no power to fix a standard.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have no objection to add the words 'for testing the calorific power of gas and establishing standards therefor.'

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That is right.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In subclause (d), I add a new section: 'for testing the illuminating power of gas,' and to that I will add the words suggested by the hon. member (Mr. J. A. Currie), 'and establishing standards therefor.' Then, in subsection (e), to the words 'or testing the purity of gas,' we will also add the words 'and establishing standards therefor.'

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That appears to be all right.

On section 3, meters to comply with true standard measure.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is one of the important amendments. It limits the percentage of errors in the meter. The old law allowed 3 per cent in favour of the seller and 4 per cent in favour of the consumer. We are now narrowing the limit down to 2 per cent and 3 per cent, respectively, thus making the meter more perfect.

On section 4, undertaking of gas makers as to supply and quality of gas.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The complaint is made that sometimes natural gas is supplied at far too great a pressure. Has the minister taken into consideration an amendment to provide that it shall not be delivered to the consumer above a certain pressure?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that gas from a natural well could not be taken into a house at the natural pressure of the well, and that as a matter of fact it is always reduced to a very small pressure.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Sometimes it is not reduced enough, and, therefore, causes leaks in the joints of the pipes, which in turn cause explosions in houses.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest that the minister use the words, 'proper and sufficient pressure.'

Amendment as proposed agreed to.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I have already taken exception to paragraph (d), which says that the gas 'shall exhibit no trace of sulphuretted hydrogen or any excess of sulphur and ammonia.' I think the department has sufficient power to make regulations without the necessity of a statutory enactment of this kind, and, moreover, this is not necessary, because I do not think that it can be shown that sulphuretted hydrogen is poisonous.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This clause is regarded by the department as most important. The very reason why we inspect gas is that no trace of sulphuretted hydrogen is permitted in it. These provisions, I am advised by the experts of the department, are essential to the proper inspection of gas. Its purity and its illuminating quality are the two great points. My hon. friend says that we can make regulations covering these provisions. If so, there can be no objection to having them in the Act.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I say that neither the hon. gentleman nor any chemist can show me that sulphuretted hydrogen is poisonous.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that no chemist in the world will agree with my hon. friend. A year ago, when we tried to legalize the use of natural gas as an illuminant, the chemist of our department would not permit natural gas, with 1 per cent of sulphuretted hydrogen in it, to be used as an illuminant.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I take issue with the chemist of the department. I say that sulphuretted hydrogen is neither poisonous nor does it form an element in the compound when burned. It happens to be a component of two very cheap gases which the public want to use: one is natural gas, and the other is Mond gas; and this clause is kept in the Act to compel these gases to be put through very expensive processes in order to remove the smell of sulphuretted hydrogen, which is not dangerous and thereby to make the gas more expensive to the consumer. I say again that, from my knowledge of chemistry, which is not very great and should not be any greater than the minister's, who is a doctor, sulphuretted hydrogen is not poison, and I do not think he can find anybody who can show that it is.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am not a chemist but nothing has been impressed upon me so much in the administration of this Act by the experts of the department as the fact that sulphuretted hydrogen is poisonous. The chief inspector gives me this memo:

> Sulphuretted hydrogen is the one poison in gas which is not destroyed by combustion, but escapes into the room as sulphurous acid gas. The other poisonous constituents are destroyed by combustion.

The whole inspection of manufactured gas in Canada during all these years has been with the view of eliminating the very last particle of sulphuretted hydrogen.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. An ordinary coal stove will produce more sulphuretted hydrogen in a room than half a dozen gas jets, there is no question but that it is an expensive process to take the sulphuretted hydrogen out of natural gas, more especially out of the cheaper gas called Mond gas. The regulations are already sufficient. Clause 3 permits the department to take steps to protect the public so that it is not necessary to have clause 4. If at any time the department wishes to relax their regulations they can do so, but under this clause they cannot.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In accordance with the hon. gentleman's suggestion, I would move that after the words 'by regulation made by the minister,' in the fourth line, the words 'or not in accordance with the standard' be substituted.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I also desire to add the general penalty clause which we have in all our Inland Revenue Acts as subsection 3 of section 8:

> Every person who violates any of the provisions of this Act, or any of the regulations established under this Act, or who neglects any duty imposed on him by this Act, or by any such regulation for which violation or neglect no penalty is specially herein provided, shall incur a penalty of not less than $25 and not more than $100.

Subsection, as amended, agreed to.

On section 9,

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I move to substitute for this section:

Sections 35, 36, 37 and 38, and the schedule of the said Act are hereby repealed.

We have made certain changes in the Act that make these clauses unnecessary.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The House will be moved into Committee of Supply. We will take up first the remaining items of the supplementary estimates, and after that the Minister of Public Works will continue with his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.18 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 18, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Laurentian Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Talbot.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES.

Mr. FISHER moved:

That the House go into Committee of the Whole on Monday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the payment to members of the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources of their actual reasonable disbursements incurred in travelling to, returning from and remaining at meetings of the committees of the commission or attending to the business thereof.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I hope that when the minister takes up this motion, as he proposes at an early date, he will make a statement to the House as to what the relation of the commission is to parliament in the way of the committees of parliament asking its advice in regard to certain questions. We have had such questions up in the Railway Committee at times in connection with Bills that seriously interfered with the conservation of our natural resources and I hope the minister and the government will be able to let us know how the committees of this House may avail themselves of the advice, if we are entitled to have the advice, of the commission, and what ought to be the means of communication between the House and the commission.

Motion agreed to.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 23rd inst., it stand adjourned to Tuesday the 29th inst.

Mr. WARBURTON. Before the motion is carried, may I call the attention of the right hon. First Minister to the fact that, owing to the position in which some of the maritime province members are placed, an adjournment from Wednesday until Tuesday is rather awkward. For myself, going to Prince Edward Island, it means that I have either to lose some days from the House or spend two nights on the road to get into Charlottetown on Saturday at midnight and leave Monday morning. I would like to ask the First Minster if he could not see his way clear to amend the motion so that instead of having the adjournment to Tuesday, it be to the Wednesday following, which would be conferring a great favour upon us, and be most convenient for us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a matter as to which the government are quite willing to place themselves in the judgment of the House. If it is preferred that we should reconvene on Wednesday, the 30th, instead of Tuesday the 29th, we are quite willing.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Several hon. members from the west have spoken to me on the same subject, and they would prefer Wednesday to Tuesday.

Mr. M. CLARK. Personally, I am nearing the end of the second session in which I have lost one day. I have not been able to go home at any time except upon the occasion of the last Christmas holidays. I represent in that respect a number of western members who come long distances to serve their country, at a great deal of inconvenience, and if the views of the Prince Edward Islanders are to be met they will be met by keeping other gentlemen here, who cannot go home at all, in absolute idleness.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In order to accommodate both the east and the west we will say Wednesday the 30th.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. EDWARDS. On the 2nd of December last, I put a question with regard to armouries and drill halls which in the form of a notice of motion was issued as an order on the 15th of December. When may I expect the return to be brought down?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will inquire about the matter, and have it brought down. I might say to the hon. gentleman that there is no objection to it.

Mr. EDWARDS. I just thought it had escaped the attention of the minister. On the 13th of January last, I asked a question with regard to certain work done by contractors Sullivan and Langdon of Kingston, and an order was issued on the 19th of January, but the papers have not yet been brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make inquiry as to the cause of the delay.

Mr. BRODER. When may we expect the report of the commission appointed to look into the swine industry in Ireland and Denmark?

Mr. FISHER. The report has been in the hands of the printer for some time, and when we get it, which I hope will be soon, it will be distributed.

Mr. BRADBURY. On the 14th of February last, an order of the House was passed for:

Copy of all papers and instructions given to A. S. Williams, law clerk of the Department of Indian Affairs, and to S. Swinford, inspector of Indians, Winnipeg, in connection with their work among the St. Peter's Indians in Manitoba; also a copy of the report of these gentlemen in connection with the work they have been engaged in during the last few weeks among the St. Peter's Indians.

I would like to have this return as soon as possible.

SUPPLY—LACHUTE POST OFFICE.

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

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY. Six weeks ago, I questioned the government as to why the new public building in Lachute was not being used as a post office, and on my visit to Lachute a short time ago, I was much surprised to find that the post office was closed yet, so far as the transaction of business is concerned. The building was practically completed many months ago, the caretaker has been living in it all winter, and it is being heated and lighted at the public expense while the public have not the use of it. The Lachute post office is a distributing centre for many of the smaller post offices, and it is very much needed. Why has it not been opened for the transaction of business?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad the hon. member has brought this matter to my attention. It may be that the Public Works Department has not yet given the Post Office Department possession, but if it has I will see that the post office is opened at once.

Mr. PERLEY. The Minister of Public Works informed me yesterday that the building had been transferred to the Post Office Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If that is so the postmaster will be installed immediately.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building has been placed at the disposal of the Post Office Department, and the postmaster has recently been asking for certain equipment which no doubt will be supplied as soon as possible. I think my department has done all that is necessary.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will see to it immediately.

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I ask the Minister of Finance whether it is the intention of the government to make any statement before the adjournment next Wednesday in connection with the tariff issue between the United States and Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. For the present I should not care to make any definite announcement. It will depend upon the state of affairs at that particular time whether an announcement will be made or not. I do not think it would be in the public interest to say anything on the matter at present.

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

Further amount required for steam service between Canada and Mexico, upon the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, $16,666.66.

Mr. FIELDING. This vote is intended for the service on the Atlantic and the Pacific. Originally the Mexican government paid $50,000 in gold, and Canada a similar amount. The Mexican government ceased paying anything, and the Canadian government, rather than see the service abandoned, granted an additional $25,000 per annum, making $75,000 in all. This amount of $16,666 is to cover that portion of the fiscal year 1909-10, since the Mexican government ceased paying their share of the subsidy.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What business is being done by this line and what are the prospects?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a considerable trade outward, but not very much coming back. That is the reason the Mexican government did not seem disposed to continue their share of the subsidy. From the Canadian point of view, however, the traffic is very encouraging.

Mr. J. HAGGART. We ought to have a specific statement, giving the exact amount of the trade. Will the minister at the same time give us a statement of how it is divided between the Atlantic and the Pacific?

Mr. FIELDING. The vote is a general one for both the Atlantic and the Pacific, but this increase is entirely for the Pacific side. The full details of the traffic are contained in a departmental report which is now in the printer's hands and will reach hon. members shortly. The tonnage carried outward during the recent months has been as follows: September, 766 tons weight and measurement; October, 2,228 tons weight, and measurement, November, no sailing, December, 3,133 tons weight, and measurement, January, the figures are not yet available.

Mr. WRIGHT. How frequent is the service on the Atlantic and on the Pacific?

Mr. FIELDING. Monthly on both oceans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What portion of this belongs to the mail service?

Mr. FIELDING. The mails are carried on all subsidized steamers as a condition of the contract, but there is no specific allotment for mail purposes.

Mr. JAMESON. Can the minister state what the amount of subsidy per ton of freight is?

Mr. FIELDING. No, we haven't it worked out in that form.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps the minister would give us some idea of what the aggregate trade is between Canada and Mexico.

Mr. FIELDING. The department report, which has already been presented to the House, contains information of that character. If on examination anything more is required, we shall be happy to supplement it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the minister give us the total increase in the steamship subsidies and subventions this year as compared with last year?

Mr. FIELDING. I haven't it at hand, but I shall be very glad to get it or any other information desired, and endeavour to supply it at another stage of the trade and commerce estimates.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART.

Steam service between Canada and Cuba, $15,000.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Why is this increase, and why did it arise?

Mr. FIELDING. This is a new service. The contract was entered into with Messrs. William Thomson & Company, of St. John, at the rate of $25,000 per annum, one sailing per month. This amount of $15,000 is intended to cover the service performed since November last, but all of it may not be required.

Mr. J. HAGGART. How is it a new service? The government has not power to enter into a contract without the consent of this House. There must have been an amount voted for it.

Mr. FIELDING. Services of this character are placed under contract with the qualifying condition that no money can be paid until it is appropriated by parliament. It is not an unusual proceeding.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It has been done, but it is rather unusual, and it is not the correct principle of carrying on the business of the country.

Mr FIELDING. Perhaps in the main my hon. friend is right. Before a dollar is expended, we should have an appropriation by parliament; but sometimes that is found to interfere with efficient business, and if the parties to a contract are willing to enter into the arrangement on the condition that I have mentioned, I cannot see any objection to it. The failure to do it might prevent the doing of something which parliament would wish to have done as promptly as possible.

Mr. CROSBY. I understand that this matter came up last autumn, a demand having been made by the people of St. John for a line between that city and Cuba. While I have not anything to say against St. John, I wish to point out that the only port in the maritime provinces to which steamers plying between Canada and Cuba will come is the port of Halifax, and they afford sufficient accommodation for all the trade that is carried without any subsidy at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What line is that?

Mr. CROSBY. The Pickford & Black Company put on boats whenever they are required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They get large subsidies for the West India service.

Mr. CROSBY. They do not get any for Cuba. I do not know whether the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) or the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was communicated with, but there must have been some communication from

the port of Halifax in regard to this matter. On account of this subsidy being granted, this steamer was brought to St. John and loaded largely with potatoes which she carried to the port of Havana and flooded that market to such an extent that shippers in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick lost a great deal of money. I understand from the statement of the Minister of Finance that all the money will not be required. That means no doubt that the steamship is not going to continue the monthly trip. Is that the case? I have no desire to interfere with the port of St. John or any other port. I desire that every port should be given all the accommodation possible, but I do not think it wise to subsidize one line to compete against others. I shall be glad when the time comes when we shall be able to dispense with subsidies, but am satisfied in the meantime that such subsidies as are necessary to encourage trade and commerce should be given. I might refer to the Mexican trade as an instance in which a subsidy is very advantageous. But if any fair minded man will consult with the merchants of St. John, he will be told that the subsidy to the line in question was not conducive to their best interests.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This service established between St. John and Cuba has been of the very greatest possible benefit. If my hon. friend were to communicate with the board of trade and the merchants and shippers of St. John, he would find that the service has been very successful in the way of developing trade, and has given satisfaction to the shippers, not only from St. John, but from up the valley of the St. John river, more especially in the counties of Carleton, Victoria, and other sections. My hon. friend says that the steamship lines from Halifax to Cuba will afford all the accommodation necessary. I am always glad to see trade developed from the port of Halifax, but the difficulty with that port is that it is too far away from the point of production in New Brunswick to be of any advantage to the people producing hay and potatoes and other agricultural products in the valley of the St. John river, one of the best sections in the whole of Canada for the production of potatoes. The only difficulty was the want of a market, but by reason of the establishment of this line, these people have been able to market their potatoes in large quantities. These potatoes are a great favourite in the Cuban market, and the result has been an enormous benefit to the farmers of the St. John river valley. As to the line which the Department of Trade and Commerce agreed to subsidize, it was bound to give one sailing per month. As a matter of fact, in the two months, during which its steamers have been running, it has given seven sailings instead of one per month. In one month it gave three sailings instead of one. It did that because of the development of trade and because it was reasonably necessary for the accommodation of the public.

Mr. CROSBY. How many sailings in February and March?

Mr. PUGSLEY. March is not much more than half through, but in February, I think they had two sailings.

Mr. CROSBY. Does the minister know whether they had any sailings at all or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I am quite sure they had one, and I think they had two.

Mr. CROSBY. Is this steamship service, to which we are paying a subsidy of $25,000 a year, to continue every month in the year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the expectation.

Mr. CROSBY. I am not asking what is the expectation, but what the contract is.

Mr. FIELDING. This contract requires a monthly service. My hon. friend is mistaken when he says that the service from Halifax is performed without a subsidy. There is a service subsidized from Halifax to Cuba.

Mr. CROSBY. There is only the Mexican line which calls at Cuba.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a subsidized service.

Mr. CROSBY. But here you have a line subsidized from St. John direct to Cuba and back. The line from Montreal in the summer, and Halifax in the winter, touching at Havana, calls at the Bahama islands and Cuba, and goes down to Mexico. We get all the boats we want in Halifax in the season when freights are offering; and if very little freight offers, it is difficult to get boats to carry on the service until next November. Before the government entered into a contract to pay a subsidy of $25,000 to a steamship line between St. John and Cuba, they should have been able to show whether there was any necessity for it or whether that service could not be had without a subsidy. I have no desire to oppose the granting of a subsidy where necessary for the general benefit of Canada, but I am opposed to the granting of subsidies where they are not required. That is why I take exception to this subsidy. People in Halifax were very much disappointed when it was granted, and from the information I have, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) must have had some communication from the merchants in the export trade, indicating that all the accommodation necessary for the trade with Cuba could be had at Halifax without charge to this country.

Mr. FIELDING. According to my hon. friend, all the accommodation which Halifax desires must be given even with the assistance of subsidies. But the province of New Brunswick is largely engaged in the production of potatoes, and if the trade there wishes to export them to Cuba, I do not see why they should not have the right to do so; and as St. John is more convenient for the shipment of New Brunswick produce, I do not see why the St. John people should not have a line subsidized to Cuba.

Mr. CROSBY. If the Halifax merchants can get all the freight accommodation they want, the St. John people ought to be able to get the same. The boats chartered from Halifax come to that port at a season when freight is offered, so that the trade can get all the accommodation they require. These boats to Cuba will not carry the mails, the mails go by way of New York. They are subsidized from St. John simply for the purpose of carrying freight and nothing else, and are not suitable for carrying the mails any way. I am not asking that Halifax be put on a different footing from St. John, but that it be on an equal basis.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have always thought that Halifax was treated better than St. John.

Mr. CROSBY. It is easy to prove that the hon. minister is wrong, and when the time comes, I shall be able to do that. When we take up the railway question I shall be able to show that St. John has a great advantage of one per cent per 100 pounds over Halifax. All we want is to be on a fair and equal basis with St. John, but I do say it is unfair to grant a subsidy to St. John to a boat running in competition with boats that run on their own bottoms from Halifax, and so put the merchants and exporters of Halifax in a different position from those in St. John. I want them to be on an even basis, and on an even basis we are able to play our part in exporting, or importing at all times. But I do not want to have Halifax placed at a disadvantage by giving $2,000 a month to a boat to run from St. John or any other part of Canada. The Minister of Finance must know this better than I do because he is more familiar with these things. He refers to the steamship company that trades between Montreal in summer via Halifax, and the Bahama Islands, and Cuba, and then to Mexico, but he should know that that service has nothing to do with the direct trade with Cuba.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not understand my hon. friend. A vessel sailing from Halifax to Cuba, and landing goods there is in direct trade with Cuba. There is that steamer running direct to Cuba, and enjoying a government subsidy. It is true that Halifax has occasional other steamers that do not enjoy a subsidy, but it is also true that both Halifax and St. John have subsidized lines to Cuba.

Mr. CROSBY. The Minister of Finance surely does not want us to believe that a boat sailing from Montreal, calling at Halifax, and then going to the Bahamas, and calling at Cuba, and on to Mexico, is a direct subsized boat from Halifax to Cuba.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why not?

Mr. CROSBY. The New Brunswick people have the same right, and opportunity that the people of Halifax, and Nova Scotia have on this line subsized from Montreal in the summer, and from Halifax in the winter to Cuba and Mexico, but here we have a steamship line subsidized last November, a contract made by the government last November, yet no intimation was given to the House last session that such a thing was intended. Now we are asked to vote the money. I think it is quite unfair. The understanding was that nothing was to be paid unless we granted it. It should not be granted because I do not think they are entitled to anything. If it was necessary that this should be given in order to facilitate the trade of Canada, and Cuba I would be quite satisfied, but that is not the case, and no one has shown or attempted to show that we have not now all the accommodation required for our trade with Cuba, which is chiefly the fish and potato trade. We have a lumber trade which is carried by sailing vessels, and we have all the accommodation required for that trade. No one in St. John or in Nova Scotia has any desire to have the lumber trade diverted from sailing boats to steamers. The fish and potato trade is all that requires accommodation. I protest against this $25,000 subsidy to a service that is not required.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will this line running to Cuba also run to Mexico?

Mr. FIELDING. This line to which this item refers does not go to Mexico, but the other line to which I referred, after serving the trade between Halifax and Cuba, proceeds on to Mexico.

Mr. EDWARDS. I notice that the total amount in the main and supplementary estimates granted to these two lines is something like $65,000 more this year than last year. That is the subsidy to the line running to Mexico is increased this year by $25,000, and the main estimates contain $25,000 for the line to Cuba, which I presume is the same line towards which you are giving the additional $15,000 in the supplementary estimates, making $40,000 of subsidy to that line where last year there was nothing.

Mr. FIELDING. There seems to be a misconception. There is an additional

subsidy of $25,000 for a line from St. John to Cuba. That is a new vote, an addition to the subsidies of last year. The other item shows an increase of $16,000 for the current year on the Pacific side towards Mexico. That is not the Atlantic service at all. On the Pacific we are taking up to some extent the burden which the Mexican government had to lay down.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I may inform the minister that the potato business, which looms so largely in his mind, last year amounted to $57,000, and he is giving $25,000 to improve that service. The exports to the British West Indies were $2,549,000, whilst the imports were over $7,000,000. Thus the West Indies are getting the benefit of our market through our subsidy. Have the West Indies expressed any desire to add to these subsidies as they benefit by them three times as much as we do?

Mr. FIELDING. That is rather a broad question. The subject of trade relations with the West Indies is at this moment engaging the attention of a Royal Commission on which the Minister of Customs has been sitting. I was also a member, but unfortunately was not able to go to the West Indies. The West Indies have not felt able to contribute to these subsidies in the past. The arrangement has hitherto been one sided, both with respect to subsidies, and to the preference. We are trying to bring about a better understanding, how successfully remains to be seen. The West Indies are not too prosperous, and not as well able as Canada to assist commercial enterprise. While it is an undoubted fact that they get advantage of the trade coming this way. it is of considerable advantage to Canada that we should encourage our export trade to the West Indies. That has been a large trade in bygone years for the lower provinces, and we still hope that it will be a trade that will command the encouragement of parliament.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) should be able to show some reason other than those he has given for the extraordinary contract he has entered into. A contract for which there is no vote of parliament should be justified by some extraordinary reason, something in the nature of an emergency. No such cause as that is alleged. Surely, the New Brunswick trade in potatoes was as great in preceding years as it is now. When such a contract is entered into, for which there is no vote of parliament, there should be some other justification than such a statement as that of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) of the extraordinary quantity of potatoes coming down the St. John river for shipment to Cuba. If there was an extraordinary crop last year, are the conditions likely to bring about a repetition of that crop next year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Then, it is now probably about what it has been for fifty years past, and so the question is one which ought to have been considered by the government before now and ought to have been brought to the attention of the House. What I protest against is this manner of doing business, the government entering into a contract for so important a matter as a subsidy with an ocean steamship company without any authority of parliament and for no better reasons than the carrying of the surplus stock of potatoes from the St. John river to Cuba. The very fact that a commission is sitting for the purpose of inquiring into this matter of West Indian trade is the reason why no such arrangement should have been made without consideration of the matter by parliament, unless there was some stronger and more urgent reason than those that have already been stated to us. I enter my protest against such a manner of carrying on the business of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. J. Haggart) says that there must have been the same surplus of potatoes at any time during the last fifty years as last year. I assure my hon. friend that he is entirely mistaken. In the valley of the St. John river, and more especially in the county of Carleton, as my hon. friend from that county (Mr. Carvell) well knows, a great deal more attention has been paid to the cultivation of potatoes in recent years than in the past. People have been going into the business scientifically, and it is not unusual for a farmer to raise $4,000 or $5,000 worth of potatoes in a season. Therefore, this is a matter of enormous importance to a great many farmers. About a year ago the Department of Trade and Commerce very wisely sent a trade commissioner to Cuba. That gentleman made a very careful investigation of the Cuban market, and the possibilities of a large business in potatoes and other products of Canada. His reports gave great encouragement as to the possibilities of doing business in potatoes in that market. The farmers of Carleton and other parts of the St. John valley had been finding a market for potatoes in Montreal and Ottawa—they had even sent them as far west as Toronto, but, owing to the freight rates, there was very little profit in the business for the farmer, and some years no profit at all. Therefore, they began to turn their attention to the Cuban market, and especially view of the report of the trade commissioner appointed by this government.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What about the American market from which they were shut out about a year ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was also an important fact which necessarily had its influence. Under the former tariff of the United States the duty upon potatoes was 25 cents per bushel, but by the recent tariff legislation it was increased to 40 cents, a prohibitory rate. Therefore, the farmers were obliged to turn to Cuba for a market, and it did seem as if there were vast possibilities of creating a profitable business there. So strongly did the people feel upon this subject that, last season, the provincial government undertook to assist in the work by renting a warehouse in Cuba and also a warehouse in the city of St. John to facilitate the storage of potatoes until they could be sent forward. My hon. friend from Carleton came to Ottawa in the interest of the people, and as the result of large meetings that had been held in various sections of the county of Carleton, and urged in the strongest possible manner that this government should take steps to procure a regular service between St. John and Cuba, so that the producer might know that there would be an opportunity of sending potatoes forward regularly, and that the Cuban market could be cultivated with a greater degree of certainty. The government, after very careful consideration, yielded to the representations made on behalf of the people who had met to discuss the matter altogether irrespective of politics, and in such large numbers that it was evident that the feeling was universal that here was an opportunity to develop trade which ought not to be missed. The government agreed to give the aid, and, while the company was bound to give a sailing once a month, it has, up to the present time, given two or three sailings a month. The business has developed greatly. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) speaks of the total value of potatoes sent to Cuba as having been $57,000——

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That was the amount sent to all the West Indies.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can tell my hon. friend that, as the result of the regular steamship communication which has been established, and the efforts of the trade commissioner in Cuba appointed by this government, and of the co-operation of the farmers of New Brunswick in developing the trade, the farmers of the province of New Brunswick will export to Cuba alone during the present year fully three times as much in value of potatoes as the amount given by my hon. friend as representing our trade with the whole of the West Indies.

Mr. CARVELL. Six times as much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, probably six times as my hon. friend states. There will be sent there this year probably six times the total quantity of potatoes sent from the whole of Canada to the West Indies, including Cuba, up to the 31st March last.

Mr. CROSBY. The estimate given by my hon. friend was of potatoes sent to the British West Indies, not to Cuba.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood my hon. friend to give the total exports. In my judgment this government cannot be performing a better service to the public than by giving the farmers of any section of Canada a new outlet for their products.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It is the government doing it that we object to. It is parliament that has the authority.

Mr. FIELDING. Parliament is going to vote it, I hope.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know of nothing that will be of more benefit to an important section of Canada than the establishment of this service between St. John and Cuba. In regard to parliament voting the money, I may say that it was a matter of great urgency last fall that this service should be established, at the very time that these potatoes were being harvested. That was the time that the market was ready, and it was necessary to provide this service. The company was willing to take the assurance of the government that parliament would be asked to vote this subsidy, but the whole matter is subject, of course, to the approval of parliament. The matter was one of very great urgency as far as it affected a very large number of the people of New Brunswick.

Mr. EDWARDS I think I am quite right in saying that as far as the potato crop is concerned, last year was one of the most prolific years that we have ever seen for that crop in the Dominion of Canada. As regards the trade of Canada with Cuba, I find that there was a larger amount of potatoes exported from Canada to Cuba last year than for several years previously. In the year 1908 the amount was 468,438 bushels, valued at $357,824; and in 1906, 486,893 bushels, valued at $377,140. If you take the total exports and imports, you find that the total exports to Cuba in 1906 amounted to $1,221,766; in 1908, $1,366,319, and in 1909, $1,403,442. There was an increase in our export trade with Cuba last year over the previous year of $37,123. It appears to me that to increase subsidies to the extent of $40,000 is a little out of proportion to the increase in the trade as shown by the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce. When we take up the matter of our imports from Cuba we find the following figures:

1905	$351,000
1906	445,000
1907	475,000
1908	515,163
1909	496,485

There has been an actual falling off in our imports from Cuba, a lessening in the trade, and if we compare our total trade in 1909 with our total trade in 1908, including exports and imports, we find that the increase is only $18,000. We are hardly warranted in giving so large a subsidy by the result as shown in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce. We are anxious to do anything we can to increase the trade of Canada, but I think we should keep within reasonable bounds in this matter, and when a commission has been appointed to inquire into this question, it would be well to have a little more information to warrant so large an appropriation as that which is being asked for by the minister in this regard.

Mr. FIELDING. The commission referred to does not cover trade with Cuba. The commission in question has relation entirely to trade with the British West Indies, and perhaps it would be well to understand that the Cuban trade is not in any way affected by the operations of that commission.

Mr. EDWARDS. I gave the figures of Canada's trade with Cuba.

Mr. FIELDING. I merely wanted to have it understood that the commission is not inquiring into anything beyond the British West Indies.

Mr. EDWARDS. That might give us an indication of trade with the islands in the vicinity of British West Indies.

Mr. CARVELL. I am sorry I was not here at the beginning of this discussion, because this is a matter of very great importance to my own constituency and the whole western part of New Brunswick, as well as to other portions of the maritime provinces. The figures quoted by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) I have no doubt are correct as to the year ended March 31, 1909, but he will be surprised when he learns the totals of this year's trade with Cuba. I have not the figures at my hand, but my recollection is that last year alone something like 300,000 or 400,000 barrels of potatoes were imported into Cuba from the United States. I had a letter only a few days ago from the Canadian Trade Commissioner in Cuba, and he informed me that no potatoes whatever had been inported into Cuba from the United States during the past year. The maritime provinces to-day are controlling the entire potato trade of Cuba. We know that the development of that country is only commencing. I can tell my hon. friends here that in the St. John valley alone we are producing seven or eight times the quantity of potatoes that we were producing six or seven years ago, and we could multiply that three or four times yet without any difficulty if we only had a market. There is practically no limit within reason to the possibilities all up and down the St. John river in respect to potatoes providing we have a market. Formerly we used to send them to the United States. The duty is now 62½ cents a barred of 160 pounds. For a number of years we were able to sell quite a quantity of potatoes to Ontario, but we found last year, on looking into the crop returns, that there would be an export from Ontario rather than an import. My recollection is that the United States tariff is not only 62½ cents a barrel, but that they proposed to make it 40 cents a bushel. It may be 40 cents a bushel now.

Mr. CROSBY. It is 40 cents a bushel now.

Mr.CARVELL. That is how much a barrel?—and if the surtax is put on that means probably $1.25 or $1.50, which absolutely precludes trade with the United States. We saw that if we could not sell our potatoes to the upper Canadian provinces or to the United States, with a crop variously estimated at from 400,000 to 600,000 bushels in New Brunswick alone, it would mean almost ruination to the very farmers in that province. I make no apology in stating that I did everything I could to get the government to inaugurate this service. I take my full share of the responsibility, and I can assure my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that regardless of politics or of any political feeling in the province of New Brunswick, both parties are agreed that this is one of the best moves that was ever made. To such an extent are they agreed that the local government, whose rights are not so great as are those of this government, are co-operating in this business. This year our farmers have been able to dispose of their products, but without this encouragement I do not know what they would have done, and this applies to Nova Scotia to some extent as well as to New Brunswick. The service is from St. John, and I hope the House will not hesitate for a moment to vote this because so much good has it done in my own constituency alone that up to the present time we have shipped about 300,000 bushels of potatoes to Cuba.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Have we sent from Canada to Cuba any more potatoes than last?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Very little.

Mr. CARVELL. Oh yes, the export this year has been more than doubled from

the maritime provinces. The returns my hon. friend has are only brought down to March, 1909, but he will be surprised when he sees the returns down to March, 1910. A year ago the people of the United States were supplying the people of Cuba with potatoes, but with proper transportation facilities there is no reason why New Brunswck and Nova Scotia cannot control the whole potato trade of Cuba.

Mr. J. HAGGART. There is a monthly statement issued by the department down to March, 1910.

Mr. CARVELL. I was not aware of that, but I am positive these returns will show an enormous increase in the export trade to Cuba from the maritime provinces and from Canada as a whole. From my own constituency 250,000 bushels of potatoes have been sent to Cuba since October; from the whole province of New Brunswick 350,000 bushels, and there will be half a million bushels sent before the first of May. There is a great chance for business with Cuba, not only in potatoes, but in hay, grain, fish, and lumber, and every steamer shows a largely increased cargo.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is this subsidy confined to one steamship line, and has the government control over the freight rates?

Mr. CARVELL. The contract is with a very responsible firm, that of Wm. Thomson & Co., of St. John, who are large ship owners. The department has absolute control over freight rates and as a result of the subsidy the freight rates on potatoes to Cuba are to-day 30 per cent less than they were a year ago.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the rate?

Mr. CARVELL. Forty cents a barrel from St. John to Havana, and this time last year it was 65 cents. The subsidy has more than doubled the business between the maritime provinces and Cuba, and it promises to be even more beneficial in the future.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not dispute the wisdom of subsidizing a line between Cuba and Canada, but I do object to the principle of the government making a contract before it informs parliament, and then asking parliament to approve of it so that no matter whether it is a bad contract or not the friends of the government have to support it or vote non-confidence in the government. Parliament has the right to be consulted before contracts of this kind are entered into. The people of New Brunswick must have been raising potatoes before there was any subsidy, and if they wanted to get into the Cuban market the government could very well have submitted the proposition to parliament before committing themselves to a contract.

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. MICHAUD. I beg to state that I concur in the statement made by the Minister of Public Works and my hon. friend from Carleton county in reference to potato growing in New Brunswick. The potato growing industry is one of the largest agricultural industries in the state of Maine, and there is no reason in the world why it should not be an equally important industry in New Brunswick, if we had transportation facilities for the crop. What has happened in the past is that the potato buyers of the state of Maine have been buying our New Brunswick potatoes for from 60 to 70 cents per barrel, paying the duty, taking them to Boston and New York, and very often sending the same potatoes to Cuba. We want the same facilities for getting into the markets as our American friends have, and the present subsidy is one way of enabling us to obtain these facilities. I am informed that the state of Maine produces as much potatoes as all the rest of the United States put together, and every Maine farmer who goes into the industry is making money. We have the same soil in New Brunswick, and there is no reason why we should not supply the Cuban market as well as the market in the British West India Islands. I approve of the subsidy to be granted by the government in this case to help transportation between St. John and the West Indies, and I believe it will be productive of the best results.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Have you any starch factories in New Brunswick?

Mr. MICHAUD. No. The farmers of Maine send their best potatoes to the market and keep their small potatoes for making starch, but we have not as yet developed in New Brunswick a starch industry to any extent.

Mr. WRIGHT. It does not seem to me that the best method is to give a subsidy to one particular steamship company. I should think that if a subsidy of so much per ton were given to any steamer which carried the goods from St. John or any other port, that such a system would leave it open for all steamship companies to compete. But if you give full control of the business to one company they can charge up to the limit of the arrangement they have with the government and all other companies are shut out.

Mr. CARVELL. The actual conditions existing would make the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Wright) impracticable. The potatoes have to be shipped in the winter, and they have to be kept free from frost in heated cars, and warehouses, and unless there was a regular steamer leaving at a fixed date the potato grower up in the country 150 miles away would not

know when to send his potatoes to the sea-board. With the subsidies confined to a regular line sailing on a given day in each month, the merchant has a month in which to get his shipment ready and send it to the sea-board. If we gave the subsidy to any steamer that came along, we might be subsidizing half a dozen steamers in one week, and none in the next month or two. I think the only way to arrange the matter is the way the government has adopted. With regard to the manufacture of starch, I may say that that question has been gone into carefully by the business men of New Brunswick, and it has been found impossible. The amount of potato starch consumed in Canada is so small, that even of the amount produced in the province of Prince Edward Island two years ago one-half was left over. We cannot send it to the United States because there is a prohibitive duty against it, and we cannot send it to England because there they use sago starch.

Mr. J. HAGGART. A good deal of starch is exported from Canada to England, is it not?

Mr. CARVELL. Not potato starch. I went into the question with other gentlemen with the view of establishing a starch industry, but we found that we could not make it pay

Mr FRASER. I am not against the passing of this item, but I think the government should have a settled policy in regard to these subsidies to steamers, so that the different provinces, and the different cities would be able to derive some benefit from them. In the province from which I come we labour under a great disadvantage in the matter of transportation, especially in regard to potatoes. We grow more potatoes per acre in Prince Edward Island, I think, than any other province of Canada. I am well aware that the valley of the St. John river and that part of New Brunswick adjacent to the state of Maine, are becoming very productive in potatoes. But we in Prince Edward Island have not the advantage of having a winter port, like St. John, open all the year round. We have to ship our potatoes in the fall, in a month or two before the close of navigation. Our whole potato crop must then be thrown on the market. The consequence is that the market is glutted, and the farmers do not receive the price they should receive if they could put their product on the market gradually. As to starch factories, we have some in Prince Edward Island. In Kings county alone, we have four which manufacture potato starch during the fall of the year, and to as late a time as they can. One thing this government could do to foster the potato trade would be to give us a better freight rate on the Intercolonial railway, and better conditions for shipment. We cannot ship potatoes in the winter season, because there is no provision made on the Intercolonial railway for keeping the cars warm, and the potatoes in a marketable state until they arrive at Montreal. I have known merchants to inquire whether they could send potatoes to Montreal, and the answer was that if they sent them they would have to send them at their own risk, and send a man along to keep a fire going in the car to prevent them from freezing. As hon. gentlemen know, we have shipped a great many potatoes for years. It is not a new industry, but a very old one, and the government would be justified in providing better transportation facilities for our potatoes, and other products. In this connection I wish to call the attention of the government to another matter which would greatly increase the value of the potato in Prince Edward Island. We want this government to allow us to go into the manufacture of denatured alcohol, for which the potato has been found to be very suitable material. A company has received a charter from the provincial government for that purpose, but for some reason we cannot get permission from this government to manufacture it. If the government would allow the manufacture of denatured alcohol to be carried on, it would greatly reduce the price of gasoline and other products of alcohol, and also increase the value of the potato.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend complains of the difficulty of shipping potatoes from the island, and we realize that there are difficulties, particularly on account of the inclemency of the weather in the winter time. I think the Cuban and Mexican service calls at Charlottetown until the close of navigation, so that potatoes can be shipped from September to the close of navigation. He speaks of the difficulty of transportation over the Intercolonial railway. I can assure him that we have the same difficulty in shipping over the Canadian Pacific railway. There have been thousands of ordinary box cars lined in my constituency in the last ten years. A merchant gets a box car, lines it up, puts a stove in it and a man to look after it and keep the fire going, and pays all the expense. Once in a while he may get hold of a car that is lined and will not have to pay the expense of lining it. The Intercolanial railway is not the only railway in Canada which does not provide heated cars for the transportation of potatoes.

Mr. FRASER. Do you not think that ought to be remedied?

Mr. CARVELL. I am only pointing out that the Intercolonial railway is not worse than the others.

Mr. FRASER. That does not make the case any better. I am informed that this line does not call at Charlottetown.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that upon being notified that freight is waiting there for shipment, the line will call at Charlottetown. No complaint has yet been made of any difficulty on that score.

Mr. J. HAGGART. There is an item for this in the main estimates for the present fiscal year?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. This item, I understand, is for the months which have passed.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. CROSBY. So far as I am concerned, I am not here to protest against any facility being given any port in Canada, but to say that what we want is fair play. We do not want a line subsidized in St. John which is going to handicap the shipping trade of Halifax or any other port. The Cuban market has been open to us for many years and we have been supplying it. Every port in Europe which has potatoes to ship, sends its surplus to the Cuban market. There all the shippers meet on even terms, and I want to see that one Canadian port is not given an advantage in that market over another. No doubt it is quite proper for the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) to do everything he can to protect his own people, but we have every facility for this trade to Cuba from the Bay of Fundy side of Nova Scotia. Forty cents a barrel is a low rate, but if a steamer gets $2,000 a trip, she can easily afford to carry freight very low. Potatoes are carried from the Bay of Fundy side in sailing vessels at 50 cents per barrel. One of the largest shippers of potatoes in the maritime provinces is Mr. R. C. Tait, of Shediac, who ships from Halifax to the Cuban market. I am glad to be able to give the name of a shipper in New Brunswick, and if the Finance Minister will communicate with Mr. Tait, and ask him what conditions prevailed in Cuba this last year, Mr. Tait will tell him that it was the worst year the maritime provinces shippers ever had. Probably they lost more money this last year than they ever made in any other, and in my opinion that was largely due to the fact that steamers, which were chartered to load without subsidy from Halifax, had to compete with steamers subsidized from St. John. It was not the case of Nova Scotia against New Brunswick, but of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick contending against New Brunswick, in a sense.

Mr. CARVELL. The combine tried to drive New Brunswick potatoes out of the market and failed.

Mr. CROSBY. A combine could not drive the government out of the market.

Mr. FIELDING. No one can do that.

Mr. CARVELL. I refer to the Cuban combine.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not know anything about a combine. There cannot be any combine in Cuba.

Mr. CARVELL. Go down there with a car-load and you will find out.

Mr. CROSBY. Nova Scotia has been shipping to Cuba right along without any assistance from the government. But if the government is giving $2,000 a trip for a steamer from St. John to Cuba, I ask the same subsidy for the province of Nova Scotia. However, as this matter will come up again in the main estimates, we shall be able to discuss it more fully. But I am much surprised that the Minister of Finance, who is the representative of Nova Scotia in the cabinet, seems to be particularly anxious that this subsidy should continue, although he must know that it is nothing less than competition against Nova Scotia.

Mr. FIELDING. There are various ways of assisting the port of Halifax, and I am always anxious to do it, but I have no idea that I can assist that city by trying to prevent fair play to any other port. The best way to help Halifax, is to try to do justice to it and equal justice to all other ports.

Mr. CROSBY. As regards the subsidizing of a steamer direct to Cuba, we have no such subsidy.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a steamer running direct from Halifax to Cuba, which afterwards goes on to Mexico. If that steamer went on to the Sandwich Islands, or any other place, afterwards, that would not alter the fact that it gives the people of Halifax direct freight to Cuba.

Mr. CROSBY. That statement is hardly correct. The steamer goes from Montreal with the understanding that she will call at Prince Edward Island or anywhere else she is asked to call. I would not call that a direct route.

Mr. FIELDING. When she leaves Halifax, she goes direct to Cuba, but she has the option, when business offers, to make a call at the Bahama Islands. She leaves Halifax, takes what goods are offered her there, and lands them at Cuba.

Mr. CROSBY. She may be loaded when she leaves Montreal.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. firend will say that freight is offered at Halifax for Cuba, which that steamer cannot take, he will then have a grievance.

Mr. CROSBY. We will allow the matter to stand over until the other estimates come up. By that time the Minister of Finance

will have had more opportunity to look into the conditions we have to contend with as regards this subsidized steamer from St. John.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The suggestion regarding the making of alcohol from potatoes, is of the highest importance to this country. It comes well within the scope of a national policy. The Minister of Inland Revenue should take up this question of making spirits out of potatoes without putting on a tax. There is a way of doing that so that it will not come into competition with spirits that pay excise duty. Germany has found a way of doing it and that has contributed very largely to her industrial progress. The Germans make spirits out of potatoes which do not come into competition with the spirit that pays excise duty, and as a result Germany has the cheapest alcohol in the world for manufacturing purposes. Germany does not need to import great quantities of gasoline; she is quite independent of the oil combine that exists in the United States and that fixes the price of gasoline the world over. We may have the same condition in Canada if, as these hon. members tell us, the maritime provinces can produce potatoes in such enormous quantities. The need of some kind of spirit in competition with gasoline for industrial purposes is constantly growing. I venture the prediction that within five years all the agricultural machinery of the northwest will be run either by gasoline or by alcohol. If by gasoline, we shall have to import from the United States; if by alcohol used in engines based on the principle of explosion, we can produce that alcohol in enormous quantities. In France and Germany every encouragement is given to the cheap production of spirit of this kind. All we have to do is to follow their example. The maritime province members could not do a better thing than to urge the government to appoint a commission to inquire how this industry may be encouraged. Once it is done, it will be easy to carry it on, seeing that it has been made a success elsewhere.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know that the manufacture of alcohol for power purposes has much to do with the transportation of potatoes to Cuba—

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, it is a question of a market for potatoes.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is the easiest thing in the world to manufacture alcohol from potatoes. If the farmers can grow potatoes cheaply enough, the thing is done. If the farmers of Prince Edward Island would prefer to grow potatoes that would net them, probably, 8 cents to 10 cents a bushel instead of the 40 cents to 50 cents which they now get, it will be possible to manufacture in Canada alcohol for power purposes. When I say 10 cents a bushel, I am speaking approximately and from what I remember of the figures of two or three years ago when this question was before the House. I have all the data in my office. To get denatured alcohol down in price to compete with gasoline means potatoes at from 10 to 12 cents per bushel. I am aware that a poor class of potatoes produce even a larger quantity of alcohol than potatoes which are better for food. I suppose that is the kind from which alcohol for industrial purposes is made in Germany. But there is no use of comparing Canada with Germany—and Germany is the only place where alcohol for power purposes is made on a large scale from potatoes, for I do not think the manufacture in France is very large. Germany encourages this manufacture by a bounty. In the first place, the government there controls the manufacture of alcohol—I do not understand the system but they control it. And there is a higher tax on alcohol intended to be used as a drink than upon crude alcohol used as an illuminant or for fuel. On the other hand they put a tax upon petroleum, thereby increasing the price when imported into Germany. If we are prepared to do all this in Canada, we may solve the problem of getting the cost of alcohol down to something like 15 or 20 cents per gallon. Two or three years ago, a wave of interest in the question of denatured alcohol arose in the United States and passed into Canada. The United States congress enacted a law giving permission to remove alcohol from bonded warehouses to be denatured and put upon the market for this purpose, and also took power to authorize the establishment of small distilleries on the farms to produce alcohol from cornstalks and other rough or waste vegetable matter. To-day, I believe, there is not one of these distilleries in the United States. Even in the corn belt of Illinois, where the cheapest alcohol on this continent can be manufactured, alcohol is taken out of bond and denatured and is put on the market as a fuel and illuminant, if I mistake not, at about 40 cents per wine gallon, which would be at the rate of about 48 or 50 cents per imperial gallon. It is utter nonsense to talk about manufacturing alcohol in Canada out of potatoes grown for that purpose by the high-priced labour of the farms of this country to compete against the alcohol of the great corn belt. There is no question of duty at all; we could remit the duty if the alcohol were used for industrial purposes, and we do so now. If the farmers of Prince Edward Island can demonstrate that they can produce potatoes at a price that will permit the manufactured alcohol to be

sold at a less price than gasoline, we will arrange very quickly that they shall have permission for the manufacture. A distillery license costs $250, but that could be removed in the case of industrial alcohol. But from our investigation, we are convinced that alcohol cannot under existing conditions be made in Canada at a rate to compete with gasoline or petroleum. If my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) or anybody else can demonstrate to the Department of Inland Revenue that it can be done, I give my promise that the legislation will be introduced to enable the manufacture of alcohol for industrial purposes to be carried on. It is not a question of legislation but of manufacture.

Mr. BARNARD. Can the minister tell me anything of the subsidy for the steamship line between San Francisco and Victoria?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The subsidy is the same as usual—$3,000, I think. It is in the main estimates, but is not yet voted.

Winter steamship service between Rivière du Loup and Tadousac and other points, $4,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is a new item in the estimates. The north and south shores of the River St. Lawrence below Rivière Ouelle have been practically closed during the winter season. The company which obtained this contract from the government undertook to have winter navigation, and I must say to their credit that they succeeded this winter. They have a steamer between Tadousac and Fraserville or Rivière du Loup—I wish they would adhere to the old name—They have also established a service between Tadousac and St. Catherines bay in Chicoutimi. That is why $1,000 has been added. I would move the following addition:

And St. Catherines bay and Tadousac.

There is an amount of $2,500 in the main estimates for that service. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Price) knows that service. I think Price Bros. performed the service in years gone by, but last year they had not a boat, and we subsidized this boat. Instead of going as they do in the summer, when there is a steamship service between Quebec and Chicoutimi stopping at different ports on both sides of the river, in order to facilitate delivery down the St. Lawrence, even to Labrador, the mails, cross from Tadousac to St. Catherines bay, and thus avoid the long detour by Chicoutimi, at the head of the river. The steamer is the 'Mahone', not a large boat, but one thoroughly adapted for that winter service.

Mr. J. HAGGART. However commendable the service, this vote is open to the same objection as the last, that a contract is entered into without money having first been voted by parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman will be quite right, but he must remember that in the contract there is a clause making payment to the contractor conditional upon the voting of the money by parliament.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What about the winter service to the Magdalen islands?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I presume the hon. gentleman refers to the special winter service for the mails. I think that next year I can provide a winter service to the Magdalen islands for the mails, owing to the experience we had this year. This year the cable was destroyed, and it was impossible to repair it during the winter. I applied to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the use of the steamer 'Minto' in order to enable the people of Halifax, Newfoundland and Pictou, who deal with the Magdalen islands, to carry on their correspondence. After some difficulty I succeeded in having the 'Minto' sent to the Magdalen islands. She brought back the answers to the mail, and the trade of the Magdalen islands has profited thereby.

Mr. SPROULE. How long has this subsidized line been operating.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is the first year.

Mr. SPROULE. How many months have the company been performing the service this year?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Since the first of January. Of course they have a contract for the summer service between Fraserville and Tadousac.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they a subsidy from the federal government for the summer work?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I think it is $6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. And this is the winter work?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they been paid anything on this contract?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. CROSBY. I am very glad to hear that the Postmaster General has been able to make some arrangement for a winter mail service with the Magdalen Islands, and I hope he will be able to continue to do that. It is very essential in the interest of the trade between the Magdalen Islands and the province of Nova Scotia that proper facilities should be provided.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, there are about 7,000 people on the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. From the Postmaster General's remarks it appears that

he hopes to establish a winter mail service in the Lower St. Lawrence in future. I should think it would be advisable to take into consideration the giving of a substantial subsidy in order to place a vessel in the service that would be capable of breaking the ice at any stage. Does this contract extend over a period of years or is it just a new contract?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In this case the steamer need not be a regular ice-breaker, because the distances are not great and the circumstances are rather favourable. But, my hon. friend will find in the main estimates a vote of $8,000, or $10,000, for a service in that very portion of the St. Lawrence to give special communication between the north and south shores including Seven Islands, where there is a large business at Clark city. Then, I expect that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will stipulate with the contractors that they shall put on a substantial boat that will not only afford the facilities, but will give all protection possible to passengers and freight.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is not this amount of $4,500 for winter steamship service between Rivière du Loup and Tadousac and other points in the supplementary estimates connected with the services mentioned in the main estimates, items 199, 201, and which total $8,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. FISHER. The one is a summer service and the other a winter service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) spoke a moment ago about winter communications with the Magdalen Islands. I wish to state, in order to let the public know, because I have received a great many inquiries, that it is the intention of the government to erect a wireless station on the Magdalen Islands in case an accident should happen, as it did happen this year when the cable was broken. But, besides that, I think we should endeavour to give them a mail service in the winter. We have succeeded this winter and I do not see why we could not succeed another year.

Mr. CROSBY. I am very glad to hear it from the Postmaster General. It is very essential that a service should be maintained during the winter between the Magdalen Islands and the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island who are dealing with them.

Trade and commerce—further amount required for salaries of chief inspectors, deputy inspectors, and other employees, rents, wages and contingencies, under the Inspection and Sales and Manitoba Acts, $35,000.

Mr. CROSBY. Is this in payment of services already performed?

Mr. FISHER. The service was more expensive than it was last year, and this is required to carry it on to the end of the current fiscal year. In the main estimates there is $155,000, but for the ensuing year we will have to ask for $175,000.

Mr. J. HAGGART. $48,000 seems an enormous increase. What was the original estimate—about $130,000?

Mr. FISHER. There are three different parts of this estimate.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I see there is an increase of $35,000 for wages. What was the original estimate?

Mr. FISHER. The original item, 109 in the main estimates of last year, was $155,000, but the department has found that the increase in the work has been so great that for the ensuing year it has asked for $175,000. A great deal of this comes back in fees. The increased expenditure is largely due to the increased production of grain and consequently the increased expense of inspection.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is there anything provided in this amount for sending trade representatives to Germany?

Mr. FISHER. No, this is for the Grain Inspection Board. It has nothing to do with trade commissioners.

Mr. CROSBY. I notice that rent is mentioned in this item. Why should there be any discrepancy in the item of rent? I presume, when the estimates were made up last year they knew what the rent was going to be?

Mr. FISHER. The business has increased enormously this year on account of the very large crop and the great movement of grain early in the season. The result has been an increased staff and increased expenses. I am told that there has been an increase in the rent of the offices to accommodate the staff.

Further amount required for trade commissioners and commercial agencies, including expenses in connection with negotiation of treaties, or in extension of commercial relations; miscellaneous advertising and printing, or other expenditure connected with the extension of Canadian trade, $10,000.

Mr. FISHER. The amount in the main estimates was $85,000, and if my hon. friend will look at the main estimates for 1910-11 he will see that $95,000 is asked. The increase has been going on this year and this amount is asked to meet it. In reply to my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) I would say that at present arrangements are under way to send a trade commissioner to Germany.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention only to send one commissioner to Germany?

The minister will find there are large numbers of travellers and men engaged in pushing the trade of Germany in Canada according to the press reports, and that they are doing their utmost to extend their trade here, while we have no agent in Germany, and apparently no definite arrangements have been made to send one. Do I understand that this vote is sufficient to send a trade representative to Germany?

Mr. FISHER. It is the intention of the government to send a trade representative to Germany very soon, and if it is found necessary we shall send more than one agent to Germany in view of the new trade conditions between us and that country. It is true that Germany is sending agents to Canada, but I understand these are agents for private firms, and it is to be hoped that Canadian firms will send their agents to Germany as well. The government does intend to establish in Germany a commercial agency which will discharge much the same duties as the German consuls in Canada perform.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Where will these trade representatives be located in Germany?

Mr. FISHER. It is not yet decided, but probably in Hamburg and other chief commercial centres.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What portion of this vote has been expended in the negotiation of the German treaty?

Mr. FISHER. About $1,700 was expended in connection with all foreign treaties, including the German treaty.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total amount it cost this country to negotiate the treaty with France?

Mr. FISHER. I have not that information at hand; I think there was a special vote for that.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In what way does this vote refer to the Manitoba Grain Act?

Mr. FISHER. We have a staff who inspect and look after the grain elevators and warehouses, headed by Mr. Castle. There is also the staff of inspectors under the Inspection and Sale Act headed by Mr. Horn.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does this vote include all the salaries of Mr. Horn and his staff and of Mr. Castle and his staff?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does it include Port Arthur?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, Port Arthur and Fort William as well.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does it include the payment of the supplementary men who were appointed when the change was made in the Act?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What proportion of the whole amount, approximately, is for grain inspection?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say that exactly. There were $140,000 spent on grain inspection for the calendar year 1909, which would be up to the 1st of January last.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does this vote include the total amount at Port Arthur and Fort William for inspection under what is called the Manitoba Grain Act?

Mr. FISHER. Not only at Port Arthur and Winnipeg, but the whole grain inspection of Canada.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Will the minister explain why he takes a vote for the current year of $15,000 more than he thinks necessary for next year?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that there will have to be a supplementary vote for this year. The increased cost of grain inspection is due to the increasing commerce of Canada in grain; but I may point out that most of this money is returned in fees, so that as the expenditure increases the fees increase accordingly.

Dredging — maritime provinces, $125,000; dredge vessel repairs, $95,000.

Mr. CROSBY. I cannot understand why this item of dredge vessel repairs is not itemized so as to give us some idea of what it is for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the way the vote is always taken, but I can give the details: In New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, $27,200; in Nova Scotia, $12,250; in Manitoba, $650; in British Columbia, $12,000; for labour and materials generally, $19,500; and further amount for labour and materials, $23,200. These are the total requirements for the year ending the 31st of March instant.

Mr. J. HAGGART. To take a vote for labour and materials seems to be a way of getting rid of contracts. That allows you to employ men by the day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A good deal of that is expended in our shipyard at Ottawa.

Mr. J. HAGGART. You should specify where it is expended, and how.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has never been put in detail.

Mr. CROSBY. I would like to ask what amount of money out of that is paid in the province of Nova Scotia, to whom it is paid, and for what.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will take some little time to get this information, but if my hon.

friend will be good enough to send me a memorandum of what he wants, I will get the information from the accountant of the department, giving the names, and the amounts, and where the money is expended.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What was the total amount got last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total amount for the maritime provinces for the current year was $380,000.

Mr. J. HAGGART. You increased your estimated expenditure nearly 50 per cent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Something over 25 per cent. One reason was that the vote last year was only about one-half what we required if the dredges were all kept actively in operation, but owing to the condition of the revenue we reduced the estimates. Some $4,000,000 to $5,000,000 were taken off from what we estimated would be required for public works, and the dredging was reduced one-half. But later on in the season, the revenue became better, and where the dredging work was urgent, the time was extended and the work continued.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What is the total expended on the repairs of dredges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $220,000.

Mr. J. HAGGART. How is it that the repairs cost 100 per cent more than the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is impossible to judge with accuracy, or even approaching accuracy, what the repairs of a dredge will cost. They are very expensive machines to keep up. Hulls have to be rebuilt, buckets replaced, and machinery generally put in order. Boilers have to be repaired or rebuilt. I could give the details if required. The work is all done under the direction of the superintendent of dredges, a very efficient man, Captain Howden, who has been long in the department, and he has very good superintendents under him.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Does it not strike the minister as extraordinary that the repairs for these dredges for doing about $400,000 worth of work cost about $200,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The great expense of dredges is the keeping in repair. They are working under water, they are likely to strike boulders at any time, the buckets are liable to be destroyed and the machinery put out of order. You can never tell with certainty what the expenditure is going to be. While the amount seems large, we have a very large plant. We have from 30 to 40 vessels altogether employed in dredging in the different provinces—dredges belonging to the government.

Mr. JAMESON. Are they all in fairly good working order?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not all. There is one which requires very considerable repairs. Possibly we may have to put it into the scrap-heap. There is another we have decided to abandon. We propose selling the hull, as she is no longer in a sound condition to be operated. With these two exceptions, the plant generally is in pretty good condition.

Mr. JAMESON. When we were discussing the item for dredging a few evenings ago, I drew attention to the need of dredging the port of Weymouth. On that occasion I was informed by the minister that the quantity necessary to be removed, according to the plan of the department's engineer, was in the neighbourhood of 500,000 cubic yards. I have been urging the hon. minister to make a beginning at least during this year on this work. I have since had communications from the commercial interests of Weymouth, particularly those engaged in the shipping interests. They tell me that while they would like the work to be done up to the plans of the department, they recognize the very large demands on the department for the use of their dredges, and the fact that the vote must necessarily be limited in amount. They, therefore, would not ask that the entire work proposed by this plan be done in one year, but they are very anxious indeed that a beginning should be made. At the entrance to the port there is a bar which has been made in the course of many years, and is a serious obstruction to the shipping. I am informed by vessel owners and vessel charterers that by a very reasonable amount of dredging, that bar can be cut down sufficiently to admit vessels of a tonnage now unable to get over it, and which the needs of shipping in that locality call for. I am requested to urge on the minister that, in view of the fact that he has increased his vote, enlarged his dredging plant, and that, with the exception of two dredges, it is in very fair condition, he should make a beginning this coming season.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to go on with the dredging at Weymouth, but my hon. friend will see himself that where there are 500,000 cubic yards to be removed, to really do effective work, work which would be satisfactory and which probably would cost 50 cents per cubic yard—that was the tender price—it is a question for grave consideration as to whether the department would be justified in spending one-quarter of a million dollars to improve the harbour. I have already given the matter consideration, and am not without hope that we may be able in the near future to do some work which may result in improvement, but I cannot say when the work will commence.

Mr. JAMESON. I am not asking, nor are the people of Weymouth asking, that this entire 500,000 cubic yards should be removed at this time, but that only a reasonable amount of dredging be done at the entrance to the harbour. The dredging which requires to be done above the bar in the way of straightening the channel might stand for the present. And that, for the time being, can stand. I can assure the minister that, if he will make a beginning, that beginning need not entail a very serious outlay. A comparatively small outlay will improve conditions there wonderfully, and I trust he will not allow the plans which have been made, and the estimates of the amount of material to be moved, to frighten him, for we are not asking for that. These plans are very elaborate, and it may be they were made for effect rather than with a view of ever being worked up to, but that they should be held up as a reason why some work should not be undertaken. I do not think that is reasonable or right. We are not asking that the entire plans be worked out, but that a beginning be made, and that the bar at the entrance of the harbour be cut down a reasonable degree so as to allow shipping to pass. I do not think it is fair of the minister to hold up this estimate of 500,000 cubic yards of material to be moved, and a quarter of million dollars spent, when we ask for some dredging. I hope he will not allow that to alarm him out of spending a reasonable amount of money on the entrance to the harbour.

Mr. J. HAGGART. In the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I desire to support the observations of my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson). We are spending large sums of money for such works as the Transcontinental railway, the Hudson Bay railway and others of that kind. But the people of Weymouth, unfortunately, are not reached by any of these large works.

And, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in such cases, has used the argument that the people cannot be expected to pay taxes for works from which they benefit only very indirectly unless they receive a quid pro quo. It is the duty of the government, according to the argument of the Minister of Finance, to see to it that these parties in the maritime provinces, and especially in the port of Weymouth, are recouped for the expenditures they are making in other parts of the country by an expenditure for works in which they are locally interested and which they demand as a right from the government.

Public works—chargeable to income—miscellaneous—surveys and inspections, $23,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to supplement an appropriation of $60,000 made last session for surveys and inspections in connection with rivers and harbours, slides and booms, roads and bridges, and other services. There was expended up to 31st December last, as follows: In the maritime provinces, $16,086.11; in Quebec, $21,768.97; in Ontario, $13,283.00; Manitoba, $1,654.42; in Saskatchewan and Alberta, $4,075.63; in British Columbia, $7,452.80; and other expenditures making a total of $74,440.02. This leaves to be provided for, $14,440.02. The estimated additional outlay to cover engagements for the months of January, February and March, 1910, is $8,551.98, making a total of practically the amount of this vote, $23,000, to square the accounts of the year.

Engineering branch—salaries of engineers, inspectors, superintendents, draughtsmen, clerks and messengers of outside service, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to supplement votes of $145,000 and to make provision for a balance of salaries of engineers and others in the engineering branch of the Public Works Department in connection with the construction and maintenance of harbours and rivers, slides and booms, roads and bridges. The total expenditure to December 31, 1909, was $116,593. On the same basis, there will be required to the end of the fiscal year $40,200, making a total of $156,793. This gives a balance over the appropriation of $11,793 and we are asking $12,000, thus leaving a small margin.

Surveys of Richelieu and Yamaska rivers and their affluents to determine the cost of improved waterways between the river St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain — further amount, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The appropriation for this service was $20,000. The actual expenditure was as follows: Salaries of survey party No. 1 to 28th February, 1910, $11,895.11; survey party No. 2 $7,447.75; survey party No. 3, $4,333.76; sundries, $147.11; total, $23,623.69.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What is the object of the survey?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The object is better water connection between the St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain, and also Lake Champlain and the River Yamaska and some other rivers near the lake.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I thought there might be in view the bigger object of making a connection in the future for the improved St. Lawrence canals or the Georgian Bay canal looking to a deep waterway connection with New York. Unless the service contemplates something of that kind, I do not see the object. We may have, certainly we ought to have, a survey of a 22 foot to a 25 foot canal from the

St. Lawrence down, probably by way of the route that Young used to advocate from Montreal by way of Lake Champlain.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been no such survey of recent years; it may have been made a long time ago.

Mr. J. HAGGART. But this one is going on at the present time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is a very desirable expenditure in the public interest to ascertain the feasibility of getting a deep waterway and the cost.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I want to know if that is what the money is being expended for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. Is this for the purpose of carrying the course of the water from the St. Lawrence to Lake Champlain or from Lake Champlain to the St. Lawrence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Lake Champlain runs to the St. Lawrence. We do not propose to alter the course of the flow of the river; this is only to get a better navigable channel to connect Lake Champlain with the St. Lawrence. There is in connection with that another proposition to cut a channel through from near Montreal across to the Richelieu river which would shorten the distance by about 100 miles, and make the water route from Montreal to New York a little shorter than the railway haul.

Mr. CROSBY. That is the difficulty. Who are going to benefit by that, ourselves or the Americans? The whole thing it seems to me would tend towards diverting the trade of the St. Lawrence to New York. Practically all of Lake Champlain is in the United States, so we would facilitate the diversion of trade into the United States, and that seems to me to be a very risky thing for us to do. We have evidence that some of the great steamship lines plying between the old country and New York have been compelled to give up the St. Lawrence, and possibly if they can get the trade diverted, and have it go by Lake Champlain to New York they will not come up the St. Lawrence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think the committee will be very much alarmed at any project which may result in giving opportunities for the farmers and producers generally to get their produce to a great city like New York for sale, but we are not proposing anything of that kind, because we are making a survey to see the feasibility of the channel.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not my hon. friend see that there is an objection to improving a waterway from Canada to New York? On general principles that would seem to be objectionable whether for the benefit of the farmers or of anybody else. I should think our farmers would be patriotic enough to want to improve our waterways for the benefit of Canadian cities, not of the United States cities. The very statement of my hon. friend seems to me to put this item out of consideration by this committee instead of leading us to approve it. He said it would improve the water communication from that part of the country to New York. We have not yet annexed New York. I hope we will do so, I hope the Union Jack will be flying over New York some day, but until we do annex it, I do not think we should spend the money of the people in improving such a waterway.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER TRANSMISSION COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited.—Mr. Pardee.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume there is no object in taking up time to-night with this Bill.

Mr. FISHER. Let it stand.

Progress reported.

NORTHERN QUEBEC COLONIZATION RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 152) to incorporate the Northern Quebec Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. J. P. Turcotte.

On section 11—agreements with other companies,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In the 21st line the words 'commissioners of the' are struck out. Shall the section as amended be carried?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that not a mistake? What power would the company have to enter into an agreement with the commissioners of the National Transcontinental Railway? It would be the government of Canada, which would enter into an agreement with respect to the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. FISHER. It would be the lessees—the Grand Trunk Pacific Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The purposes of section 361 are those of amalgamation, and I think we had better make it read that they may enter into an agreement with the

government in respect to the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. LENNOX. They had it at first ' with the commissioners of the National Transcontinental railway ' and then they struck out the words ' commissioners of the ' and left it ' with the National Transcontinental railway '. I venture to say that they could not make a contract with the railway, and that it should be made to read ' with the government of Canada ' as the minister says.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With the government of Canada in respect to the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. LENNOX. I move that we add the words ' with the government of Canada in respect to the National Transcontinental railway '.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be better to leave it out altogether. The section provides for two companies amalgamating and that is not applicable to the government road at all.

Mr. LENNOX. It would be better to leave it out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is a Bill from the Senate and an amendment to that extent might be irregular.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Better let the Bill stand.

Progress reported.

JAMES BAY AND EASTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order being called for the consideration of Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to have the Minister of Railways here when we are discussing this Bill. It would be a waste of time to take it up to-night. I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported.

RAINY RIVER RADIAL RAILWAY.

On the order being called: House in committee on Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Rainy River Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Conmee.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Railways should be present when we are discussing this Bill. I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 137) respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the Bay of Quinte Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 147) for the relief of Archibald Laurie.—Mr. Congdon.

Bill (No. 148) for the relief of Bernard Shea.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 149) for the relief of Clara Louise Holden.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Low.

Bill (No. 156) to incorporate the Weyburn Security Bank.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 161) respecting the Sovereign Trust Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 154) an Act respecting the Northern Empire Railway Company.—Mr. White (Victoria).

Bill (No. 162) an Act for the relief of Alexander Augustus Barthelmes.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 160) an Act respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 167) an Act to incorporate the Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 169) an Act respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 170) an Act to incorporate the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Timiskaming.—Mr. Gordon (Nipissing).

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the recess we were discussing a small amount required to pay for surveys of the Richelieu and Yamaska rivers. An appropriation was voted last session, and there is a small amount now due the surveyors.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that by the resident engineers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a special survey party made up for this work. It was the work of surveying the Richelieu from its mouth up to its outlet from lake Champlain. And also the Yamaska and tributaries with the view of ascertaining the possibility of connecting those rivers and what it would cost.

Experimental farms and additional branch stations—further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I understand that these items are duplicated in the main estimates not passed. A great many members want to speak on these, and I presume they can do that on the main estimates.

Mr. FISHER. In the main estimates for the ensuing year there will be similar items and ample opportunity for discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you require this additional amount?

Mr. FISHER. With regard to the experimental farm we found that nearly $10,000 had lapsed in last year's vote, and we had to pay out of this year's appropriations. In consequence of the death of Dr. Fletcher, I was obliged to appoint two men, an entymologist and a botanist. They asked for a considerable amount of apparatus, and books, amounting to nearly $5,000. After careful consideration by Dr. Saunders, he recommended that the equipment should be supplied. The result of these two is a deficiency of $15,000. There was an expenditure of $2,000 or $3,000 in preparation for the purpose of some additional branch farms in the west. The money was spent in obtaining information and inspecting sites. Again, I have been doing extra work in connection with tobacco growing which, in the aggregate, has cost $5,000. This accounts for about $23,000, and the balance of $2,000 is for small amounts to close up the business of the year.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says he had to take out of this year's vote to make up for last year's accounts. There is no justification for that. The money voted for this year should not be used for last year's accounts.

Mr. FISHER. Sometimes accounts incurred in one year do not come in in time to be paid out of the appropriation of that year. In this case, the delay was in the case of some large accounts. The Auditor General always permits a regular vote of this kind to be used to close up the accounts of the past year. But these accounts are so large that we could not deal with them in that manner. Had I known during last session, I could have had a revote of the amount. But, as I did not know, it has to be provided for in this way.

Mr. SPROULE. The fact that the Auditor General allows this does not make it right.

Mr. FISHER. But it shows that it is a practice that is followed.

Mr. SPROULE. A great many practices have been begun by this government that we think are very wrong, and this is one of them. I do not think there is any justification for paying money after the vote has lapsed. Money is voted by parliament for a given year, and it is certainly not proper to use the money of one year for the purpose of another.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many additional experimental farms have been established this year?

Mr. FISHER. One in Prince Edward Island, and one in Rosthern, Saskatchewan. I have had an officer investigating sites that have been suggested in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Quebec and Nova Scotia.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did the minister establish a farm in any part of western Ontario as he promised last year?

Mr. FISHER. No, and I have none yet in view. I think I said that I hoped to see an experimental farm established in new Ontario. But we have not yet reached the point where it seemed well to establish such a farm. I think there ought to be one, perhaps two, experimental farms in the northern part of New Ontario, but it seems better to wait until the construction of the Transcontinental is further advanced, and the course of settlement is more clearly decided.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister gave us to understand that he would establish an experimental station in western Ontario, not only to assist the tobacco growers——

Mr. FISHER. That is established.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I asked the minister about that.

Mr. FISHER. I did not understand that that was what was referred to. I established a station for experimental tobacco work in Essex county, and also a similar station in Quebec. These account for about $5,000 of expenditure.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understood that the establishment of a fruit station in western Ontario would be taken up seriously, and I would urge the minister to investigate with that view. I think he is hardly justified in waiting until the Transcontinental line is located before he locates an experimental farm in the northern part of New Ontario. I hope he will look into the matter.

Mr. FISHER. I will do so gladly.

Mr. BURRELL. What steps has the minister taken in regard to an experimental station in the semi-arid belt of British Columbia? The statement made by the minister on a previous occasion led the people to hope that a station would be established there this year. Many requests have been made for the establishment of

such a station. I should like very much to have a statement from the minister, and of a favourable character.

Mr. FISHER. I am pushing that as rapidly as possible. I have been waiting for some little information, which I would not like to announce at present, as to a particular site. I have had careful examination made of a number of sites, and have gone over the report of the officer who examined them. In view of this, and some information that I acquired when in that country, I hope before the end of this year that the matter will be settled. I had not intended to go into it on this item; perhaps it would be better to leave a fuller explanation until the main estimates are before the committee.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Injustice is often done to inland constituencies in our part of Ontario. A great deal of money is spent by the Dominion for harbour improvements to the benefit of certain ridings, while inland ridings get nothing at all. I have been many years in this House, and have asked for several things, and have failed to get any grant that I ever asked for. East Huron is as good a riding as there is in Canada, and an experimental farm there would yield as good results as in any other place I know of. A great many hundreds of millions of dollars have been voted away since I came into this House. I have asked once or twice for little things that I wished to have done for East Huron, but no request that I have ever made has been granted. Now I would ask for an experimental fruit farm in East Huron. Because of the peculiar position we occupy—elevation, the proximity of the lake, and the nature of the soil—we have, I believe, the finest apple-growing section in Canada. I have heard others claim something of that kind for their localities, but, for a particular kind of apple, the Northern Spy, I think we have the best condition to be found in the country. The Northern Spy ripens in East Huron exactly at the season when nature provides it with all the benefits which in other localities have to be procured by means of artificial cold storage. The farmers there, however, do not know what to do. They do not understand spraying their orchards or how to get rid of the codling moth, and other pests. I am sure that if a small experimental fruit farm were established there—if it were only a farm of ten or fifteen acres—and handled properly, it would mean a great deal to the people of that part of the country. I know that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) would like to do what is fair and right, and I would ask him to remember that an inland riding like mine, that has been paying and paying for years, ought as a matter of the barest justice, to get something. I would ask the minister to kindly remember that there is an old man up in East Huron, and that he would like to get something for East Huron before he dies.

Mr. FISHER. I want to assure my hon. friend that I never forget, I shall not say the old man, but my hon. friend, who is so vigorous and young notwithstanding his grey hairs, the representative of East Huron (Mr. T. Chisholm). When the main estimate for the experimental farms for next year comes up, I will be glad to have a very thorough discussion of this whole question of branch farms. I look forward to it with interest, and will be glad to have suggestions such as my hon. friend has made in reference to what I consider a very important branch of the service.

Mr. FRASER. In what position is the farm which the government is establishing in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. FISHER. The farm is in our possession, the buildings are fairly towards completion, and I think the house will be ready for the farm manager before spring. A good deal of fencing was done last fall, the arrangement of the farm is completed, the plots, &c., have been laid out, and a good deal of ploughing has been done, so that I think a large part of the farm will be under cultivation this spring. The farm consists of between 50 and 75 acres just outside of Charlottetown.

Exhibitions—further amount required (including Governor General's warrant for $25,000), $75,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you come to have a Governor General's warrant?

Mr. FISHER. The decision to exhibit at the Brussels exhibition was not arrived at until after the last session, and in order to move our exhibit from Seattle to Brussels we had to take a Governor General's warrant. Then an additional $50,000 is required because we had expected at the time we took the warrant that parliament would have voted money for this purpose before this, and as the work had to go on we have been obliged to do a good deal of it on credit.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What exhibitions will be participated in this year?

Mr. FISHER. Last summer we were at Seattle. This coming spring the International Exhibition in Brussels opens, and we have arranged for a Canadian pavilion there. Lately we have been invited and strongly urged by a very influential committee in London to take part in what is known as the Festival of Empire at the Crystal Palace, and the government has decided that it would be very unfortunate if at such a celebration as that, Canada was not represented. We are just now taking

the steps necessary to be represented, and that and the Brussels exhibition are the only two I know of in the ensuing year.

Immigration—further amount required for contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, $60,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the total amount of the vote for immigration, and of what is it made up?

Mr. FISHER. There is one item:

Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries, $200,000.

Then there is:

Contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies and general immigration expenses, $700,000.

Making a total of $900,000. This addition of $60,000 will make $960,000. That is for the current fiscal year ending March 31.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What are you asking for next year?

Mr. FISHER. We are asking $900,000 for next year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask if it is the intention of the government to send immigration agents to Germany during this coming year?

Mr. FISHER. I have not inquired of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), but I think, speaking subject to correction, that I heard him make a reference to it the other day. I will not be positive.

Public works—capital—harbours and rivers —Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements, $425,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of that very large amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to cover the following progress estimates, certified to by the chief engineer, for works performed under contracts in force at Port Arthur and Fort William during the fiscal year in excess of those covered by the appropriation of $600,000 which was made by parliament at the session of the year 1908-9; also drawbacks which have been retained on the works and which, of course, have to be paid. First, I will give the different contracts showing the amounts which are due to the different companies. There was a contract dated June 27, 1906, with the Great Lakes Dredging Company for dredging in the Kaministiquia and Mission rivers. For the September account there is $8,964.93; October account, $592.20; November, $1,464. which with a ten per cent drawback amounting to $4,526.17, makes $15,490. 94. Then, there is another contract, dated June 4, 1909, with the same company for dredging on the Kaministiquia and Mission rivers. That was a contract for additional depth. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at the last session I stated that it was proposed to increase the depth of water there from 22 feet, as had been originally designed, to 25 feet, which seemed to be regarded as necessary to accommodate the larger lake steamers which had recently been built for traffic on the lakes. The September account amounted to $32,714.37; October, $5,925.44; November, $959.42, ten per cent drawback, $16,326.39, making a total of $55,925.63. There was another contract, dated the 27th of February, 1909, for dredging out the terminal basin in connection with the terminals of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. The September account was $48,127.22; October, $116,267.71; November, $102,495.58; December, $26,743.98; ten per cent drawback, $14,049.40, making a total of $307,783.89. There was a contract with Mr. W. J. Hogan for the Port Arthur breakwater. There is a balance due to the 30th September of $31,760. Adding that to the previous amount makes the total $410,960.46. Then, there is a contract, dated June 28, with Mr. W. H. Phinn, of Welland, for dredging at Port Arthur. That was dredging that was regarded as urgent in order to give the requisite accommodation at Port Arthur. There is an amount due to Mr. Phinn of $10,263.82 for work done from the 1st October to the 22nd October. That makes the total amount due contractors for works performed in excess of those covered by the appropriation of $600,000 of $421,224.28. In addition to this, there is a progress estimate up to October 30, 1909, of $16,168 for timber supplied for Fort William harbour improvements; that is for revetment wall, which is being constructed along the face of the harbour on the Mission river. This estimate was only received by the accountant on the 16th February, 1910. If I had received that item, I would have had that added to the supplementaries. However, that can be paid out of the main estimates next year. We will still be short about $12,000 for the closing up of these accounts. We have only asked for $425,000, while the total amount is a little over $437,000. We had on hand on the 17th February, to make further payment for timber, land expropriated, engineering expenses and contingencies, $15,335.69. Hon. gentlemen may ask how it was that so much was allowed to be done in excess of the appropriation. The reason is this: At the last session of parliament we cut down the appropriation to the smallest possible figure. I had myself thought that with the appropriation which we had it would be impossible to have the work proceed throughout the season as vigorously as it ought to proceed, but my hon. friend the Minister of Finance thought we should curtail, as far as possible, and we did so. Later on in the season, we were pressed very earn-

estly by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to complete the work of dredging up to the very large elevator which the Grand Trunk Pacific is erecting, and after discussing the matter in council, it was decided that it would be wise to allow the contractors to push the work with all possible expedition. The contractors had contracts for the whole work, and it did not make very much difference to the country whether the work was done this year or next year, while the Grand Trunk Pacific represented to us the enormous importance of having a channel dredged through from the Mission river to the pier forming part of the elevator system, either by the 1st of October or very early in October. It was hoped by the Grad Trunk Pacific that they would be able to handle the grain of the western country tributary to their railway through the outlet at Fort William.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did they handle—one small train load only?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did not, as it happened, but I felt that as far as my Department was concerned, we ought not to be behind. I gave the assurance to the Grand Trunk Pacific that as far as we were concerned we would do our part.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Are they carrying grain there now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. I am bound to say that we did our part, we dredged out the channel so that by the middle of October steamers could go right in through the Mission river and up to the Grand Trunk Pacific elevator.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Was the dredging done by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the contracts were all given by tender.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At how much?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were different prices. The contract for the terminal basin was let at sixteen cents. Then, a large portion of the work is being done at eleven cents, and a portion at nine cents. They put on one powerful hydraulic dredge to expedite the work, but most of the dredges are of the ordinary dipper type. We did not contemplate last session that we would have to do any great additional dredging at Port Arthur, but it was brought to our attention that a company was erecting a large grain elevator, and unless dredging was done the lake vessels would not be able to reach it. In view of the fact that at Port Arthur, and Fort William there converges all the grain trade of the west during the season of navigation, and that there was likely to be a large crop, we thought we should provide the necessary facilities. Tenders were invited, and Mr. Phinn, at thirteen cents per cubic yard, was the lowest tenderer. Mr. Hogan has had for some time a contract for the building of the breakwater at Port Arthur which will form part of the larger harbour improvements which were strongly recommended by the Transportation Commission, and which are essential for the protection of the harbour. We entered into a contract for the building of a revetment wall or system of wharfage along the Mission river in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific terminals, and we required the Grand Trunk Pacific to convey to the Crown the title to a thirty foot strip along the harbour front so that it may be open to shipping generally at rates to be controlled by the government. We think it desirable to close up those accounts before the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. WRIGHT. The vote in the main estimates last year was $600,000, and with this vote the expenditure will be considerably over $1,000,000 which seems a large sum of money for one particular place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are two places, Port Arthur and Fort William.

Mr. WRIGHT. The vote is under the same head, and it is practically the one city. This expenditure at the one place makes it very difficult to get grants for necessary public works at other places in the province of Ontario. What will be the total cost of these works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost, so far as the government is concerned, is in the vicinity of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. How much has been already spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should think something over one-half. It must be borne in mind that Port Arthur and Fort William are at the gateway of our great western country which is developing with marvellous rapidity. These two cities are growing at an equally marvellous rate, and the business which has developed there is simply enormous. It is a national port. The improvements at Mission river will extend for six miles along the front and there are industries springing up everywhere. The Grand Trunk Pacific elevator now under construction is to have an initial capacity of 3,000,000 bushels, and their plans contemplate an elevator capacity of 30,000,000 bushels. At Fort William and Port Arthur there is an elevator capacity in the vicinity of 40,000,000 bushels. I believe the Grand Trunk Pacific terminals will be the finest in the world. I do not believe that anywhere in the world will there be a better layout of terminals than in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific, unless it be the terminals of the Canadian Pacific railway, which are also at Fort William. The Canadian Pacific railway have bought considerable property to enlarge their terminals,

and they are taking means to accommodate this vast traffic expeditiously and cheaply.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Enlarging the spout?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, enlarging the spout.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister is giving us in this another exhibition of a procedure which is wholly unjustifiable. Last year he submitted to parliament an estimate of $600,000 for the Port Arthur and Fort William works, and he told us that having had a comprehensive survey made he could cut down the original estimate. But during the recess of parliament he undertook nearly half a million dollars worth of works, for not one dollar of which he had the authority of parliament. These were not works that could not have been foreseen; it was well known that the Grand Trunk Pacific would have their terminals there and would require certain work done to enable them to ship grain, therefore parliament should have been consulted so as to discuss the matter and decide whether or not it was wise to make the expenditure. The minister now says that the dredging was badly needed to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific to handle the grain, but our information is that only one small train load was shipped by that company during last season, and there was not much dredging required for that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would require as much dredging as if they handled 50,000,000 bushels.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. There was no necessity for bringing in the largest boat for that small amount of grain, and as a matter of fact millions of bushels have been shipped from Port Arthur by vessels drawing less than 18 feet. Could it not have been foreseen that it would be required and submitted to this House? Then the House could have considered it, and would doubtless, if it were needed, have voted the money. But not a word of it was mentioned to the House or the country. We were told that $600,000 was all that would be required for the year, and that was granted without any dissent; and later the government commenced dredging and working on the breakwater and the revetment wall at Port Arthur, all of which the engineer who visited the locality and made his survey must have known and foreseen last year, because the works there were laid out years ago, and it was well known what improvements would be required from year to year for several years. But in undertaking new work amounting to nearly half a million dollars, and in going on with the expenditure when there was not a dollar voted by parliament for it, the Minister of Public Works has introduced a very pernicious and improper principle, which parliament should not tolerate. If there had been a storm or an accident that necessitated the work being done in a hurry, I could understand the hon. minister resorting to a Governor General's warrant. But these works are not of that character; they were known beforehand, and under these circumstances to expend $425,000 without the consent of parliament is unjustifiable. The minister might just as well have expended as many millions; the principle is the same. I think this is the first Minister of Public Works I have ever known to make such a proposal in this House, and parliament will be doing a very improper thing if it consents to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend assumes that this work has been paid for. It has not been paid for, and that is the reason we are asking for this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Even if it is not paid for, you have committed the country, and it must be paid for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am only correcting a mistake the hon. gentleman made. My hon. friend also says that we have entered on the construction of this breakwater without the consent of parliament. This breakwater has been under construction for three years, and there have been votes for it each year. The contractor is to build the breakwater, and he could go on and finish it in one year if he chose, but he would have to wait for his money until parliament voted it. If a contractor for any work carried it on more rapidly than we anticipated we could force him to wait until parliament voted the necessary money to pay him for the work done. But we thought that was not desirable. As these contractors, in order to give these much-needed facilities, went on much faster than we had anticipated, we have thought it only right and desirable in the interest of the country that the work of the year should be closed up, and that we should ask parliament for an amount sufficient to close up these accounts before the end of the present month.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much of this $425,000 represents new contracts entered into by the minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The $15,490.94 was under an old contract of June 27, 1906. There is $307,783.89 due under a contract dated February 27, 1909. That was before we had taken our appropriation from parliament. This is practically a part of the original contract. The only difference is that we are digging to a depth of three feet beyond what we had originally intended. But it is all part of the original scheme.

Mr. SPROULE. How was it that the minister could not have provided for that last year when he let the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already explained that we thought $600,000 would be all we could afford last year; but if the contractors chose to go on and do more than the appropriation called for, they could do so under the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What was that contract for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For dredging. There was another contract on the 4th of June last. They had a right under the contract, if they chose to employ dredges enough, to do the whole work this year.

Mr. EDWARDS. About how much would that have amounted to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably two or three million dollars. This work, proceeding with ordinary rapidity, would run over three or four years Then there is an amount of $31,000 to pay Mr. Hogan. That is under an old contract made in 1906.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was voted last year on the Hogan contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The vote was a lump sum of $600,000 for improvements at Port Arthur, which included dredging and the breakwater. I say frankly to the committee that when, during last summer, our revenues began to improve, I felt that I would not be doing my duty to the country, in view of the rapid development of the country and the necessity of providing as soon as possible the requisite accommodation, if I had said to these people, who had contracts and who were entitled to go on and do the work, though they might have to wait until parliament had voted the money to pay for it, 'You must stop work.' On the other hand, I allowed them to go on, and I believe parliament will ratify what was done and provide the money this year, instead of compelling the contractors to wait until next year. Of course, there is the question of interest, but it was much better we allowed them to go ahead with the work and now pay them, and so close up the account for the year.

Mr. FRASER. I think that the principle laid down by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is perfectly correct. Parliament is called once a year to vote money to be expended on public works and other necessities of administration. Parliament granted $600,000 for this work and the minister spent $425,000 more than we voted. That over expenditure was an open violation of the first principles of responsible government. Why this farce of our coming here to vote these expenditures at all if the ministers can afterwards spend as much money as they like regardless of our vote. This is a matter which should engage the attention of every member of parliament, because it strikes at the very root of parliamentary authority. Let the minister of any department go on spending 80 or 90 per cent more than the amount we authorized him to spend, and what becomes of parliamentary control? If we go through the different items, I have no doubt that we will find many millions of dollars spent without any parliamentary vote. It seems to me that we ought not for a moment to sanction anything of the kind. We ought at least to stick to first principles and see that no money is expended unless authorized by parliament except in some very extreme and unforeseen emergencies.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I was not here when this discussion began, but as I understand something about the work done up there, perhaps a word from me, as an independent outsider, will show that there are certain mitigating circumstances in this case. Fort William and Port Arthur are two great harbours of Ontario, and certain works were planned to be done at these harbours extending over many years. Parliament votes a certain amount for these works every year, and, as I understand, the work has been anticipated. But if the minister can have the work done in two years instead of four, I think the country will gain by having that much earlier the use of the harbours and those improvements. If these works could all be done in one year, that would be still a greater benefit. The trade has grown so enormously that the facilities at Fort William and Port Arthur are altogether inadequate, and if the business continues to grow, any delay in the prosecution of the government works will cause great injury to shippers at the head of the lake.

Mr. SPROULE. What would the observations of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) lead to if they were made generally applicable? Last year we voted altogether $100,000,000. Out of that amount we voted for Port Arthur and Fort William $600,000, but we spent during the year $1,025,000, or we spent nearly $2 for every one that parliament voted. Surely that extra expenditure was not expenditure which could not have been foreseen with the exercise of a little good judgment and foresight. Surely parliament should have been asked to vote that money before it was expended. Suppose the same principle were carried out all along the line and that our revenue had fallen off, and suppose we found ourselves at the end of the year with an expenditure of $200,000,000 when we had only voted $100,000,000, what

would then be the financial condition of the country. I am not objecting to any reasonable expenditure, but I am objecting to such excessive expenditure not authorized by parliament. When we find a minister spending two dollars for every one we voted, it is time that parliament should express in no doubtful terms its condemnation of such conduct. It is a violation of the principle of constitutional government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If that be so, how is it that every year since confederation we have voted supplementary estimates for the current year?

Mr. SPROULE. We vote them before the money is expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we vote them to pay the debts due on the 31st March, which were not provided for by parliamentary sanction.

Mr. SPROULE. In some cases that is done, but only in exceptional cases. It is done to meet expenditures which could not have been anticipated at the time the estimates were brought down, but which had to be incurred owing to urgent need. But that is not the case here. In this case parliament voted the money which the government asked for, parliament in so doing exercised its judgment and understood that the vote should not be exceeded, but here we have the minister spending two dollars for every one voted, and then asking parliament to condone his conduct by voting money to meet the deficiency. This is not a case of a sudden and unforeseen emergency. Such a case as that would justify the expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For such cases you get a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. SPROULE. They may be provided for by Governor General's warrant or otherwise, and parliament will overlook a great deal in consideration of the circumstances; but in such a case as this, any intelligent engineer should have known what amount would be required and have furnished an estimate for that amount. How many more dredges did they put on during the year than they expected to put on at the beginning?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One very powerful suction dredge which they bought for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. How many more have they?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Five more.

Mr. SPROULE. Where a contract has been made, and it is expected that certain amount of work will be done during the year, and parliament has voted the money, if the amount were over-run a little, parliament would not object to that. But it is carrying it too far, and is defying the fundamental principles of parliamentary government when very large expenditures are made, and then the minister comes in an unconcerned, commonplace way, and says: The money is spent, and it will have to be voted. Suppose every minister did the same thing, is it not easy to see to what abuses it would lead? The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has acquired the reputation of being very strong-willed, and of taking his own way, whether right or wrong, doing what he feels disposed to do regardless of parliament. Both the House, and the country are taking note of this. The hon. minister may carry this out to a limited extent, but a day of retribution will come when the public disapproval will be visited upon him and his colleagues, for an abuse that ought not to be tolerated by parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite agree that the government ought not to engage in any work not authorized by parliament. But parliament has over and over again sanctioned this great work at Port Arthur and Fort William; parliament has been fully informed of the expenditure from year to year. The work has been carried on according to a design prepared by the engineers in conjunction with the railway companies which are making their termini at Fort William and Port Arthur. Parliament has been informed, substantially, what this is going to cost. Therefore, this puts the present case entirely aside from the cases to which the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) has referred, of the government engaging in new work without the sanction of parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the dredging of the Grand Trunk Pacific harbour new work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. How in the world can you develop a harbour on Mission river unless you have a turning basin?

Mr. SPROULE. Why did not the minister ask for the money for that if he knew it was to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me tell the hon. member what occurred. Early in the year, Mr. Chamberlin, of the Grand Trunk Pacific, said to me: 'We expect to take part in moving the crops this year'.

Mr. SPROULE. About what time was this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. May or June. He said they expected to move the crops over their road by October 1. The line was to be finished from Edmonton to Winnipeg, and also the branch from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William, and they were informed by the commissioners of the Trans-

continental that their part of the work necessary for this purpose would be finished. He represented that it would be most unfortunate if the Grand Trunk Pacific could not utilize its elevator at Fort William, and the only way by which it could be utilized would be by dredging the channel—I think about half a mile—between the Mission river and the elevator. I told Mr. Chamberlin that I did not know that I could do this, as it might cost more money than the government could afford to spend that year. He urged upon me that it would be a most deplorable thing if, by reason of the delay of the government in this dredging work, the Grand Trunk Pacific was not able to handle the crop of 1909. I brought the matter before my colleagues, especially Sir Richard Cartwright, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who keeps in touch more especially with the trade of the country. I found he was strongly impressed with the rapidity with which the trade there was developing, and with the importance of doing everything we reasonably could to give the requisite facilities at Port Arthur and Fort William. I sent for the contractor, and was informed by one of the gentlemen in charge of the contracting work that it would be utterly impossible for them to make the connection between Mission river and the elevator by dredging the channel—because it was an entirely new channel—unless they purchased a very powerful suction dredge, and they could only get such a dredge in the United States. I conferred again with my colleagues, presenting the whole matter to them, and they concurred in the view that in these pressing and urgent circumstances, if the contractor could, by bringing in an additional dredge, accomplish what the Grand Trunk Pacific desired, and what seemed to be in the interest of the whole country, and especially of the west, should be accomplished of having this route opened for traffic by the 1st of October, it was desirable to allow the dredging contractors to put another dredge upon the work. With that encouragement they went to the United States, bought a powerful suction dredge, brought it in, paid the duties on it, and put it at work. And, with this dredge and the others they have a very large plant of six different dredges. They were able to dredge out the channel, and make a connection with the elevator so that steamers could go from the Mission river to the elevator. We did our work, and did it in anticipation of it being necessary for the companies to handle the grain in time for that season, and I am proud that our department did this work on time, and accomplished what we assured the Grand Trunk Pacific would be done. But it was only by the contractor putting forth additional effort, and buying this extra plant that the work was accomplished. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), says: Suppose the revenues had declined? In that case I doubt very much if we should have allowed the work to go on as we did. We should probably have said to the contractors: 'You will have to stop work on the Grand Trunk Pacific elevator channel, for, much as we desire to give connection to that elevator this season yet, in the state of the revenues, we do not think it desirable in the public interest to go ahead. But the revenues began to improve and remained buoyant, so I took the responsibility of ordering this work, in connection with my colleagues, and particularly with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir Richard Cartwright, than whom there is no more prudent man in the country. I think parliament should say we have done the right thing. It makes no difference whether we provide for the work now or next year, or last year. For it must be borne in mind that these contractors had a contract for an area—not for a season, but for the entire work—and they were entitled to proceed with it as rapidly as they chose, but always subject to their being allowed to wait until parliament should appropriate the money to make the payment. It is, as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) has said to the committee. If a public work involved an expenditure of $1,000,000, if it were in the hands of a contractor who was expected to finish $500,000 of the work in a season would there be any quarrel with him because he does building to the extent of $750,000? The contractor puts on a large force of men, employs the best of machinery, and gets along with the building to the extent of $750,000. Is there any violation of the principle of responsible government in allowing him to do that? Is there any encroachment on the law of parliament? It would be my duty as minister to say to parliament that the contractor had gone on more rapidly than we expected, and I am sure parliament would cheerfully grant the necessary money to pay him. It is exactly the same in this case. Parliament had given its sanction to the full performance of these contracts.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. The member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is perfectly correct in what he said. The Minister of Public Works has gone the wrong way about getting his money. If he had had this statement in the main estimates for next year it could have been included in the Supply Bill which was passed the other day and the money would have been available sooner than it will be in this way because it will now be impossible to include this in a Supply Bill before the first of April. If he had asked for this money

in that way there would have been no question about it.

Mr. EDWARDS. I agree with the principle advanced by the members for Grey and Kings, Prince Edward Island. We are here to decide on how we shall spend so many millions of dollars. We have so many millions at our disposal and according to the judgment of the House the money is divided and expended in different parts of the country for necessary public works. If going over these estimates means anything it means that they are submitted to the judgment of the House and the money is divided according to the best judgment of the majority of the members. The principle laid down by the minister to-night is in effect that if after the supplies are granted the revenues increase, he as Minister of Public Works has a perfect right to expend the increased revenue without applying to or getting the sanction of parliament for the expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that, I said that I might be justified in allowing a contractor to proceed with his work more rapidly.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is not a question of whether this work is necessary at Fort William and Port Arthur; we will grant that it is, and that much more money should be expended there. The question is whether a minister should take it upon himself after the money of the country has been divided, to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars without receiving the sanction of parliament. For instance, last year I asked the minister to spend a few hundred dollars in my riding, but he told me the money had been expended and that there was no money available for that particular work. He did not say it was unnecessary or not in the interests of the people. I contend that in the expenditure of this money I have the right, as any member has, to lay the claims of my county for a fair share of this money before this House, and to let the judgment of the House say whether or not that money should be expended. I object to the principle of a minister of the Crown taking it upon himself to expend several hundred thousand dollars for a work no matter how necessary it may be without having received the sanction of parliament. The minister has referred to the erecting of a public building to cost $2,000,000 and argues that he would be justified in going beyond the appropriation for a certain year if the contractor had gone beyond the amount voted. I do not think that could be done without infringing on the rights of other parts of the country to a fair share of the money. While I believe it is very necessary to have this work done, I wish to put myself on record as being opposed on principle to a minister expending some $400,000 more than the amount to which this House gave its sanction.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The minister has neglected to state that a commission sat on this harbour and decided to make it a national harbour and that plans for that purpose were adopted. The Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway adjusted their plans to the plans adopted by the government. That report was presented to the House and is to be found among our sessional papers. The government is carrying on that work and the Grand Trunk Pacific has certainly opened up a large extent of territory which must be served. That road reached completion at Fort William much more rapidly than the government anticipated. I was there a year ago last fall and I concluded that the Grand Trunk Pacific would have to wait with their elevator at least a year before they could get a boat to it. I am pleased that the government has rushed the work. Private money to the extent of $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 is invested in the elevator, and it would not be fair to have a couple of millions stand idle for a year or two years owing to the slowness of the government work. I am pleased that the minister has decided to rush the work, because there is a great deal more work necessary to complete the harbour. If the minister had directed the contractor last year to stop the work owing to lack of money voted by parliament so that the elevator would have had to stand idle, I am afraid that the whole northwest would have been here tearing his head off for causing that delay. If this money were being expended on a worthless or political job, then I would say that the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) was quite right and that it should not be done, but this is a national work, one of our greatest national works in transportation. I cannot see that the minister has done very much wrong in doing what he has done.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) can become as much of an apologist as he likes for the minister's conduct, but that will not influence my action in this House one iota. The hon. member gives the very strongest reason why parliament should have been asked for this expenditure last year when he says that the commission visited that harbour and decided to make a certain report and that that report was made and presented to parliament last year. Therefore, they must have been in possession of that report, they must have known what was required to be done, and they should have submitted the estimate to parliament.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I did not say that the report was presented last year. The report was presented two years ago, and the work has been carried on by this government for three years in accordance with that report.

Mr. SPROULE. That makes it so much the worse, and it makes my argument stronger because it was known the longer beforehand. I am not objecting to any expenditure at Port Arthur, per se, because it is a very important harbour, and if twice as large an expenditure had been proposed last session as was proposed, I have not the slightest doubt that this House would have voted it. But, I object to the principle. I say it is unparliamentary and wrong notwithstanding anything that has been said by the Minister of Public Works or the hon. member for North Simcoe. I am not very much concerned in either case. The hon. member for North Simcoe has asked: What would the Northwest have said if they could not have got their grain down there and through the elevator if it had been ready to receive it? We were told last session that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be hauling the crop of 1909 down to Port Arthur. Then, if they were going to haul grain, if it were known beforehand and we had that information given to this House by the ministers of the Crown, what kind of business men must they be, knowing that, that they did not prepare for it in proper time? If there had been provision in the proper time, this House could have authorized the expenditure and the harbour could have been made ready for navigation in time to permit the Grand Trunk Pacific to handle that grain. The minister said that the president of the railway company came to him last May or June. Does he not remember that this House only adjourned on the 19th or 20th of May? If it were in May surely he could have told this House what was needed, and this House would have willingly voted it. But they came to the minister a few weeks after parliament rose. How did it happen that it was known a few weeks after parliament rose and it was not known a few weeks before? All these plans are not the result of a moment's excitement. They are all worked out beforehand. They have to look over the ground, provide and prepare months beforehand. Therefore, it was known, the company had their consultations with the government, no doubt, and the government engineers had gone into the question and determined the amount of work which was required to be done, and the depth of dredging necessary to enable them to ship through these elevators. That was all known beforehand, and therefore I think that this expenditure ought to have been provided for by parliament. I am not objecting to the expenditure. If it had been ten times as much I would not object because I know the importance of that harbour, but I am objecting to the unparliamentary principle that has been adopted and has been introduced by the Minister of Public Works, one which parliament should not condone and one which parliament should not allow to pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not introduced by me. I am following what has been done for forty years.

Mr. SPROULE. Not by any means. A few thousand dollars here and there—

Mr. PUGSLEY. But on the same principle.

Mr. SPROULE. For every dollar that parliament has voted you spend $1.75 during the year on this work. We voted $600,000 and you spend $1,025,000. Yet, we are told that such a principle is defensible. No such principle that I have any knowledge of in parliamentary life is defensible. I have said all I intend to say about it, but I say that the government and the Minister of Public Works ought to be held responsible and called to account for it by the people of this country.

Mr. FRASER. I have no objection to the item as far as this harbour is concerned. I know very little about the merits of the question, but there is a principle recognized by the people of this country. One thing that we are assembled in parliament for is to look after the expenditure of public money. The principle of the appropriation of public money is one which is recognized by every banking or financial institution to-day in Canada. It is a well recognized principle that all moneys that are to be expended shall be voted by a Board of Directors, or, as in the case of public money, by this parliament. The principle is the same. Last year the Minister of Public Works asked for $600,000 to expend on this public work. It was granted. A few months afterwards a man by the name of Chamberlin, a contractor up there, the president of some company, comes to the minister—

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is the manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. FRASER. Well, he comes to the minister and tells him that he wants more money to be granted. This is shortly after parliament closed, or perhaps before parliament closed. The minister says: Yes, we will get at the thing and we will spend $400,000 more. For what purpose? So that we may be able to get the grain out. What do the Grand Trunk Pacific do? They take out one train load of grain. The minister has departed from a fundamental principle of constitutional government.

Although this may be, as the hon. member for North Simcoe says, a necessary work, surely this parliament will try and govern itself in accordance with fundamental principles. If we are going to get away from them why come and ask for any more money for this work? Let them go on and spend the money, and at the end of the year come and tell us how much they have expended. Why do they go through the farce of coming and asking parliament for $600,000 when at the end of the year they will come back and tell us that they have spent over a million dollars? I feel sure that if we go over the different items in the accounts for the year we will find expenditures without the authorization of parliament amounting to thousands and even millions of dollars a year. What business has the minister or any department of the government to spend a million dollars without the authorization of parliament? Surely it is the duty of parliament to authorize public expenditures, and I think every hon. member will concede that it is a principle and a duty that should be adhered to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the minister whether the place that is being dredged by the suction dredge is not likely to fill in again with material washed from the lake or the river. I want to call his attention to what I think is the most serious part of this whole question. I think my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is perfectly right in criticising the minister for this large expenditure of money without the consent of parliament. The minister quoted to us the amount of the expenditure on each of the contracts let previous to the present year, and these contracts, as I added them up, amount to only $350,000, which leaves $75,000 of new contracts that the minister has let on his own responsibility. To my mind that is the most serious part of the whole transaction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did my hon. friend take the $55,000 paid to the Great Lakes Dredging Company for the deepening of the river from 22 to 25 feet?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I took $307,000, $15,000 and $31,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Add the $55,000, $31,000 and $15,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understood the minister to make the statement that there was a contract for $55,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that was for deepening the channel from 22 to 25 feet. That is part of the same work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is that not a new contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is new instructions, but still that would be included in the work originally designed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did it cost the same?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It cost a little more to go to the greater depth.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, it must be a new contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not a new work. It is all part of the one harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. How much more per yard is paid to the Great Lakes Dredging Company for this deeper work than for the other?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A part of it had already been dredged to 22 feet, and then we had to provide for the extra 3 feet, and where it had not been dredged at all, we dredged down to 25 feet, and the whole thing was figured out with very great care by the engineers. I cannot give the figures exactly, but I think we raised it from 9 cents for the 22 feet to 11¼ cents for the 25 feet, which is a very reasonable figure.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was earned by the Great Lakes Dredging Company last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get the information on the main estimates.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. New work for at least $75,000, including the deepening of the harbour, was let last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only really new work was the $10,000 worth done by Mr. Phinn.

Tiffin harbour improvements, $23,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for amount due contractors for drilling and dredging operations at Tiffin to a depth of 25 feet at low water in connection with the terminals of the Grand Trunk. The important harbour at Tiffin is part of the national system of transportation, and we have decided to dredge there to 25 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was voted last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $125,000, and we have expended $147,377.88.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we will continue work this year.

Mr. SPROULE. How much has been spent on this harbour, and how much is yet to be expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have already expended $384,000 at Tiffin, and the engineer tells me the total estimated cost will be $600,000.

Victoria harbour improvements, $36,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had an appropriation last year of $150,000, and we have expended $185,526.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Will the minister have sufficient depth of water for the Canadian Pacific railway at these elevators?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes; the Canadian Pacific railway is entirely satisfied with the way in which the work is proceeding.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. You should take enough money this year, so that we may not have the same complication we have had over Fort William. There is a lot of work to be done at Victoria harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we are taking enough money.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that work let by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is under contract, let after public advertisement for tenders; rock, $2.25 a yard; other materials, 12½ cents when towed; boulders, $1.75; all other materials, 11 cents per cubic yard when cast over.

Mr. SPROULE. The whole contract is let to one company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What is the total estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $600,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I think it will be more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps a little more. In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) I may say we have the usual slope, and it is rather hard material there, so that it is not likely to fill in to any extent.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The banks and the bottom of the river are heavy red clay.

Mr. SPROULE. Then why have you to pay for rock cutting?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There is some hard granite rock there.

Further amount required towards the encouragement of better transportation and conservation of fresh fish, $20,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The reason for this supplementary vote is that this service has proved itself so effective in the development of the fresh fish trade that it was decided to continue it through the fiscal year. The whole explanation of the arrangement covers two and a half pages of the last report of the Fisheries Department, beginning at page 17. The policy of the department has been to guarantee one-third of the ordinary express rates to Quebec and Ontario in order to encourage the direct shipment of fresh fish. Formerly it came to Montreal via Boston.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was voted for this purpose last year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. $25,000. That was to carry on the work to November last, but it has proven so successful that the department decided to continue it, and the additional $20,000 is required to meet the additional expense. The ordinary express rates from Port Mulgrave or Halifax to Montreal is $1.50 per hundred pounds. Of that we pay fifty cents, so that it costs $1 per hundred pounds to cover the shipment to Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want to be understood as opposing this, because I think that anything that will tend to stimulate trade between the various provinces is very desirable, but I am afraid that the minister would get into trouble if he attempted to apply the same rule to all other commodities.

Mr. FISHER. We have been doing that for a long time for butter, cheese and fruit.

Mr. SPROULE. Not paying one-third of the express rates.

Mr. FISHER. We have been doing it in a different form. We have been guaranteeing to the railway companies that they would earn two-thirds of the ordinary freight rates per car. If they do not get enough freight in the car to earn two-thirds, we make up the difference. If they get more than two-thirds, they give us a credit for the extra, and at the end of the season a balance is struck, and we make up the loss. We spend about $10,000 a year on that.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I think there is a great constitutional principle at stake here. I quite agree that it is a good thing to encourage the shipment of fresh fish from the maritime provinces as far as Montreal, and to pay part of the freight on it, to the province of Ontario, where it may compete with the fish caught by our fishermen on the great lakes; but I notice that when there is any expenditure for the province of Ontario every one seems to want to jump on it with both feet. I do not believe in being provincial in this matter; but the mistake made in this case is the same as in the case of the Minister of Public Works, that the money was expended without the consent of parliament.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. I understand that this is a sort of bonus given for the purpose of driving the American fish out of our market. This market was formerly supplied by the Boston dealers, and it was to enable our Canadians to compete with the Boston men that this money is given.

I think the object very commendable and I presume the increase is due to the development of the trade. In place of voting the $30,000 in the estimate last year, that vote ought to be increased.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There is a great constitutional principle at stake right here again and, as representing an Ontario constituency, I say we ought to come right back to that principle. The minister has violated a constitutional principle by overrunning this estimate, what would he do if he had to spend a million dollars? No doubt he would overrun it by $500,000.

Mr. CONMEE. Why should not the fishermen on the north shore of Lake Superior have some of the benefits of this? They are nearly as far from the Montreal market as the deep sea fishermen and they have to express their fish.

Mr. BLACK. They do not compete with the American fish.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, they do. They ship white trout and pickerel.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And the fishermen of Lake Manitoba, represented by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), catch two million to three million dollars worth of fish every year and ship them to the United States. Why should they not have a share in this money? But again I would remind the House that there is a great constitutional principle at stake, and I hope my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) will support me in opposing this vote.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The policy has been to give assistance to salt water fishermen only.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Why?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The policy was only inaugurated one or two years ago and the idea was to bring the Atlantic fisheries into Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. They have Spain and Cuba and other countries to ship to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I frankly admit that if the principle is sound in one case, it ought to be in another, and I would advise the department to consider the suggestion made by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee). Just to show the effect of this, take the imports from the United States into the port of Montreal, the greatest Canadian fish market. The importation of such fish as cod and haddock from the United States fell in 1898 to the end of October from 753,000 pounds to 75,000 pounds in the case of cod and from 75,000 of haddock to 9,000 pounds. This shows that the American fish had been displaced by direct importation from the Atlantic.

Mr. SPROULE. I might reply to the observations of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that this is not a matter to turn into a jest. The principle in the present instance is entirely different from that in the case we discussed some time ago. Some years ago we passed a law to give certain consideration to those who shipped butter, cheese or other perishable produce in cold storage, and we voted $75,000 for that purpose, but it was distinctly understood that if the trade called for more we would give more in the same proportion. In the case before us the principle is just the same. It it were decided to give for this article of produce one-third of the cost of transportation and it was assumed so many tons would be shipped, and the shipments happened to exceed that amount, there is no violation of principle in paying the extra percentage. That is not the same at all as an over expenditure on a public work. In the latter case, the engineers have every opportunity of drawing plans and making estimates and submitting everything to parliament, and there can be no excuse for the minister doubling the expenditure voted.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does the Minister of Agriculture provide cold storage facilities for shipment of butter in the winter?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Cold storage was supplied for the fish business in the summer, but now the minister asks an additional appropriation during the winter. Again there is a great constitutional principle at stake.

Mr. FISHER. On butter in winter we do not need cold storage.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Nor do we need it on fish.

Mr. FISHER. The fish is expressed and not sent in cold storage at all.

Fish breeding establishments—amount required to pay W. S. Young for special service collecting whitefish eggs for hatchery at Selkirk and Berens river, $100.

Mr. SPROULE. I have thought for a good many years that the government are not doing all they should with regard to the establishment of these fish hatcheries. The rivers and lakes of our country are being depleted very rapidly. In the Georgian bay we have one of the very finest fishing grounds in Canada, but it is being rapidly depleted. Every year immense quantities of fish and fish ova are brought

to the shore and the fish ova destroyed, in some places in tons, and yet we require them. The Americans take them and use them for hatching out fish on their side. Instead of having those fish ova destroyed, as they are in some cases in tons, we would be doing the proper thing if more fish breeding establishments were erected on the Georgian bay and Lake Huron, and have the fish hatched out there. They send to Georgian bay and collect the ova there right along the shore of the riding I represent. They bring them to Ottawa and hatch them out, and afterwards the fresh fry are taken back at considerable expense and put into the lake. The hatching might as well be done there at the edge of the lake, in the streams that are in every way suitable for the purpose. Many of the fry are destroyed in carriage, and it costs a good deal more while yielding nothing like the beneficial results that would follow having hatcheries near the water in which the fry are to be placed. I have again and again drawn attention to this improper and short-sighted policy. For some time I thought I had the promise of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he would establish a hatchery on the river leading into Thornbury down through a portion of my riding, where there are opportunities for a dozen fish hatcheries close to the lake. Though I thought I had his promise, I found that the minister was only jollying the thing along, and I was forced to the conclusion that he had no intention of carrying out the idea. I understand that one hatchery was established at Wiarton. That is right. I would like to see a dozen along the Georgian bay including one at Southampton. Tons of fish ova are destroyed there every year, and the waters are being depleted and the public are complaining. We are talking of conserving our forests and of replanting. That is what we should do with our fisheries; we should make the best use of all that nature has given us.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am inclined to agree with the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). Not many hatcheries have been built in very recent years. I am informed that it is proposed to build one on Lake Superior, and two or three applications for hatcheries on Georgian bay, and other points along that lake shore are under consideration at present.

Mr. SPROULE. Is one on the Beaver river?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am informed that that is not one of those under consideration. I believe that the view expressed by my hon. friend has the concurrence of the department which has always been anxious to establish fish hatcheries. There are thirty-seven hatcheries in Canada, and, of these fully two-thirds have been established within the last ten years. In my own province there are nine, eight of which have been built within the last ten or twelve years. We are well supplied in British Columbia for the hatching of salmon. The policy of the department has always been to build hatcheries, and keep up the fisheries by this artificial propagation. If I can influence the department, I will try to have others built on the great lakes.

Mr. BLACK. Is it the intention to hatch shad at the Windsor hatchery?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that that is being provided for, that provision is being made in the main estimates in relation to that matter.

Fisheries protection service—further amount required, $30,000.

Mr. CROSBY. What protection service is this?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is to provide for expenditures of last year. This vote is necessary largely because of additional fisheries protection on the Pacific ocean. The protection of the sea fisheries there is a very serious question. The government has had only one cruiser, the 'Kestrel.' It was felt that another vessel was needed, and the steamer 'Joliffe,' a large and powerful tug was engaged in the service at an expense of $9,000 or $10,000. Another large item covered by this vote is repairs to the government cruiser 'Kestrel.' No repairs of any account had been made to this vessel since she was built in 1903. An examination showed serious defects and she was put on the ways and thoroughly repaired at a cost of $13,000.

Post Office Department, outside service—further amount required, $300,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of this $300,000, the sum of $60,000 is for the increases that were made statutory last year for the humbler employees in the Post Office Department, outside service. Then $40,000 must be applied for the payment of better railway facilities for the British mails between Montreal and Rimouski. That is paid to the Intercolonial railway. As to the balance of $200,000, last year when the estimates were made up we were still under the influence of reduced revenues, and I thought I could imitate some of my colleagues and practice the policy of economy and retrenchment. We, therefore, cut off this amount, but we found that with the expansion of business in the country, with the establishment of the rural mail delivery and the continuation of our policy of multiplying the varous postal services from weekly to semi-weekly, from semi-weekly to tri-weekly and daily we could not do without the amount by which we had attempted to retrench.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been the cost of the rural mail delivery system and to what extent has it been put in force?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have here a table which will give all the information desired by the hon. member.

STATEMENT in connection with Rural Mail Delivery Routes in the Dominion of Canada for the period ending November 30, 1909.

Division.	No. of Routes authorized.	No. of Routes on which authorized rate was accepted.	No. of Routes on which authorized rate was refused.	Total number of box-holders reported.	Cost of services of boxes for four years.	Increase in cost of mail services for four years.	Total increase in cost of mail services (including service of Rural Delivery Boxes) for four years.
					$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Prince Edward Island..	33	21	8	428	1,594 00	2,720 48	4 48
Nova Scotia	4	4	.....	41	148 00	.....	148 00
New Brunswick	15	9	3	193	648 00	1,574 80	2,222 80
Quebec	8	5	3	58	223 00	760 00	983 00
Montreal	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Ottawa	7	3	4	80	311 00	706 40	1,017 40
Kingston	23	14	7	362	1,440 00	4,448 00	5,888 00
Toronto	38	18	14	486	1,936 00	4,637 00	6,573 00
London	104	56	38	1,595	6,236 00	16,793 68	23,029 68
Winnipeg	28	14	11	143	432 00	5,277 52	5,709 52
Moosejaw	8	8	.....	81	214 00	680 00	894 00
Saskatoon	3	3	.....	6	18 00	.....	18 00
Edmonton	13	12	1	106	312 00	20 00	332 00
Calgary	6	4	.....	47	135 00	178 40	313 40
Vancouver	6	2	4	83	309 00	3,412 00	3,721 00
Victoria	5	4	.....	20	75 00	.....	75 00
Totals	302	178	93	3,729	14,031 00	41,208 28	55,239 28

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister be good enough to tell us where the bulk of this money is expended?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is chiefly in the western provinces, on the new railway systems, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific. I know of forty or fifty post offices on these lines that were established two or three years ago. At the beginning the receipts were $25, or $30, or $40. I remember that the best revenue producing office was Wainwright, one of the divisional points on the Grand Trunk Pacific. The revenue was then about $175; now it has increased to nearly $1,000. It shows the progress of the country in these new sections. New settlements grow up and new offices are opened. That is where the great bulk of the business is done now, but in the older sections of the country we are establishing post offices, reducing the distances between offices and giving better postal facilities.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I see the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Congdon) sitting behind the minister, and I was wondering whether he was asking for an expenditure for increased postal facilities in that part of the country. I see that last year there was an expenditure of $135,000 in the Yukon.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have to contend with special circumstances in the Yukon. It is not a profitable business on account of the prives that have to be paid for the services, and the distances covered to reach the mining camps that are dispersed throughout that land. It is not a profitable business, but still we have to maintain the service. We have to be in a position to send a letter from north to south or east to west at two cents. We take pride in the Post Office Department in the fact that persons at the remotest points in this country can send and receive letters. As an instance of the development of postal facilities in the west. I may say that since 1908 we have established in the district of Medicine Hat alone, something like 60 offices. It shows the rapid development that is taking place in the west, and how difficult it is to predict in advance the amount that will be spent in a year. That is why I am obliged to come now and ask for an additional vote of $200,000.

Mr. FRASER. What are the conditions and requirements necessary to secure the establishment of a rural mail delivery?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will give my hon. friend a little booklet in which he will find the instructions and directions necessary

for the establishment of a rural mail delivery.

To provide for the appointment of R. G. Mercer as superintendent of the railway mail service at London, at a salary of $1,500 a year from the 1st April, 1909, $1,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that a new appointment?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, he succeeds another gentleman. Mr. Mercer has been employed since 1872, first in the inspector's office, and then in the office of the Superintendent of Railway Mail Service. On the death of the late superintendent, in July, 1905, Mr. Mercer was placed in charge of the district, and has given very good satisfaction. He is known as a first-class clerk, and he is now in receipt of the maximum salary of $1,500. Under the statute, however, no person can be appointed as superintendent unless he has actually been employed as a railway mail clerk for two and a half years. Mr. Mercer has never been employed in that capacity, and, therefore, his appointment has to be made by a vote in the estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you are deliberately and flagrantly defying the Civil Service Act?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is now at his maximum, and we simply propose to change his title, he continuing to receive the same salary. He has been acting since 1905.

Mr. SPROULE. In that capacity?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but he had not the title.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the minister to say that the law provides that a man occupying the position of superintendent must be employed two and a half years. If he was there since 1905, he must have been employed more than two and a half years. The minister must be wrong in his explanation. I take it that the salary is being voted because he has not complied with the Act.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the details of the situation enough to be able to explain them, but under the new Civil Service Act a salary of this kind cannot be voted unless a man's name is put into the item, and I think that is the reason of this particular item. The amount may have been provided and paid otherwise, but the item must contain the name according to the provision of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to call the attention of the minister for a moment to some communications I have received in reference to 'Cotton's Weekly,' published at Cowansville.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is my hon. friend a socialist?

Mr. LENNOX. That is not to the point.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not at all.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not need to be a socialist in order to wish to do justice. I know not whether injustice has been done in this matter, but I am requested by some of my constituents to call the attention of the Postmaster General to what is alleged to be a grievance. I have a letter from Mr. McQuarrie, a gentleman in the town of Barrie who is an avowed socialist, but a man whom I hold in the very highest esteem. I have also a petition from some people who live very close to me in the little hamlet where I reside, and they represent that an injustice has been done. I shall send that petition to the Postmaster General. Now, I do not know whether this is a good publication or not, but my correspondents allege that discrimination has been practised against them. I see in a copy which has been addressed to me as well as other members, a letter addressed to the Postmaster General complaining that by a recent order the postmaster at Cowansville has charged sixteen times the amount formerly charged as postage on this publication. If this is an improper publication which should not have the privilege to go through the mails it should be shut out altogether, but if it is entitled to postal privileges it ought not to be charged more than the rates charged other publications. As a public man representing these people who have communicated with me, I want to bring the matter squarely before the Postmaster General, and to ask him for an explanation.

Mr. CROSBY. I have had communications similar to those received by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) and I endorse the statements made by him. If this publication is not such as should pass through the post office, it should be stopped altogether, but if it is entitled to postal privileges it should be treated the same as any other newspaper. I ask, for those interested in this paper, fair and reasonable and impartial treatment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When I made a remark to my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) a moment ago, of course, he understood it was a joke.

Mr. LENNOX. Oh, certainly, I did not resent it at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is quite proper that my hon. friend should ask the reason for the complaints made by Mr. Cotton, the editor of 'Cotton's Weekly'. I have been deluged with letters from all parts of the country, not only from those who believe in

socialistic doctrines, but from other citizens, who want to see fair play done to every section of the community. I must say at once that there has been no discrimination, whatever, against 'Cotton's Weekly'. If there was anything published in that paper of a scurrilous character it would be prevented altogether from passing through the mails, as has been done in other cases, but 'Cotton's Weekly' is not a paper of that class. Through an error of the postmaster as Cowansville, where the paper is published, it was allowed to pass through the mails in bundles, paying the same rate as if the paper had been addressed to bona fide subscribers. There is a postal rate for bona fide subscribers, and there is a certain other rate charged for papers sent in bundles. As soon as the attention of the department was called to that fact the proper legal rate was exacted from the publishers, and hence all the trouble. I repeat that there is no discrimination, whatever. Mr. Cotton is under the impression that we are discriminating against his paper, because it is a socialistic paper, but the department has no idea of the kind in mind. The fact is that Mr. Cotton is sending his paper in bundles to certain individuals, who then distribute them to other parties.

Mr. LENNOX. They are not individually addressed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are not individually addressed. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) is a distinguished member of the bar, and he knows the legal definition of 'bona fide subscribers' used in this sense. The whole thing in a nut-shell is that Mr. Cotton addresses his papers in bundles to one individual, who then distributes, or sells, them to others, and that does not mean a 'bona fide subscriber' as set out in the Postal Act. There have been hundreds of complaints sent to me that there is an attempt by the Post Office Department to crush this paper because of its socialistic character, and I have answered every one of these correspondents, explaining the matter very fully. There is no discrimination in the Post Office Department against any respectable opinion which may be advanced by any citizens. I respect the views of the socialists, I respect the views of the labour people as I respect the views of all classes of the community, and I would not be a party to lending the authority of the post office to suppress any respectable opinion. Mr. Cotton is completely in error about this. He has written to his friends throughout the country telling them to write to the Post Office Department to state that we are trying to destroy his paper. Such is not the case. We are simply charging him the rate which is charged in every other similar case. The other day I gave more, in reply to a question, the legal aspect of the matter, which will be found in 'Hansard'.

Mr. LENNOX. Do I understand the Postmaster General to say that the rate imposed upon 'Cotton's Weekly' at Cowansville, in bundles without individual addresses, is exactly the same rate that would be charged to any other weekly paper issuing from the same place, whatever its opinions might be?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is correct.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, if they were addressed to bona fide subscribers and put into a bundle, they would be allowed to go at a lower rate?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. And it was because this was detected, and they had been allowed to go at a rate which they should not have gone that the change was made?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. The Postmaster General says that he has answered a great many letters. Has he answered Mr. Cotton?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Cotton wrote me yesterday a personal letter, in which I am sorry to say he abused me terribly; but I ignored the abuse and answered the facts. I signed the letter this afternoon. He labours under the delusion that he is discriminated against, whereas the department is simply treating him as it does any other editor in the country.

Mr. ARTHURS. While this item is under discussion I would like to call the Postmaster General's attention to the mail service in the Parry Sound district. We have certain new lines of railway in that district, and yet in a great many cases the people continue to get their mails by the old routes, perhaps by a vehicle carrying it fifteen miles when there is a railroad within a mile or two. I think it would be advisable for the Postmaster General to have the inspector make an inquiry into the service and report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall be pleased to give the railroads the preference in every case, and I may say to my hon. friend that when a railroad is completed, the company does not lose any time in coming to the department and asking for the privilege of transporting His Majesty's mail. However, if my hon. friend will call my attention to any railway company which has no transportation of the mails, I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. ARTHURS. I may cite a case in point. There is a town in my county called

Byng Inlet to which there is a mail service north by the Canadian Pacific railway, I think, on alternate days. There is no return service south, and a letter from Byng Inlet to Parry Sound goes north to Sudbury, from there to North Bay, from there to Toronto, and back again to Parry Sound. In that way it takes six or seven days for the letter to reach its destination, whereas a man could walk down the track and deliver the letter in a few hours. That is one case, but there are a great many others, and I think it would be well for the minister to have the inspector look into the whole mail service of that district.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fisher, House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 21, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 177) to incorporate the Morrisburg Ferry Dock Company.—Mr. Broder.

Bill (No. 178) to incorporate the Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Company, Limited.—Mr. Perley.

Bill (No. 179) for the relief of Helena Mellor Fleming.—Mr. Knowles.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Canal Statistics, 1909.—Hon. Mr. Graham.

List of shareholders of chartered banks.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Upon the orders of the day:

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I wish to read an item in the 'Citizen' of to-day, and found a question upon it which I will ask the hon. the Minister of Finance, (Mr. Fielding) to answer. It reads as follows:

> Hon. W. S. Fielding Returns—Tariff Conference at Albany ends in most Friendly Manner—Reported that probability of Tariff War has receded and a Settlement regarded as likely—Conference occupied Whole of Yesterday but no Conclusion was reached, says President Taft. Canadian Minister has left for Ottawa and may go to Washington the end of month.
>
> (Special to the 'Citizen.')
>
> Albany, N.Y., March 20.—There will probably be no tariff war between the United States and Canada. The prospect for commercial peace with the Dominion is more favourable to-night than it has been at any time since the president caused it to be understood that the situation was critical.
>
> By joint agreement between President Taft and Hon. W. S. Fielding, the Canadian Minister of Finance, the following statement was given out from the state executive mansion this evening for publication:—
>
> 'The President and Mr. Fielding were in conference in respect to the tariff to-day for several hours. No conclusion was reached, but the situation remains that of friendly negotiations.'
>
> Despite the late hour at which the University Club dinner ended Mr. Fielding and Mr. Charles M. Pepper, who is here from Washington as the representative of the state department, were at the executive mansion at half past nine o'clock this morning. They immediately went into private conference with Mr. Taft and remained closeted with him until he had to leave them to keep his engagement to attend church with Governor Hughes. The Canadian minister and Mr. Pepper returned together to the Ten Eyck hotel, chatting in a manner that indicated amicable relations, but they returned to the governor's official residence in time to resume the conference with the president after luncheon, to which Earl Grey and Mr. Fielding as well as the president had been invited as the guests of Governor and Mrs. Hughes.
>
> After luncheon the conference was resumed, and it continued until four o'clock in the afternoon, when the president, by reason of an appointment of long standing, kept an afternoon tea engagement at the house of his friends, Mr. and Mrs. Ward. Mr. Fielding and Mr. Pepper again returned to the hotel. They repaired to the apartments occupied by the Dominion Minister of Finance and busied themselves in going over certain of the tariff schedules with a view of reaching some basis agreeable to both sides whereby the president would be justified in withholding the operation against Canadian imports of the maximum tariff as prescribed by the Payne-Aldrich law after March 31.

I wish to ask the Minister of Finance whether that statement is substantially correct and whether there was a conference between the President of the United States and our Finance Minister in Albany yesterday (Sunday) re tariff matters, as alleged in the despatch read? Was the invitation of the president, which was accepted by the government, for a Sunday conference?

Mr. FIELDING. At the invitation of the President of the United States, I visited Albany and had the honour and the pleasure of meeting that gentleman on both Saturday and Sunday. We discussed matters which I trust will work for the peace, order and good government of these two nations; there could be no better Sunday work.

JAPAN-UNITED STATES TREATY.

Mr. S. HUGHES. In the New York 'World' of Friday, March 18, I see a dispatch speaking of the proposed treaty between Japan and the United States, part of which is:

England wishes to get away from her treaty with Japan, and Japan, it is said here to-day, is ready to let her go at the expiration of the Lansdowne-Hayashi agreement. Japan is desirous, however, of having a government support her in the Orient without committing her against any nation.

The reason for this is that Japan does not feel capable of taking care of the commercial and industrial feature of China, but she also has her doubts as to the motives behind offers of certain European governments. With the United States ready to develop the far east in accordance with every provision of American 'commercial equality' and without ulterior motives of aggrandisement, Japan feels that China's future and freedom from contention are assured.

POINTS IN NEW PROPOSAL.

The points to be added on the new proposal, not included in the Root-Takahira agreement, and which could not be embraced by the latter, even in its vague wording, are these:

1. Consolidation in Asia, especially along the Pacific shores.

2. To include Great Britain if she desires to become a party, through her alliance with the empire, by a triangulation of interests, or dissociate England entirely without in any way jeopardizing British interests.

3. Further definition of fisheries rights.

4. That the jeopardy of the rights of either nation requiring safeguarding of common and mutual interests and rights is not to be construed as open belligerents but a bid for either arbitration or other outlet.

5. That the powers signatory to the Hay note do not figure in any way in the motives behind this new pact other than to share all the benefits to be derived by a direct understanding between two nations politically, diplomatically and commercially identified with the Pacific basin, namely, Japan and the United States.

6. Japan will agree to maintain peace so long as her own sovereignty is not menaced.

7. Japan, in the event that the United States will concede the moral right to guide and control Chinese Manchuria and the Pacific basin in general, does not oppose Russia, nor does she seek any right other than that of mutual friend to all those interested; in the event of difficulties, the matter will then be referred to the participating governments for settlement.

In courtesy to the powers they will be acquainted with the fact that Japan wishes to come to a more settled and definite amicable understanding with the United States.

Might I ask the government, in view of the fact that in this despatch the Pacific ocean is regarded as practically a sea concerning which the United States, Japan and Great Britain (Great Britain, I presume, being more especially interested through Canada, Australia and New Zealand) shall have control, if the government have the intention of taking any steps towards safeguarding the rights of Canada, through the empire, in this proposed treaty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to inform my hon. friend that we have received no invitation at all from the imperial authorities upon this subject.

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the Finance Minister in a position to give any information as to what progress, if any, he and the government have made in their negotiations with President Taft over tariff matters?

Mr. FIELDING. I can only say to my hon. friend that I do not think the good purpose that he has in view, and that we all must have in view, would be advanced by making any statement at the present time. The matters in dispute remain as matters for friendly negotiations, and beyond that it would not be expedient to make a statement at this moment. At an early date I hope to give the House fuller and better information.

WAR VESSELS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. BOYCE. I have read an item in at least one newspaper to the effect that there has been some correspondence with this government looking to the modification if not the entire abrogation of the Rush-Bagot treaty so as to permit of training ships or armed cruisers going up the great lakes, which is prohibited at the present time by that treaty. Has there been any such correspondence, and if so, has any conclusion been reached?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that an invitation has come from the United States with a view of having this Rush-Bagot treaty revised, but nothing more than that has been done so far as I know.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would renew my inquiry regarding a return ordered about a month ago for papers with reference to a report made by Mr. Williams in connection with the St. Peter's Indian reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. The return in question is being prepared, and I hope to be able to lay it on the table within a day or two.

PRIVATE BILLS.

JAMES BAY AND EASTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company—Mr. Girard.

On section 11,

Mr. LENNOX. We had a good deal of discussion over this clause in the committee. I understand that the hon. minister was present when the Bill went through. From recollection the clause provided that the company might acquire electric power and energy and sell surplus power but had not the right to build dams or generate electric power. I am at a loss to understand why they should require the right to dispose of surplus power if they are only to get such as they need for their own purposes.

Mr. GRAHAM. This condition might arise. They might need 10,000 horse-power for the purposes of their undertaking. They might have to buy from some one who had 11,000 horse-power to sell and they would have to buy the whole 11,000. This Bill would give them the right to sell the surplus 1,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. The words 'not by expropriation' are to go in.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. That is rather a weak argument. If the railway required a quantity of power and got one horse-power more than it required, it would not be a great hardship on the company if it were not able to dispose of that. It looks very much as if something was lurking behind this apparently innocent language. It looks like an attempt to get control of water-powers which will not be used necessarily for the operation of the railway as it should be.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does the clause read now 'in the municipalities through which the railway is authorized to be built' or 'in the municipalities through which the railway is built'?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The clause reads as follows:

11. For the purposes of its undertaking and subject to the provisions of section 247 of the Railway Act the company may acquire but not by expropriation, electric or other power, or energy, which may be transmitted and delivered to any place in the municipalities through which the railway is authorized to be built, and may receive, transform, transmit, distribute and supply such power or energy in any form, and may dispose of the surplus thereof, and may collect rates and charges therefor; but no such rate or charge shall be demanded or taken until it has been approved of by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, who may also revise such rates and charges from time to time.

Mr. EMMERSON. In other Bills of a similar character we have confined them to the municipalities through which the road is built and not through which it is authorized to be built, the reason being that the railway must first build its road before engaging in the business of distributing electric power. Otherwise the company might never build its railway and simply become a transmission and distributing power company. I would think that we should follow the practice adopted with respect to other Bills and strike out the words 'authorized to build'.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that was the amendment made in committee. We had quite a discussion there. Attention was drawn to the fact that the railway might build two miles only, though authorized to build a line a thousand miles long. Under the power given by this Bill, it would have the right to distribute electricity along the whole of its authorized line through all the municipalities. There was evidently some mistake, for the Bill has not been reported as the committee intended.

Mr. J. D. REID. According to that amendment, this company would have the right to enter into any municipality and distribute electricity in competition with a municipal plant and perhaps destroy it, or the municipality might have to sell out its plant to this company. I understood that it was the intention to have these Bills amended in such a way that a company such as this could not enter a municipality and interfere with a municipal plant.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. member for Westmorland has moved to strike out these words?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not understand him to make a motion.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not wish to make a motion, but if the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill would act upon the suggestion I have made, he would be conforming to the practice allowed by the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the Bill was passed in the committee, we had several Bills in which these words 'authorized to be built' appeared, and in every case we

changed them. In the Rainy River Bill we had this clause again, and we changed the wording so that this Bill stands alone in that respect. It will be advisable, I think, for the promoter of this Bill to consent to this change. This must have got in merely by inadvertance. We have adopted a definite practice in that matter, and it is the duty of this committee, I submit, to insist that in some way it be made right. I am disposed to press the objection, and, if the promoter of the Bill will not consent to what has been the uniform practice, then to ask that the committee rise and report progress, so that notice may be given.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member (Mr. Girard), who is in charge of the Bill, is not present. Of course, if there are amendments to be made, it would be better to move that the committee rise and report progress, that the usual notice may be given. I know that there is a difference of opinion about the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox). The other point of view may be worthy of consideration, and it is this: A railway line—say this railway line—is to be built. If you confine it to the power on which the line is built, you might make the rule so rigid that they could not use it to run the road. It will be better, however, to leave the Bill over, so I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

RAINY RIVER RADIAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Rainy River Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Conmee.

On section 9—power to operate telegraph and telephone lines.

Mr. BOYCE. Is that amended, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It does not appear so in the copy before me.

Mr. BOYCE. I think that after the word 'may' were to be inserted the words 'for the purposes of its undertaking, and,' making it read: 'The company may, for the purposes of its undertaking, and subject to the provisions of the Railway Act, construct and operate telegraph and telephone lines,' and so on. I move that these words be inserted. I do not think it is usual to give a railway company the right to do a telephone and telegraph business. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) desires more than that they should have power to carry on a telephone business in connection with and for the purposes of their railway.

Mr. CONMEE. I think that is correct.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 10—express business.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the railway companies, when they have the express business entirely under their own control sometimes act in a not very generous way with the public. They often compel shippers to send goods by express and pay a much higher figure if they want them taken proper care of and sent through rapidly. There are many advantages in combining the ownership of railway and express services, but there are some disadvantages to the public which are very considerable. Take the case of a line passing through our section of the country; when it was in its original ownership, there was an express company different from the railway company. The railway company was obliged to haul the express cars, but the express company could make its own contract. The public had much better service then than they have had since the express company was bought up by the railway company. The railway and express are now controlled by the Canadian Pacific railway. The people have to pay much higher figures for their express, and they have less advantages than they had under the old system. For instance, the company will not deliver express in the villages. The express matter is dumped at the station, and the individuals for whom it is intended may not receive notice before several days. And then they have to go down to the station for it. The charge is made much higher. For instance, where they carried express, it was 60 cents a hundred to Toronto, now it is 75 cents. These are all exactions from the public, and I thought it was due to the fact that when the railway company took over the express business and were carrying freight and express, they could charge whatever they pleased.

On section 12,

Mr. BOYCE. I would ask the Minister of Railways if this is the usual clause. I was not able to attend the committee in which the change was made.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think this clause is somewhat new, in that it introduces the words 'not by expropriation.' We did not have that in the old clause. We have for some years gone on the understanding that the provisions of the Railway Act, as the particular clauses were drawn, did not apply to these Bills with regard to expropriation. But to make sure we put in these words 'not by expropriation.'

Mr. CONMEE. My understanding of that clause in the Railway Committee was this: There is in another subsection a further amendment to that clause, which stipulates that they shall not build such works on the Rainy river, which is the only navigable river in the vicinity. I did not understand that the words 'not by expropriation' were going to be inserted in that subsection 2. I think that is going a little too far. I think that subsection ought to be satisfactory, and such powers of expropriation as the Railway Act confers ought to be allowed.

Mr. BOYCE. Wasn't that agreed to in the Railway Committee?

Mr. CONMEE. That is the way I understood it. What good purpose is to be served by using the words, when the clause itself excludes them from the only navigable stream that could be dealt with under their charter?

Mr. SPROULE. There may be other water-powers that they could expropriate.

Mr. CONMEE. They are given authority to use a water-power and sell the surplus, but they can only do it subject to the Railway Act. What good purpose could be served? It is only depriving the public of the use of that power. It is not injuring the companies to any great extent, but it is depriving the public of the opportunity of utilizing the power. Every one knows that a railway does not use all its power every day. In the winter season when it has to contend with snow and ice, it has to use nearly double the force it would at other times. Now why leave that force idle? The public interest is absolutely protected. The company cannot deal with it except under the control of the board, and they are excluded by Act from dealing with the important stream in the district where navigation might be affected. Surely the public interest is amply protected without putting in that restriction.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman asks what good purpose was to be served. In the Railway Committee we thought that there might be other water-powers than the one specifically mentioned, and that the same rule should apply to all. There must be a principle, there must not be any picking, and choosing between different powers. We thought that both these amendments were necessary. The committee thought that this company was to be subject to the Railway Act, and that they should not go into the water-power business, but only into the business of developing electricity for the railway and that they should not have the right to expropriate any water-power. Then because the Rainy river is a navigable stream, and the Dominion government might have some control over it, to be consistent, the committee said that 'not by expropriation,' would not necessarily cover the Rainy river, because the Rainy river is navigable. And so, to carry out the principle entirely, and protect the public both as regards the Dominion authority and provincial authority, the committee almost unanimously came to the conclusion that both these amendments should be adopted as they now stand.

Mr. GRAHAM. My own opinion is that none of these Railway Bills should be given any right to expropriate the water-powers of anybody. If I owned a water-power, if I got on the ground first, I don't think any other person ought to have a right to come in and expropriate it, and use it for the same purpose I was going to use it for. They ought to make some arrangement with me. I do not think they ought to have the right to expropriate water-powers on the right of way for the railway. If they expropriate sufficient for the right of way, I do not think it should include the water-power. It is not needed for the right of way of the railway. It is supposed to be outside of it altogether. I think that is a pretty safe ground to take.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I am glad to hear that expression of opinion from the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) in reference to this question. It is not necessary at all for the construction of a railway to give the company the power to expropriate water-falls. We should not declare a railway to be a work for the benefit of Canada and grant the extraordinary power that accompanies that declaration unless it is absolutely necessary. There is no necessity, in connection with the construction of a railway, to give the company the power to expropriate water-falls. All the powers you may put in this Act do not give the right to a corporation to take from the Crown what is vested in it. You must get the consent of the Crown. Powers of expropriation, given under the Act of parliament, have no effect, certainly against the Crown in the Dominion and, I believe, in the province. Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), the other day when he quoted a decision of the Privy Council, I do not believe that the judgment goes as far as the hon. gentleman indicated, and I do not believe that any power that we may put in the Act of parliament gives a right to the exercise of eminent domain as against the Crown in a province.

Mr. TURRIFF. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) make the state-

ment that he did. I believe the time has come when we should curtail the powers that we give under these different railway charters, and I hope that next session when these different railway companies come before this House for incorporation the Minister of Railways and Canals will lay down the principle that we will grant them railway charters but we will not grant them water-power rights in connection with the railway in any particular whatever, and that if they want water-powers let the same people, if they choose, form a water-power company and let us deal with them as a water-power company simply. There is no doubt in my mind that there has been a large number of charters put through this House with these water-power privileges attached in which we have been incorporating water-power companies and giving them privileges because they came before us as railway companies, that we would not have given if we had known clearly what their intents were. By these charters they may be enabled to secure water-powers and build only a minimum amount of the railway. The feeling generally throughout the country and on both sides of this House, I believe, is that the time has come when no more of these natural resources of the country should be given to railway corporations. I have supported some of them in the House this session simply because I did not feel that it was advisable or good policy at the end of the session to refuse one company what we have already granted to other companies during the present session, but as far as I am concerned, at the coming session I will oppose the granting of these privileges to any of the railway companies that come to us seeking incorporation.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not quarrel with the general principle that has been enunciated by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), but there is a good deal of suspicion in the minds of hon. members of this House that because you say in a railway charter that the company may acquire and utilize a water-power thereby you give them the right to take or expropriate that water-power. I deny that. You do not give them any such right, and no hon. member of this House can point to a single case in this country where a water-power has been developed or utilized by virtue of any such right given by a railway charter. You are giving companies the right to operate water-powers in connection with their system, and under the restrictions imposed in the public interest by the Railway Act instead of compelling them to carry on two sets of business, keep two sets of books and have two different organizations. That is all you do accomplish by making this condition. I am not going to contend that the amendments should be changed because an hon. gentleman has stated that he understood them a little different from what I did. I do not think it makes any difference whatever to this company. I do not think they are prejudiced by that clause going in, but this suspicion that you are and have been giving railway companies powers that are inimical to the public interest, and that you are creating a monopoly with regard to the acquisition and operation of water-powers is all a mistake. I do not want to use a stronger expression.

Mr. LANCASTER. It depends on the view point.

Mr. CONMEE. It does not depend on the view point. It is impossible for a railway company under the powers of the Railway Act to take these water-powers. They cannot do it, and all you are doing is to compel them to maintain two separate organizations. I do not think that it is in the public interest that such should be done.

Mr. SPROULE. If the water-power is on the right of way do they not acquire it? They expropriate the right of way, and the water-power goes with it. Take such a case as that of the Lake of the Woods where the stream crosses right underneath the railway, and where the water-power is within the limits of the right of way. Surely the railway company becomes the possessor of it?

Mr. CONMEE. No, I have in a previous debate answered that point. There are several places where the Canadian Pacific railway, and the Canadian Northern railway cross important water-powers, but neither of these companies can develop these water-powers. At Eagle river and at Wabigoon river the Canadian Pacific railway cross right over the head of the falls. The line of railway could not have been located better for the purpose of controlling the water-power on the Wabigoon river, as far as a railway line can control it, yet the company have no control over that water-power. It is developed by another company altogether. The railway company never developed it, and never pretended to have any rights in the water-power. They did not secure their right of way under such conditions as to give them that right. They got their right of way from the province of Ontario, and in all the patents that are issued these water-powers are reserved. There is no case of conveying to a railway company in the deed for the right of way any right or title to the water-powers on

such right of way. It has not been done in any case that I know of, and if it were done the railway company could not develop the water-power, because you would require the right to raise the water, to build dams, intakes, and outlets, which would extend beyond the limits of any right of way. At the Lake of the Woods the railway crosses three different branches of the Winnipeg river as it discharges from the lake, and it crosses over the head of the falls in each case. Yet these powers are developed by other people. The Lake of the Woods Milling Company controls one, the Mather Milling Company another, and Kenora another. The railway company have never pretended to have any claim on those water-powers.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you want this power in the Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. There is no good purpose compelling any set of men to keep double books, a double staff, and a double organization. I do not see any sense in it.

Mr. PORTER. All of these difficulties were advanced in the committee, and considered there. In my judgment too much care cannot be taken in the granting of these railway charters as far as the granting of water-powers is concerned. I believe that all conflict of authority between the province and the Dominion in regard to these powers has been very carefully guarded against in the wording of this Bill, and fully considered. It seems to me it ought not to be interfered with now.

On subclause 2,

Mr. BOYCE. I wish to express the gratification I have at hearing the changed views of the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) with regard to the acquisition under a Railway Bill of the use of Dominion water-powers. I only hope he will continue to be a convert to that view and will not take up the time of the House by introducing such Bills as this which apparently have as their object not the building of railways but the acquisition of the most valuable water-powers in Ontario. This Bill as originally introduced transgressed every doctrine that the hon. gentleman has advanced because it gave the promoters the absolute right to build dams in the Rainy river to obstruct navigation, to put in locks and operate them to the exclusion of public use. I am glad the hon. gentleman has at last become a convert to the doctrine that water-powers should he held for the people and used for the people.

Mr. CONMEE.

Mr. CONMEE. I am pleased indeed if I have been able to satisfy my hon. friend. This Bill, however, was not introduced by me; my name was put on it and I have done my best to make it a perfect Bill. The clauses which the chairman has just read which are guarding the public interest were moved not by the hon. gentleman but by myself.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DOMINION MILLERS' ASSOCIATION.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 111) respecting the Dominion Millers' Association.—Mr. Harris.

On section 2, membership.

Mr. J. HAGGART. We are giving great powers, practically creating a trust, and it should be open to any one in the business under certain conditions to join the association.

Mr. HARRIS. Any man engaged in the business of milling is entitled to join.

Mr. J. HAGGART. That would be all right if it was in the Bill, but the wording of the clause is that he is eligible.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman if he was a member of an association would want every one to come into it unless he had some say as to who should join. As I understand every miller in the country is eligible.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand it is the same as in the old Bill and the difficulty then was to get them to join.

Mr. S. SHARPE. It seems that there are some 180 members, small millers, &c., and the idea that a man wishing to become a member should put in his application recommended by two other members of the association, so that no disreputable person should become a member. The executive passes on the membership the same as in any other company.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Could there not be some means by which a party introduced by two or three members would have a right to become a member?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. The law clerk has pointed out that sections 6 and 7 ought to be consolidated, that there is a little repetition. He suggests, and I move, that in clause 7, subclause 2, after the word 'consist' in the first line the word 'only' should

be inserted, and in clause 6 all except the first two lines should be struck out, and then as subclause 3 we should insert:

Ordinary members shall consist of such persons only as are—

That does not change the purpose of the Bill, it simply puts the two paragraphs into one with a sub-paragraph defining who are participating members and who are ordinary members.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I do not think there should be any objection to such a clause as the hon. member (Mr. J. Haggart) has suggested, providing that no application was refused when it was confirmed by two members of the association.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. The only objection I see to that is that it seems to be contrary to the usual usage of associations and joint stock companies. In this way the company would have no voice as to who should become members.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I am not pressing the point, but we are really creating a trust.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Would it not be a greater trust if you admitted all the owners?

Mr. J. HAGGART. No, because it would be open to every person in the business. Of course, it would be a greater trust as against the public, but as against the mill owners it would not be.

Mr. S. SHARPE. By the terms of the by-law the executive committee must pass upon a man's application, they have power to reject a man. This Bill was carefully considered, and the trust aspect was greatly eliminated in clause 11. I suggested that they should not have power to purchase mills.

Mr. PORTER. The clause is not framed so as to meet the wishes of the promoter. As I understand his desire is that all millers should be admitted, but the wording is only such persons as according to by-laws hereafter to be adopted are declared eligible. If the company passed a by-law declaring that no one is eligible, then you would have a close corporation.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend does not quite seize the meaning of the section. If he will read section 7, and the wording is not changed under the amendment of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Clarke), he will see that such persons only as are the owners or lessees of a mill, farmers and grain growers shall be eligible. And in addition such other persons as are by by-law hereinafter provided. But the by-law has nothing to do with the classes I have mentioned. They are eligible by the Act. The others are to be eligible by by-law.

Mr. PORTER. Does the hon. minister interpret the Bill to mean that all persons of the classes enumerated are eligible to become members?

Mr. FISHER. They are not shut out by the statute. Their entrance might be made so difficult that it would be hard for them to get in, but by the statute they are not shut out. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) was quite correct in saying that the arrangement for entering the association is that two members must endorse the application. Then it is submitted to the executive committee and they pass upon it, and the impression is that they are only too glad to get everybody in they can.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. This goes further than the section in the present Act. Under the present Act only millers are entitled to become members. This extends to farmers as well. We are not limiting what they have but rather extending it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion of the hon. member for Essex is that clauses 6 and 7 be consolidated to read as follows:

Section 7 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted:—

The members of the association shall consist of two classes: (a) Participating members, (b) Ordinary members.

2. The participating members shall consist of such members of the association as subscribe for and are allotted one or more shares of the capital stock of the association, the issue of which is provided for by section 3 of this Act, and such shares shall be entitled to preferred cumulative dividends to an amount not exceeding ten per cent per annum.

Ordinary members shall consist of such persons only as are owners of a mill for the manufacture of flour, meal or other similar commodities, or lessees of such a mill actually carrying on the business of milling therein, farmers and grain-growers and such other persons as are by by-law hereafter provided for.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I want clearly to understand the distinction between ordinary members and the others. An ordinary member, I understand, receives no dividends and pays nothing for the stock. The others are stock-holders and receive dividends.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. That is right.

Mr. BLAIN. When this matter was up for discussion last, it was referred back

to the committee. May I ask the Minister of Agriculture, who is taking care of the farmers in particular, if their interests have been well guarded. When it was discussed in the House on a former occasion, the suggestion was made that possibly a further combine—if it may be called a combine—of the smaller millers of Canada would be detrimental to the interests of the farming community in the purchase of offal and the products of the ordinary mill. I am not offering criticism or objection further than to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) if, in his opinion, the farmers' interests are well taken care of, and it is clear that this will not be a combine of the millers against the farmers' interests.

Mr. FISHER. I am a member of the Private Bills Committee to which this Bill was referred back. The committee referred to a special subcommittee. I was not a member of that subcommittee, but I know what discussions went on there and was present at some of them. The question of the possibility of a combine, I think, is the most important question in connection with this Bill. The other provisions affect the future stock-holders or the present members of the Millers' Association, and I shall not give an opinion upon these because I think they are largely the concern of these people themselves. The possibility of a combine, however, has been attempted to be guarded against by an addition to clause 11 of the Bill providing as follows:

—if the association in any way fixes the prices at which its members shall buy or sell grain or other commodities in such a way as would have made the members of the association liable to the provisions of the Criminal Code or any other Act had they individually agreed together to the like effect, such members as acquiesce therein shall be liable under the provisions of the said Code or other Act, notwithstanding that such fixing of the price of grain or other commodities is the act of the association in the same way as if they had individually agreed together to do such acts.

I do not give a legal opinion, not being a lawyer, but this amendment seems to provide that if this association should take any action in the way of making a combine, each member of the association will be liable under the ordinary law.

Mr. PORTER. Is not that what the law now provides, even without this clause?

Mr. FISHER. I understand that the Criminal Code applies to individuals making what is considered by the law to be a combine. If the association, as an association, were to make such an arrangement, it is thought possible the criminal law might not apply—I do not say that it would or that it would not. But this makes it apply. Under these circumstances, it seems to me, without presuming to give a legal opinion, that the public will be in no worse position by reason of the passing of this Act. If that be the case, the danger of a combine is provided against.

Mr. SPROULE. I opposed this Bill before, and cited a case, but, I am free to admit, on information given me which was not correct. I believe the railway company was involved, not the Millers' Association. I understand that the rate given in the case I referred to was exactly the same rate that the Miller's Association was paying, and that they encountered the same difficulty as I did—that the railway company would not guarantee to put the freight through in any given time, not even in six weeks or three months. I was told of an instance of grain ordered from the west to be delivered in Ontario, which was not received for about three months. I would regard the Bill as distinctly beneficial to the agriculturists of Ontario to-day. And for this reason: The more western grain is purchased to be ground in mills in Ontario, the larger the amount of offal will be available for the Ontario farmers, and our farmers are principally feeders whose great requirement is more feed, more grain for their stock. To-day, feed can be got only in Ontario, or in the west, but principally in the west. Sometimes, you can get only a portion of a carload. If, instead of a few millions of bushels of grain brought down in the year, that was increased to twenty times as many, there would be twenty times the amount of feed to be had here. And the feed we get from the mills here is a better quality for feeding purposes—at least we think so—than what we get from the west.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to call the attention of the House to rule 113, which refers to amendments made by the Senate to private Bills. The rule is as follows:

When any private Bill is returned from the Senate with amendments the same not being merely verbal or unimportant such amendments are previous to the second reading referred to the standing committee to which such Bill was originally referred.

I fear that this rule has not been as rigidly adhered to as it is desirable, very frequently amendments which are in reality important being treated as 'verbal or unimportant.' Lengthy reference is made to this rule by Bourinot, pp. 794-5, to which I would call the attention of the hon. members. I shall be obliged in future to in-

sist that this rule be more carefully observed than has recently been the custom. Bills Nos. 107, 61, 46, and 114 respectively, now before the House, should be referred to the proper committees before being concurred in. These four Bills contain important amendments, and under the rule I have read they should now be referred to the committee.

Mr. TALBOT. Does not this rule apply only to Bills having important amendments? We do not yet know what the amendments are.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that in the present case the amendments are important.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the question is one entirely for the Speaker to decide.

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask for information. When these Bills come back are they, as reported, referred to the Committee of the Whole House with certain instructions, or can they be again revived?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed that the committee can only consider amendments made by the Senate.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 165) for the relief of Elmore Walker Scott.—Mr. Tolmie.

QUESTIONS.

PRODUCTS OF SPRING AND FALL WHEAT, 1909.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. What was the average production of spring and fall wheat, oats and barley, the amount produced, and the value in each province for 1909?

2. What was the total value of production from the following branches in each province for 1909: The mines, fisheries, forest, animal produce, agricultural produce, manufactures?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM:

1. Average production of spring wheat, fall wheat, oats and barley, together with the total production of such grains and their values in 1909 in the provinces of Canada:

Grains by provinces.	Average yield per acre.	Total production.	Value of production.
	Bush.	Bush.	$
Prince Edward Id.			
Spring wheat	20·00	522,000	513,000
Oats	33·70	6,201,000	2,480,000
Barley	27·61	169,000	99,000
Nova Scotia—			
Spring wheat	19·80	404,000	477,000
Oats	31·56	4,358,000	2,214,000
Barley	24·77	221,000	170,000
New Brunswick—			
Spring wheat	20·15	395,000	440,000
Oats	27·87	5,775,000	2,801,000
Barley	20·26	94,000	65,000
Quebec—			
Spring wheat	16·71	1,679,000	1,960,000
Oats	27·00	42,501,000	19,891,000
Barley	24·02	2,604,000	1,867,000
Ontario—			
Fall wheat	24·24	14,086,000	14,255,000
Oats	34·75	109,192,000	45,315,000
Spring wheat	17·45	2,176,000	2,115,000
Barley	29·04	20,952,000	11,670,000
Manitoba—			
Spring wheat	18·77	52,706,000	45,854,000
Oats	39·76	55,267,000	17,178,000
Barley	29·98	20,866,000	7,929,000
Saskatchewan—			
Spring wheat	23·13	85,197,000	68,669,000
Oats	49·70	91,796,000	23,224,000
Barley	33·28	4,493,000	1,618,000
Alberta—			
Fall wheat	24·80	2,009,000	1,587,000
Spring wheat	24·90	7,570,000	5,450,000
Oats	46·80	38,376,000	9,287,000
Barley	32·25	5,999,000	2,016,000
British Columbia—			

No data later than the crops of 1900 for this province are available from which to compute reliable estimates.

The value of the total agricultural products of Canada in 1909 was $532,992,100.

2. With regard to animal produce and manufactures, figures have not yet been collected for the year 1909. A preliminary estimate of the mineral production of Canada published by the Department of Mines shows the total value of the mineral production in Canada in 1909 to have been, approximately, $90,415,763. The subdivision by provinces is as follows:

Nova Scotia	$12,598,004
New Brunswick	623,333
Quebec	6,526,185
Ontario	36,729,089
Manitoba	790,495
Saskatchewan	410,069
Alberta	5,953,928
British Columbia	22,798,909
Yukon	3,985,751
	$90,415,763

BOAR'S BACK POST OFFICE.

Mr. JAMESON:

Adverting to question as to Boar's Back post office, and the reply of the honourable Postmaster General to the effect that since the receipt of the petition of the 7th September, 1901, asking for the opening of an office there, an office had been opened within a short distance of Boar's Back, and that there would be even less need of a post office at

Boar's Back than there was in 1901—

1. What is the name of the new office referred to?

2. How far is it distant from Boar's Back?

3. When was it opened, and on whose recommendation?

4. Has no petition been received asking for the opening of a new post office at Boar's Back since 7th September, 1901?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1 and 2. On inquiry it is found the department was in error in its statement that an office had been opened within a short distance of Boar's Back, the facts being that the office recently opened at Mayflower is west, not northwest, of Hectanooga, and therefore about seven and one half miles from Boar's Back, instead of one and one-half miles as supposed.

3. It was opened on the 1st August, 1907, on the recommendation of Mr. A. J. Copp.

4. There is no record of any petition subsequent to the one received at the department on the 7th September, 1901.

Further inquiry will now be made as to whether there has been any change in the circumstances which might render an office at this point more necessary.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. How many post offices are located in federal owned buildings, and how many are housed in leased quarters?

2. Has the Post Office Department any system for rating post office employees in cities, towns and villages, as to their efficiency, faithfulness, general conduct, quantity of work employees perform, accuracy in doing it, and their general conpliance with postal regulations?

3. Has the government any knowledge of the salaries paid clerks and assistants in post offices in smaller cities, towns and villages of Canada? If not, when may we expect regulations dealing with their salaries and duties?

4. How many rural free mail delivery boxes has the government purchased, what are the names of the firms from whom they were purchased, the price of each, including the original cost, the date when purchased, amount of freight, express and duty paid, when delivered, number now on hand and the amount of storage?

5. How many routes on which rural free mail delivery has been established, did the government change from weekly to semi-weekly, and from semi-weekly to tri-weekly delivery?

6. Why does the government refuse to furnish locks for rural free mail delivery boxes, when the pamphlet issued advises all patrons that locks will be furnished at cost?

7. What amount of second-class mail matter was carried for the Post Office Department in 1909, and the amount of money collected for same?

8. What was the weight of government matter for departments other than post office, carried and charged to Post Office Department in the year 1909?

9. What was the total weight of franked mail matter in the year 1909?

10. What was the total amount paid railroads for carrying mail in 1896 and the total amount paid for the same purpose in 1909?

11. What was the total amount paid in subsidies and subventions to steamships in 1909?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. In federal buildings, 174; In leased buildings, 10.

2. Yes, in city offices and semi-staff offices.

3. Not unless the office is on the city or semi-staff basis. Postmasters other than the above are paid by percentage on revenue, and are required to furnish whatever clerical assistance is necessary for the proper performance of the duties of their offices out of the emoluments they receive. The department does not purpose altering its policy in this regard.

4. (a) Number of boxes purchased, 10,000 boxes and fittings. (b) From whom purchased, International Mail Equipment Company, New York. (c) Price including cost, $3 per each box, and fittings complete. (d) Date when purchased 6,000 on August 14, 1908; 4,000 on September 18, 1909. (e) Amount paid for freight, express and duty, $10,028.32. (f) When delivered, first 6,000 between September, 1908 and January, 1909; second, 4,000, December, 1909. (g) Number now on hand and amount of storage, 3,486 boxes and fittings being stored without cost (257 at Ottawa, and 3,229 at Toronto).

5. (a) Weekly to semi-weekly 2. (b) Semi-weekly to tri-weekly 3.

6. In deciding not to furnish locks for these boxes, the department has been guided by the experience of the United States post office, where it was found that the use of locks and keys was a fruitful source of trouble, the locks becoming damaged, out of repair, &c., occasioning very much delay to the couriers in delivery, and adding materially to the cost of the service.

During the winter season, moreover, the danger of trouble with these locks from frost would be considerable, and the couriers would lose much time in locking and unlocking the boxes, several of the couriers employed by this department having signified their intention of discontinuing their contracts provided locks and keys were brought into use. Since deciding to discontinue the use of locks and keys on these boxes, the clause contained in the pamphlet issued to patrons by the department, advising that locks and keys would be furnished at cost if desired, has been eliminated.

7. The sum paid in cash for postage on newspapers during the year ended 31st March, 1909, was $133,773.23, but, having

regard to free newspaper area, and the different rates chargeable on various classes of second-class matter, no information is available as to the quantity of second-class matter carried.

8. The department has no statistics on the subject.

9. The department has no statistics on the subject.

10. $1,285,353.18 in the year 1896; $1,750,017.76 in the year 1909.

11. $1,684,683.44.

ACCOUNT OF MR. L. F. CLARRY.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

Referring to the answer of the Minister of Railways given on the 17th February last, what is the total amount of the account of L. F. Clarry approved by the Department of Justice and standing for payment?

Mr. GRAHAM:

The whole amount of the account of Mr. L. F. Clarry for services rendered the Department of Railways and Canals, as approved by the Department of Justice, and standing for payment is $597.12. This amount includes $249.17 in respect of the eight claims mentioned in the answer of February 17, 1910, referred to in the question.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—SERVANTS QUARTERS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Is it the intention of the government to tear down the stone cottages formerly occupied as servants' quarters at the R.M.C.?

2. Has any proposition been made or offer received by the government to remove the said cottages? If so, from what person or persons and on what terms?

3. Has the government received any request from any person for the stone in said cottages? If so, from whom and for what purpose?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

It is the intention to sell these buildings by public auction, at the market square, Kingston, at noon on Saturday, April 2, proximo, the purchaser to undertake to tear down and remove the buildings and to level the ground upon which they stand, to the satisfaction of the Commandant of the Royal Military College, by not later than June 1 next.

LEASE OF BUILDING FOR ORDNANCE STORES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. For what purpose has the government leased the building in Kingston formerly occupied by the Clarified Milk Company?

2. From whom was it leased, for how long and what is the annual rent to be paid?

3. Is the building being renovated at the expense of the owner or of the government?

4. Were tenders asked for the heating of the building? If so, to whom was the contract awarded and at what price?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

So far as question 1 is concerned, the building is required for ordnance store purposes.

The other three questions appertain to the Department of Public Works, as that Department leases the building and has carried out the repairs.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. For additional ordnance stores.

2. (a) T. J. Polley; (b) five years, renewable for a further term of five years, with option to purchase at $10,000 within term of lease; (c) $1,000.

3. At the expense of the owner.

4. The heating apparatus was installed by the owner.

NAVAL SERVICE FOR CANADA.

Mr. MONK:

1. Have any petitions praying for the creation of a Canadian navy been received by the government? If so, from whom?

2. Have any petitions praying for the creation of a Canadian navy been received by the House of Commons? If so, from where?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

No petitions praying for the creation of a Canadian navy have been received by the government, nor by parliament, as neither the government nor parliament had to be reminded of such an obvious duty, as both the government and parliament have already expressed their determination to attend to it.

COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE THE PORK INDUSTRY.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

1. Did the government appoint a commission to investigate the pork industry in Europe or elsewhere?

2. If so, who composed the commission and what points have they visited?

3. What were the expenses of this commission?

4. Has the commission reported? If not, when may the House expect the report?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

1. Yes.

2. The commission consisted of W. W. Ballantyne, Stratford, Ontario; Wm. Jones, Zenda, Ontario; Gedeon Garceau, Three Rivers, Quebec; Joseph Rye, Edmonton, Alberta; J. E. Sinclair, Emerald, Prince Edward Island, and J. B. Spencer, of the Live Stock Branch, as secretary.

The commission visited England, Scotland, Ireland, Denmark and Holland.

3. $6,125.40.

4. The commission has reported. The report is now being printed and may be

expected by the House during the first week in April.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Royal Military College Act, chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by repealing section 7 and substituting therefor the following:—

7. The salaries, pay and allowances of the commandant and of the superior and subordinate staffs of the college shall be as fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council.—Sir Frederick Borden.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. (Minister of Militia and Defence). Mr. Chairman, this resolution is introduced for the purpose of founding upon it a Bill to amend the Royal Military College Act. The object, as indicated, is to leave to the Governor General in Council the fixing of the salaries. To-day, as a matter of fact, the salaries paid to the professors in the Royal Military College are all fixed by order in council, excepting that of commandant. It is proposed also by this Bill to withdraw the limitations as to the total amount of money to be expended in the college. There have been several amendments from time to time increasing the amount, which was limited in the first place by the Act, and later on increased as the college has grown and the expenses have increased, and it seemed to me that instead of having to come to parliament every few years, it would be better to leave the adjustment of the amount of salaries and of the expenses to the Governor General in Council. Each year after parliament assembles, a statement is laid before parliament under the law, and it is proposed to continue this part of the Act.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Would the minister kindly read the section?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

The details of such salaries shall appear in the annual report laid before parliament by the minister.

That part of the clause is continued. I will read the proposed Bill.

Mr. U. WILSON. Would the minister read what the law is now?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will read the law as it is, and then I will read the proposed amendment. The existing law is:

The salary of the commandant shall not exceed $3,200 a year, and the salaries of the staff-adjutant, professors, instructors, assistant instructors and staff shall be fixed and may be readjusted from time to time by the Governor in Council, and shall not exceed the total sum of $30,000.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is now proposed to give the Governor in Council unlimited power as to the salary of the commandant.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, just as with regard to other professors. The Auditor General has pointed out that in the last two or three sessions the amounts voted have been in excess of the amounts authorized by the Act, but of course this has been done with the consent of parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister consider increasing the salaries?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, except in the case of the commandant. In connection with the general staff, which has been arranged in conjunction with the war office as part of the military scheme, it has been found desirable that an officer of a higher grade and standing should be at the head of the college. We must have a first-class officer, who has passed the staff college in England with a first-class certificate, and must pay him what he would be paid in the army.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the total amount of salaries now paid?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. With allowances, about $51,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it wise to give the Governor in Council unlimited power in regard to salaries? Would it not be well to place a limit, say of $60,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I accept the suggestion, although I thought there were sufficient safeguards through the voting of estimates by parliament each year. I am content to put the amount at $55,000 or $60,000 but I think it would be better at $60,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the pay of the staff adjutant?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $2,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would impress on the minister that it is important to have a staff adjutant of high qualifications and great tact. He has to act as the intermediary between the commandant and the cadets, to make the orders of the commandant effective, and should be a man of very high qualifications. I know that Staff Adjutant Lafferty was such a man and did more work than he was paid for, and the minister should always have a first-class man as staff adjutant.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I quite agree with my hon. friend. Captain Kaulbach, the present staff adjutant, is a son of the late Senator Kaulbach, a graduate of the Royal Military College, and well suited to perform those difficult duties.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I see that in the school that is being founded in Australia

a condition is imposed that the cadets shall be at the absolute disposition of the country which gives them their education. Would it not be well to make it obligatory on these cadets to place themselves at the disposal of the country when their services are wanted for military purposes?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is now. Graduates of the Royal Military College pass immediately into the active militia and within two years have to become connected with some corps of the active militia in Canada. Immediately their names pass into the Militia List and are there recorded for service if required. That has always been the case. Recently we have added a regulation that within two years these cadets must connect themselves with some definite corps and we also require them to attend two camps.

Mr. LANCASTER. Young men are a little retarded in doing that, as they sometimes cannot get lieutenancies because the positions are occupied by other gentlemen. I am not saying that these lieutenants should be removed, but if you want to get the services of your graduates you must devise some scheme of making vacancies without insulting somebody. My own son graduated last year. He has a good record for artillery and he wants to become lieutenant, but he cannot do so without asking for the resignation of some one else and that is something which no manly young man wants to do.

Mr. HUGHES. Under the rules to-day they can add a supernumerary to any battery.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then, too, to-day we are giving a preference to graduates of the Royal Military College in our permanent force. Every month almost we are taking them on. Where there were two graduates of the Royal Military College in the permanent force of Canada fifteen years ago, I think there are seventy-five to-day, certainly seventy, in the employ of the Militia Department.

Mr. LENNOX. Does this resolution cover anything more than was covered by section 7?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is an amendment of section 7 by eliminating the first part.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not say so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It should.

Mr. LENNOX. (reading):

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Royal Military College Act, chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by repealing section 7 and submitting therefor the following:—

7. The salaries, pay and allowances of the commandent and of the superior and subordinate staffs of the college shall be as fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is intended to leave the second part of that section.

Mr. LENNOX. The second part only provides that the detail of such salaries shall appear in the annual report laid before parliament. That is not what I was directing my attention to more particularly. As far as the range of officers is concerned, it is intended to provide for the payment of the same class of persons.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not necessarily the same. As the college grows, more professors are necessary. It is the same class, but not limited as to numbers.

Mr. LENNOX. Under the Act, the salary of the commandant shall not exceed $3,200 a year, and the others $30,000, so that, under section 7 of the Act, we have a limitation of the amount to $32,200. Now the minister suggests that we should make the limitation $60,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understood the minister to say that he was already expending $51,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $51,500 is what we shall require this year.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a pretty big jump from $33,200. We have a statute in force which provides that the salaries shall not exceed $33,200, and yet we are spending actually $51,500. We have been voting this larger expenditure, but our attention was not called to the statute in any way. Although I quite recognize the necessity for a change, and do not want to limit the salaries to an unfair amount, still we have been exceeding the statutory limit.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I stated frankly that we had, as we supposed, obtained the authority of parliament for our expenditure, and no attempt was made to conceal the fact that the Act in question was on our statutes.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister's wording of this is incorrect.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, whoever drafted the Bill made a mistake. There was no intention to repeal the second part. I quite agree to the limitation suggested. Perhaps on the whole it is desirable for the department, as well as parliament, that there should be a limitation, and I think that the amount of $60,000 will be satisfactory for many years to come.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister will still come down every year, and give the specific amounts.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The resolution is to be amended by inserting after

the word 'repealing' the words 'of section 1 of'.

Mr. HUGHES. In case the Royal Military College were to be extended you would require a larger staff.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We would have to come back to parliament.

Mr. HUGHES. I think it should be made much more serviceable than it has been. In place of having the small number of men who are there now, there should be a great deal many more.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have over 100 now. The examination to enter has become competitive. We have about thirty places each year, and fifty or more applications, so that the College is in a very sound condition, indeed.

Mr. LENNOX. You have only vacant room for thirty.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The number of each class is about thirty-three, and the course is three years. Thirty-three go out this year. We open the examinations to the whole country under certain conditions. Of the fifty or sixty who apply, we can only take thirty-three, and we take them in order of merit, so that the examination is competitive.

Mr. LENNOX. Would it not be better to take all who apply, and who can pass a fair examination?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have only places for 100.

Mr. LENNOX. If it is a good institution, I do not see why any young man who passes his examination, and is in a position to enter, should be denied that opportunity. The country cannot afford any extravagances, but can afford everything necessary for the education of its sons, and we ought not to limit the opportunities for education by the want of space, or teaching staff.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree in that view, but we are limited as to space.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister propose to amend this resolution by adding something to make the limitation $60,000?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion is to add the following words: Such salaries, pay and allowances as shall not exceed the total sum of $60,000.

Mr. J. HAGGART. You have the assent of His Excellency to the unlimited amount?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to draw attention to this aspect of the case. These cadets have on various occasions given exhibitions of their skill in drill, &c., in Toronto and Montreal. I am sure it would only be a trifling expense, heartily endorsed by parliament to bring them to Ottawa, so that the members and senators, the people's representatives, could see what these young men are capable of in the way of physical training. I would be pleased if the minister would give the House the details of the studies and exercises of these cadets. He owes that to the country, and it would be a good advertisement of the institution.

Mr. LANCASTER. The object of my hon. friend is all right, but it would be better attained by the members of parliament going to Kingston. I do not think it would be wise to bring a lot of cadets from their studies to exihibit themselves more or less as a circus for the benefit of members of parliament. The members of parliament ought to know how they live and what they are doing, and they could learn that a good deal better by going to Kingston. I would suggest that an arrangement should be made to take the members of parliament to Kingston on some Saturday, or several Saturdays, and there make themselves acquainted with the workings of the college. I believe that it would be better that the members should go to the college, and learn there the work that is being done. I think that we ought to encourage members of parliament to see the college. Many members, I believe, have a wrong impression of the benefits resulting from that institution, and if they went there, I think they would be agreeably surprised at the good work done.

Mr. EDWARDS. Are officers brought out from England given a preference in appointments over graduates in the Royal Military College? I understand that to be the case. It may be thought right to bring English officers out here to give our young men sound ideas, but, if the college is doing its work properly, I do not see why we should not have in this country young men who are qualified to take their places alongside of any in the world. If there is to be a preference, I think the preference should be given to Canadians.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Before answering my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), I would like to say there is a great deal of merit in the suggestions made by both the hon. members who preceded him. I think it would be an excellent thing to have a visit from the Royal Military College cadets here, and I think it would be a better thing for hon. members to go to Kingston, and see the college. So far as I am concerned, I shall do everything in my power to further either of these ends. At this moment we are considering the question of having a visit from the college cadets in a short time. Something is going on here, and I believe it is rather desirable that the cadets should

come. As to the other suggestion, I shall be glad to do what I can to arrange to have an excursion to visit the college, if any considerable number of members will make known their desire or their willingness to go.

Now, as to the selection of British officers, I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) has no personal feelings against British officers.

Mr. EDWARDS. None whatever.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may tell the hon. member that the former commandant was a Royal Military College graduate. And, while I am not going to discuss his regime, I will say that we have had more successful commandants. At the present time there are two officers of the staff who are Royal Military College graduates. True, they are British officers, but it seems to me that in supplying teachers for the college, men are required who have had experience in military matters of the highest character, and that is the kind of men we try to get. The present commandant is a man of first-rate qualifications. I hope the day will come when, through a process of exchange which is now being carried on, between the permanent force officers of Canada and the British army, and the officers of the permanent forces of Australia and India, and other parts of the empire, we shall have in our own college our own officers who have had experience of service abroad to a sufficient extent to make them efficient teachers. At the present moment, I think the course we are following is decidedly the best one.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was not referring—though I admit that there was nothing in my words to make that clear—to the higher officers such as the commandant, but to such officers as instructors. As an instance to illustrate what I mean, I may mention a gentleman by the name of Phillips, who, I am told, was brought out in 1909, as instructor of gunnery in Halifax. I understand that he took his qualifying course twelve years ago, and three years is supposed to be the period after which a man gets behind the times—I am not much of a military man, but that is what I am informed. Again, the officers who come here from England are granted two months leave of absence, while our own Canadians are granted only one month's leave. Yet these Canadians have passed the qualifying examinations of the Royal Military College, and I think we have a right to assume that those examinations are of a high enough standard to prove that the men have the qualifications to fill vacancies that occur from time to time. I am told that two of the graduating class wished to take commissions in the artillery——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This of which the hon. member is speaking, does not relate to the Royal Military College, I think.

Mr. EDWARDS. These were graduates of the Royal Military College, and, in that respect, I think this pertains to the subject. I am told that two of the graduating class wished to take commissions in the artillery, and though there were, according to the militia list, five vacancies, only one position was given to a graduate of the college. If that sort of thing be true, it may be all right. I confess I am not a military man, but looking at it from the standpoint of a non-military man, I think it is not right.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Were these vacancies all filled?

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not know.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They were not.

Mr. EDWARDS. How many of them were filled?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot say exactly; but I can say that, owing to not having sufficient and, perhaps, not really requiring officers at that particular time, these vacancies were not all filled. There are always vacancies in the permanent force—sometimes as many as fifteen. But I will look into the case to which the hon. member has referred. I am glad that he has brought it up. But, meantime, I may tell the hon. member that we give preference to graduates of the Royal Military College, if they are recommended by the commandant over and above every other person and regardless of any consideration except that of merit.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think that is very fair. I would ask the minister to look into the case of T. F. Grant. I believe he stood at the head of his class in the Royal Military College at Kingston, he came out at the top of the graduating class; and I am informed that he resigned as a protest against the advancement of an Englishman by the name of Ellison, who was brought out in 1906.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I remember the case. Ellison was an English officer, who was stationed at Esquimalt, who had had considerable experience, and he was appointed because we thought it was more in the interest of the public that he should be appointed. It is sometimes necessary for us to ask for the loan of an imperial officer, because at the moment we have not qualified officers of our own. We borrow these officers for a period, and if, at the end of that time, we have a Cana-

dian officer who is fit for the position, he gets it. I remember the case of a young Grant, and we are very sorry to lose him. I think he made a great mistake in going out.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 180) to amend the Royal Military College Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SALE OF BABY FARM.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council: (a) To sell and dispose of the Baby farm, situate in the township of York, in the county of York, and province of Ontario, the acquisition of which was ratified by chapter 51 of the statutes of 1908. The purchase moneys received from the purchaser of the said land to be appropriated and used for the purchase of a site and the construction of barracks and buildings thereon for the housing of the militia and other military purposes in, or in the vicinity of, the city of Toronto. (b) To sell and dispose of that parcel of land situate in the municipality of Assiniboia, in the province of Manitoba, and now used and known as the Winnipeg rifle range. The purchase moneys received from the purchaser of the said range to be appropriated and used for the purchase of land for a rifle range in, or in the vicinity of, the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Two years ago a Bill was passed by this House of a similar character, by which the government was enabled to sell certain properties, one in the city of Montreal and one in the city of Toronto, and utilize the proceeds for military purposes as stated in that Bill. This resolution proposes the sale of a property owned by the Militia Department, in or near the city of Toronto, known as the Baby farm. There are several reasons why we wish to sell this property. One is that it is not quite large enough. We are establishing in Toronto a new depot for the permanent force, and we want to have that depot advantageously situated. This farm was purchased for $20,000, it contains 160 acres, and we can sell it to-day for $160,000. So the country will have a very fair profit. I do not think it wise to state exactly where the property is situated which we propose to purchase, but it is situated near the city of Toronto, and in a position even more favourable than that of the Baby farm. It is very accessible, and in every way advantageous. It is proposed to acquire that property by expropriation, and steps will be taken to do that as soon as this legislation is assented to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Mr. WALLACE. Where will it be?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would rather not state that, because I am afraid the price of land might go up in that locality. But I have had the country examined all around adjacent to Toronto, and a very suitable place has been found.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the estimated cost?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is expected that we can buy the property we want for about one-third the price that we will get for this property. It will contain from 300 to 600 acres.

Mr. J. HAGGART. If you are going to expropriate it, why do you decline to tell us where it is?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it is undesirable, even in that case.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose the government will sell this property privately, for any price they choose?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, we will ask for bids. We will advertise it for sale, but probably we will not sell it by public auction.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has the minister had any valuations made of it? Because $1,000 an acre is not a very large price for land in the suburbs of Toronto.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We bought this property less than four years ago for $20,000. There are no buildings very near it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman have a valuation made, and fix a reserve bid?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly, we propose to sell it openly.

Mr. WALLACE. Do I understand the minister to say that all the moneys received from the sale of these lands will be used in building?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, every dollar.

On paragraph (b),

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The same thing is true of the second part. The rifle range at Winnipeg is rather near the city, and we have not land enough there. With the strength of the modern up to date cartridges, the danger area is very much greater than it used to be, and we have been notified that it will be necessary to buy more land. We find that to buy land adjacent to the rifle range would cost as much as it will cost if we sell this land, go a little farther out of the city and buy about three times the amount of land, which will enable us to have a rifle range there and to move our depot if we choose,

from the city of Winnipeg, which we will have to do in the near future. It will not cost the country a dollar, and it will be as convenient as the present range is to-day, because it is on the same line of electric railway.

Mr. WALLACE. Have you a new site for the rifle range?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, we have selected the land. I do not know that it has been made public yet.

Mr. JAMESON. Is it the policy of the department to sell or lease lands of the department which are not used?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If the military authorities report that these lands are never likely to be required, and a reasonable price can be secured, the policy would be to sell them, but the policy since I came into office has been to lease them on condition that the department can take them over at short notice.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister had under consideration the removal of the troops from St. Johns, Quebec, and the selling of some public buildings there?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, that has been reported in the newspapers, but it has not been under consideration.

Mr. WALLACE. What will be done with the present Stanley barracks site?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The barracks have been sold to the city.

Mr. JAMESON. In regard to the leasing of the lands of the department, is that done openly after tender, or is there any competition for them, or does it just happen that any person who makes application and is esteemed satisfactory by the officers of the department is allowed to lease these lands?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That would depend. A good many leases have been given without competition because the lands were not believed to be valuable. I usually leave that to the officer commanding. I believe there are some lands at Digby. I think the officer at Halifax would require to go there and make a report, and we would be guided very much by his report. We always put into the leases a provision that the department can take possession, without having to pay for buildings or improvements, at any time it sees fit, for military purposes.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 181) to authorize the sale or other disposal of certain public lands, and the acquisition of certain other lands in or in the vicinity of the cities of Toronto and Winnipeg, respectively.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SMELTING OF ZINC ORES.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to enable the Governor in Council to authorize the expenditure of a sum not exceeding fifty thousand dollars for investigating the processes used in the production of zinc, for making experiments, and for any other purpose that may be deemed advisable for the promotion of the production and manufacture in Canada of zinc and zinc products from Canadian ores.—Mr. Templeman.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN. The Bill which will be introduced on the passage of this resolution will provide for the diversion of $50,000 from the fund for present lead-bounty fund, for the purposes stated in the resolution. About $2,500,000 was voted several years ago for a bounty on lead and about $1,000,000 of that is still in the treasury. Lead and zinc are so closely allied, particularly in the ores in British Columbia, that the lead miners are deeply interested in the handling of the zinc product, and this proposal has the approval of all the lead mining interests. Upon a petition presented to the government and backed up by the lead mining interests, this step has been deemed advisable. The money is to be expended under the control of the Department of Mines. There are numerous metallurgical difficulties connected with the smelting of zinc. The presence of zinc is a detriment to the lead ores, and in this country the zinc product is absolutely lost under the present system of smelting, although zinc is the more valuable mineral of the two, quantity for quantity. It is proposed to investigate all known methods of electrical smelting of zinc. There are at present in Europe some new processes, one has been in use for years and the others are comparatively new, so that it is not known whether these are commercially successful or not. There have been two attempts at zinc smelting in British Columbia, one the well known process of smelting in retorts, and the other an electric process whereby it was hoped by the one operation to separate the lead and zinc in smelting, getting from the smelter the lead bullion and zinc bullion. That smelter was carried on experimentally for several years, but only with measurable success. The desire of the min-

ing men of the Kootenay is that the Department of Mines should carry to completion the experimentation that has gone on thus far in the zinc smelter at Nelson. After a thorough investigation of all well known processes, the one which is best adapted to the condition of Canadian ores will be adopted. I believe the object to be a very laudable one.

Mr. SPROULE. How will these investigations be carried on?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We hope that the investigations in Europe will be carried on by Mr. Harbord, a mining engineer of the city of London, who was on the commission which this government sent to Europe some years ago, and who is now employed investigating for the British government in South Africa. We have been in communication with this gentleman, and we hope to secure his services. The investigations in this country will be under Dr. Haanel, who will no doubt obtain the services of the best metallurgists he can in this country or elsewhere.

Mr. SPROULE. Where will the experiments be carried on?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If we come to the conclusion that the electrical process may be applied to the refractory low grade ores of British Columbia, the further experiments will in all probability be carried out at Nelson, British Columbia, where an electric smelter with all the necessary equipment, as well as the electrical power, has been offered to us free of charge, for the purpose of experimentation. I assume that these experiments will be carried on at Nelson, although we want to have a free hand to carry them on in the city of Ottawa, or at any well equipped laboratory of a university, if we deem it wise to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Has Dr. Haanel made any success of the experiments in smelting iron by electricity?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The smelting of iron by electricity is an accomplished fact.

Mr. SPROULE. But there has been no practical application of it?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Oh yes, it is carried on in Europe to a considerable extent, and to some extent in the United States, but its application is more to the manufacture of steel than of iron. The chief problem in electric smelting in this country is to get cheap electricity. If electricity can be produced cheaper than heat can be generated by the ordinary process there is no question at all but that electricity will quickly supersede the ordinary process of smelting iron.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the extensive water-powers in British Columbia you ought to have the cheapest electricity in the world.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have also large deposits of coal in British Columbia, but strange to say electrical power is not quite so cheap in British Columbia at present as it is in Ontario. British Columbia is an enormous country in extent, and some of the water-powers are not contiguous to the iron. Progress has been made in the electrical smelting of iron, but I do not think Canada has taken advantage of the knowledge obtained along that line. Of course, the development of iron mines and the smelting of iron involves the expenditure of millions of capital.

Mr. BLAIN. Will any portion of this grant be used to send a commission to the old country to make an examination of conditions there?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This matter has been under consideration for some considerable time, but it is not the intention of the department to send any one to Europe. There are metallurgical engineers fully conversant with the industry whose services can be obtained at comparatively little cost. We will obtain the latest information as to the development that has taken place in the smelting of zinc ore, but it will not be necessary to send a commission to Europe. The necessity is more apparent now than it was a few years ago. Formerly, zinc ores went to the United States from Canada at a comparatively low duty, but under the Payne-Aldrich tariff the duty was made prohibitive. Hence the necessity to provide some method of handling in this country these zinc products. This money is being diverted from the lead bounty. The beneficiaries of the lead bounty are practically the beneficiaries of this, as lead and zinc go hand in hand, zinc being a great detriment to the lead men, and absolute waste at present, so that all those who profit by the lead bounty have virtually asked the government to take $50,000 off it and carry on the work of experimenting in zinc production and manufacture.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As I understand the ore formerly went to the United States and was smelted there, with every satisfaction to the producers of zinc ore in British Columbia, this $50,000 is practically a bonus to a smelter in that western country. Is not that the situation?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Of course it is not, as my hon. friend will see if he reads the resolution. Only a comparatively small quantity of zinc ore ever went from British Columbia to the United States. There is a vast quantity of low grade ore which cannot be concentrated sufficiently to pay the

cost of transportation, and we propose to devote this money to the purpose mentioned in the resolution, and no other. We could not possibly give one dollar of it to subsidize a smelter in British Columbia. It will take several years to expend the money, and the entire amount will be spent by the Department of Mines in carrying out the objects of the resolution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The last clause distinctly says 'and for any other purpose that may be deemed advisable for the promotion of the production and manufacture in Canada of zinc and zinc products from Canadian ores.' Would not that justify the inference I have made?

Mr. LENNOX. What does the minister aim at in using the language my hon. friend has just quoted?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We aim, in the first place, at a full investigation of the known electrical processes of smelting zinc. We aim at a full examination into the zinc and zinc products in Canada. We aim also at a full examination of the known deposits in Canada to ascertain what tonnage we could have to keep a smelter running. In addition, we aim at carrying on experiments by the department, under properly qualified men, if we can get them—and there are not so many—who have a knowledge of the electrical processes of smelting zinc, and we expect to carry on that experimentation in Nelson, where a smelter already exists, the use of which has been offered the department for that purpose. It may be necessary to ask some of the metallurgists of the School of Mines in Kingston or at other places to carry on certain experimentations in order to ascertain whether it is possible for them to separate lead and zinc at one process, and it may be necessary for them to call in the assistance of other experts.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. minister should then have no objection to strike out the words 'and for any other purpose.'

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know what effect that would have. I want to have the fullest liberty and authority to spend the money for the purposes I have named. There is no intention to bonus any zinc smelter, and you could not possibly bonus one with this sum. We have no objection to prohibiting the use of any of this money for bonuses for any zinc industry, for that is not contemplated.

Mr. BEATTIE. Has the hon. minister received any intimation of a discovery of zinc ore in the counties of Grey and Bruce, Ontario? I have had some letters on that subject, and I understand they have a very good sample of zinc, but they want some assistance in working the prospect out. Is it the intention of the minister to give any such assistance?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The very thing that the Department of Mines is trying to do is to afford assistance to the mining industry, but not financial assistance. We attempt work of research, experimentation and publication; we try to show the way in which things are to be done, that the mining interests may take advantage of the information placed at their disposal to develop our mineral resources. I am aware that there are considerable zinc deposits in Ontario, and have had some letters on the subject since this resolution was placed on the order paper; but in the case of the zinc industry in Ontario, as well as in British Columbia, we can only assist by showing the way—that is, if we can manage to solve the questions ourselves. But the problem is one in which we cannot be sure of success altogether. When you take up the question of electric smelting, you are up against considerable difficulties. I think it most likely that we shall require all this money for the purpose contemplated. I can assure the House, and my hon. friends opposite, that I do not desire to change the wording. The Bill which will be submitted to the House on the passage of this resolution, was prepared by the Deputy Minister of Justice, and the notice on the order paper was prepared by the law clerk, The notice practically follows the wording of the Bill. But, not being a lawyer, I am rather chary of giving consent to striking out words when such a change, though apparently, innocent enough, may have the effect of rendering the Bill nugatory.

Mr. BEATTIE. But the point is that the minister is going to place his smelter in British Columbia, where it can hardly be expected to treat the ores of Ontario. And I have understood that it is too expensive to send this ore for treatment to the United States. If the smelter had been more centrally placed, I think the minister's position in this matter would be much stronger.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Of course, the question of where the smelter is to be placed is purely an economic problem. A smelter for zinc ores, or for any other ores, must be so placed that power will cost as little as possible. It may be possible to haul the ore a long distance where you get cheap power. One of our serious problems, in western Canada at all events, is to combine all the conditions. One of the great difficulties in British Columbia was that the cost of operating the Frank smelter was too great, although there were other defects. That may be found to be the case with electric smelting also. But the conditions must be learned. In the smelting of iron, it is sometimes cheaper to take the iron to the coal than the coal to the iron.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am glad the minister mentioned the subject of cheap power, for,

that being so important, I think he will find that the city of London is the best place for the smelter. We have excellent conditions there, and we expect to have the Niagara power at very cheap rates. Of course, I cannot vouch for that. But I do not know of a better place thon London for such an industry, and I trust he will take it into his careful consideration.

Mr. LENNOX. We do not wish to embarrass the minister by urging him to strike out words, for I can well understand that sometimes it is difficult to know just what the effect of striking out words will be. However, the minister can probably obviate that by giving us information which we are entitled to have, and which he has no doubt at his fingers' ends. I understood him to say that he would require the whole of this $50,000 for the purposes indicated.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. member (Mr. Lennox) is pausing for an answer. That means 'yes' or 'no.' I said I had no doubt that this money would be needed. If we are going into experiments in electrical smelting, it is very difficult to estimate how much money may be expended. Frankly, I admit that this whole $50,000 may be expended, and no positive results in regard to electric smelting may be obtained. The House ought to understand that. But, on the other hand, we might hit upon a plan of smelting before we had exhausted the $50,000. So, I do not say absolutely that we shall require all this money, but I believe the probabilities are that we shall require it, and more.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister, I think, has hardly treated us fairly. When he comes to ask for $50,000, he does not ask it for pocket money, to spend or not to spend as may happen; he is asking for something which he knows he will want, in other words, he has some plan, some estimate, showing how the money is expected to be applied. He says he wants $50,000 for experimental purposes. Well, we have the right to know, and, of course, he wants to tell us, to what purposes he proposes to apply the money. If he does not know, even in a general way, to what purposes he intends to apply it, he has no right to ask for it, and we have no right to grant it. What I ask the minister to do is to give us the various items of this proposed expenditure. We shall then be in a position to judge whether it is our duty to join with him in the appropriation of this money, or whether we should oppose him in it. I have stated this in support of his plea against striking out words in this resolution.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is an estimate, but I did not suppose it would be required at this stage, and did not bring it with me. This is merely the introductory resolution. If my hon. friend will accept the explanation he asks for on the second reading of the Bill, I shall be glad to give it then.

Mr. LENNOX. I take the minister's word, and am quite willing that the course he proposes should be taken.

Mr. GOODEVE. I am aware of the difficulties that have been met in finding methods for the treatment of zinc ores. I feel inclined to agree with the minister, particularly as I understand that a portion of this money will be taken from the grant already passed by parliament for treating lead ores. That grant has proved very beneficial not only to this particular industry but to the Dominion as a whole. Heretofore all the lead for paints ground in oil were imported from the United States; but, I am glad to say, that we have very large works of this kind established in Montreal, so that a large portion of the lead used in Canada is mined, smelted, ground and manufactured in the Dominion. As to zinc ores, I can speak with some little knowledge, because our own government has expended a good deal of money trying to discover an electric process of treating these ores. One of our difficulties is that, owing to the action of the United States, we have found it difficult to market the lead ores containing zinc. Particular ores containing a certain percentage of zinc are practically prohibited by the duties, so we are unable to take out the slocan ore which contains a large percentage of zinc. The result is that many of the mines have been closed down, and many others have large dumps of second-class ore containing zinc in their composition, but as they cannot be treated in any way they are now comparatively a waste product. If by assistance from the government we can devise a process whereby these ores can be treated, it would be of great benefit to the whole Dominion, and a great stimulus to the production of zinc in our own country. On that ground I will support the proposition of the minister. I may add from my experience of this question that it is difficult to say just how much experiments of that kind would cost. We have spent large sums of money, many of us have lost money in trying to discover successful processes; and the feeling is that as the project is a benefit to the whole people of Canada, it is a subject of fair consideration by the government. It is on that ground that representations were made to the minister asking a grant of this nature. These experiments cost a lot of money, and sometimes produce little results, but we have to do these things if we are going to develop mining in our country. We were

the first country to adopt the electroclytic process in the refining of lead, and the result is that we are now doubling the capacity of one of the largest smelters on the American continent, and we are turning out the purest lead produced on the American continent. I have thought it well to give these few facts to the House in order to induce the House to support the minister in the object he has in view.

Mr. LENNOX. I sympathize with the view presented by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve). But what I desire to say to the minister is that when he comes and asks us for money he should be able to set forth a method by which he proposes to spend the money. I will be prepared to join in expending far more than $50,000 for the development of mining. But when the minister asks us for money I ask him to tell us how he proposes to spend it. I do not know anything about this particular grant of money, but I regard $50,000 for the purpose of developing any useful industry as a very small sum of money. I will be glad to assist the minister in getting a larger sum of money so long as the plan he outlines to parliament seems calculated to benefit the country. I could apply in this case that hackneyed expression so often used in railroading Bills through this House, that the development of mining in British Columbia, or anywhere else in Canada, is a work for the general advantage of Canada. I am heartily in accord with any proposition for the development of mining, and I hope the minister will bring down information to show us that this money is going to be wisely expended.

Mr. HERRON. I desire to ask the minister if the government has done anything towards investigating the zinc smelter enterprise in the town of Frank. It was to some extent a failure when first established. It is a very extensive plant.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The government has not investigated the zinc smelting industry in the town of Frank, but I think that mining men of the country generally have investigated it. It was a failure, probably built on the wrong lines to smelt the zinc ores of the Kootenay country. At all events, it was a metallurgical and financial failure, and if I am not mistaken the plant has been dismantled.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 182) respecting the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada, and to promote the production in Canada of zinc.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 102) respecting immigration—Mr. Oliver.

On paragraph (k): stowaway.

Mr. OLIVER moved:

That the word 'conveyance' in the 20th and 21st lines of paragraph (k) be struck out and the word 'vehicle' substituted.

Mr. U. WILSON. This clause is about the same as one in the American Act, is it not?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer that question as to its being exactly the same, but it is very much the same as in the Bill of last year. The principle is the same.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 3, prohibited classes of immigrants.

Mr. OLIVER moved:

That after the word 'citizen' in the 2nd line there be inserted the words 'or has Canadian domicile.'

He said: We have established a meaning for the word 'domicile,' for the purpose of permitting British subjects who have established their residence in Canada to claim the same rights as Canadian citizens on their return, and it is proper that these words should be inserted here carrying out that idea. Canadian domicile is acquired by a three years' residence in Canada.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand the minister to mean that a British subject acquires the right of domicile by residence?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. U. WILSON. Are you going to stick to the three years' qualification?

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to.

Mr. U. WILSON. I am sorry for that. In Great Britain it takes five years to become a citizen of Great Britain. In the United States it is five years, and they wish to make it longer.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Can the minister by this Act make a foreigner a British subject?

Mr. OLIVER. All we do in this is to give the privilege of Canadian citizenship to a man, who although not born in Canada has resided here for three years.

Mr. BARKER. And who had already been a British subject?

Mr. OLIVER. He need not have been a British subject. If he has lived in Canada

for three years he has thereby established Canadian domicile.

Mr. BARKER. He is not naturalized by that?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. BLACK. What do you mean by the words 'loathsome disease'?

Mr. OLIVER. The disease which is most frequently met with is trachoma, which is rather loathsome than dangerous.

Mr. BLACK. The word 'loathsome' as used there simply expresses the condition of the nervous system of the person who is looking at the disease. A medical man would not consider any disease loathsome.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What word would the hon. gentleman suggest in lieu of 'loathsome'?

Mr. BLACK. It is not necessary at all; the words contagious and infectious are sufficient.

Mr. OLIVER. While there may be no scientific warrant for the use of the word I think it will be found very desirable to retain it for the purpose of administering the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. There are diseases which are neither contagious nor infectious, but which are loathsome, such as cancer and ulcers. I do not think you could select a better word.

Mr. BLACK. I do not think trachoma would be loathsome in the eyes of a medical man. From a medical point of view there is not any such thing as disgusting or loathsome disease.

Mr. OLIVER. In connection with this section I might say that it has been urged that it is too restrictive in that it purports to restrict the landing of persons to whom money has been loaned. If the restriction were confined to loans by charitable organizations, it would probably meet all necessary requirements. Loans advanced by a friend should not come under this prohibition.

Mr. BARKER. What is the distinction?

Mr. OLIVER. A loan that is given by one friend to another is a different thing from a loan given by a charitable organization in carrying out the purposes of the organization.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not think that persons should be excluded simply because they borrow money. It is quite sufficient to restrict those who are sent out here by charitable organizations who may wish to get rid of them.

Mr. SPROULE. Recently a number of Scotchmen landed in Canada who had not sufficient money to comply with the requirements of the Act, and the money was furnished by a Scottish society. What position would these men be in under this Act?

Mr. OLIVER. That was not a loan by a charitable organization for the purpose of sending out these immigrants.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. And it was given after they landed in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it would be right to make a restriction that would shut out such persons who were aided by their compatriots in this country.

Mr. CROSBY. As a matter of fact quite a number of immigrants secure passage from the steamship companies to the ocean port in Canada, and they may want to go to Toronto or Winnipeg, or some western point, but have not sufficient money, although they may be otherwise desirable immigrants. The steamship agent will say to them, you have plenty of money to go to Halifax or St. John, and we will give you passage, and these people assume that once they land in Canada, they will have no difficulty in reaching any place to which they intend going. Frequently families of that kind, good people, have come to Canada, and have been assisted by our national societies. We have in Halifax three such societies, the Charitable Irish Society, the North British Society, and the St. George's Society, organized principally for the purpose of assisting such needy immigrants, their own compatriots. There was a case the other day to which my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has just referred. The North British Society took that case up and furnished those people with sufficient money to get to their destination. There is no doubt that they were people of very creditable character as immigrants, and it would have been a great hardship had they been turned back, and, under the strict letter of the law, they would have had to be deported. I think that the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia interested himself in their behalf. There should be some provision to enable such immigrants to get to their destination. I think there is a case of the kind now in St. John, of a man who has been there some eight or ten days. His brother-in-law, who is a well-to-do citizen in Toronto, wired sufficient money to qualify him, but there is this difficulty. that, according to the strict letter of the law, he should be deported. I am sure that the minister must have had many demands made on him in regard to the character of immigrants. When a man is of good character, and shows cause why he should not be deported, and has friends, as sometimes happens, who are prepared to help him there should be some way of preventing his being deported as an undesirable immigrant.

Mr. OLIVER. This section, as it stands, represents the position which the government take to-day, and which it enforces under orders in council, which are authorized by the present Act. It was with the desire to place upon the statute the policy of the government, so that whatever might be done would be done in the light of day, that we proposed this section. I quite appreciate the fact that many a good man is poor, and that, if poverty were a bar to admission into this country, many of us would have been excluded, but this provision was rendered necessary by the conditions which arose in the fall of 1907, and which would very likely arise again if it were not enforced. Everybody will remember that in the winter of 1907, there was a great deal of distress in many cities of Canada among newly arrived immigrants, and the Immigration Department was subjected to a great deal of very severe criticism in consequence. We found that the large majority of these cases arose as the result of the efforts of charitable organizations operating on the other side. There had been a good demand for labour in Canada during the summer, and there was considerable dearth of employment in the old country. The charitable organizations there spent in consequence considerable money in sending out their unemployed to Canada, where employment was found for them during the summer months; but as soon as employment began to slacken in the fall of 1907, we had this large number of people on our hands, and had nothing for them to do. A great deal of distress resulted, and a great deal of harsh criticism on the Immigration Department, and the cause of legitimate immigration to Canada was seriously injured in England by the reports that went back of this distress. An order in council was then passed prohibiting people, who had been assisted by charitable organizations, from landing in this country, unless before sailing they had passed inspection, and been approved by our immigration officers. I am quite aware that cases of hardship arise, and would be very glad if we could find some means of avoiding these cases, but that does not seem possible. We found the provision we made by order in council not only necessary, but useful. I believe it absolutely saved the situation in Canada, and I would like to see that provision embodied in this Act so that all the world would see exactly what our policy is.

Mr. JAMESON. Would this provision interfere in any way with the measures which the Salvation army has been taking lately in the way of aiding immigration to this country?

Mr. OLIVER. The Salvation army complies with this requirement. They always have the people in whom they are interesting themselves pass inspection in the old country before our immigration officers; and of course, once they pass that inspection, we become responsible for the character, and standing of these immigrants, and they are allowed to enter at our ports. Some other charitable organizations comply with that provision also. We do not forbid the bringing in of people by charitable organizations, but they must first pass an inspection on the other side by our officers.

Mr. JAMESON. I think that is very proper.

Mr. CROSBY. We have in Halifax three incorporated societies, not exclusively charitable, but national as well, which assist people of their nationality who come to this country. Very often when a family of such people land in Halifax or St. John, they imagine that they are close to every place in Canada. Take the case of a family of Irish people coming to this country, intending to go to Toronto or Winnipeg to join friends, but without the necessary money. We have frequently supplied the funds to take these people to their destination, and in many cases have afterwards received the money back from them. None of these incorporated societies would take hold of a family, and forward them to their destination without being reasonably sure that they were suitable immigrants for this country. The Charitable Irish Society, and the North British Society were established a hundred and fifty years ago to help immigrants coming to this side—sometimes they have received people who were shipwrecked on the coast of Nova Scotia, and sent them forward to their destinations. I think that these societies would be perfectly willing to give any reasonable guarantee in the case of the people they assist. But some regulation should be incorporated in the Bill to provide for cases of this kind so that desirable immigrants may not be deported.

Mr. STRATTON. I think there is something in what the hon. member for Halifax has just stated. I have known of cases of hardship in my own riding It sometimes happens that people having a father or brother coming from the old country are not in a position to supply the $25 referred to, but they were ready to put up bonds that, if these people should ever become a public burden, they would undertake to send them back. Yet, in the face of that, these immigrants have been deported to the great regret of their friends. Such cases are certainly cases of hardship. It seems to me, however, that the only way in which we can meet them is by the appointment of intelligent agents, and giving

these agents some little latitude to discriminate between the desirable and undesirable.

Mr. BARKER. We are getting a little ahead of the Bill. I think that under section 13, providing for a board of inquiry where an immigrant has been rejected, the minister has made provision to meet such cases. We can discuss the matter more understandingly on that section.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. If this section be amended by making it refer to assistance by a charitable organization, should it not be made clear that it applies to charitable organizations in Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. This section applies only to organizations outside of Canada. It provides that, in the case of parties aided by charitable organizations, they must be inspected and approved by our officers on the other side of the water, or we do not allow them to land here. We assume that a charity-aided immigrant is an undesirable immigrant, and the burden of proof of the contrary is on him. We provide means for trying out cases on the other side of the water. With regard to what my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) has said, I may explain that if the people are of the class and character suitable for farm work, we do not require them to have any money in possession, we only require that they should be able to reach their work.

Mr. SPROULE. How about domestic servants?

Mr. OLIVER. They are in the same position as farm help. Everybody recognizes that there is need of farm labour and domestic service, and we impose no restriction as to money qualifications in these cases. But there is a clear distinction between these and other classes who come, and we think that when people come in to engage in other callings it is right that there should be a proper safeguard that they will not become a public burden.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What classes does the government bonus now?

Mr. OLIVER. Farmers, farm labour, and domestic service.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Have you dropped the railway navies?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, over a year ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Would fraternal or national societies come under this clause?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, if they are on the other side of the water.

Mr. SPROULE. I know some such societies on this side that contemplate bringing out immigrants, selecting desirable ones.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no objection whatever, provided their efforts are directed to securing farmers, farm assistants or domestic help.

Mr. SPROULE. And people of these classes are not required to have the $25 on landing?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Nor do you take a bond from the society that they shall not become a public burden?

Mr. OLIVER. No. We know that there is such a demand for this class of people, that, if they are sound physically and of reasonably good disposition, there is no question as to their getting employment.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The clause as amended should be acceptable to the House. We have been trying for years to have only a desirable class of immigrants come into this country, and I think we might reasonably go a little too far in that direction rather than stop short. It is most desirable to keep up the standards of our people.

Mr. GOODEVE. A case arose in the town of Trail, which is next to my own town. Some Italians communicated with me with regard to some of their friends coming out from Italy. These people landed in New York. Some had bought their tickets through to British Columbia, while others had bought only to New York. They were held by the agent there. A number of telegrams passed between myself and Mr. Scott, the commissioner of immigration. I learned that all these immigrants got through except one, and as to that one I did not get any definite answer. I may say that one of the men who communicated with me on the subject was an expert metallurgist, a man in good position. I desire to ask the minister on what ground people would be refused admission under the circumstances to which I have referred?

Mr. OLIVER. That was under a short amendment of the Immigration Act that was passed in the session before last, what is called the indirect passage provision. It provides that we may exclude immigrants who come otherwise than by direct passage, or on a through ticket purchased in the country of which they are citizens. I suppose I may mention the reasons for this somewhat peculiar provision. The necessity arises from the exigencies of deportation. If an undesirable arrives and is rejected after he has been in the country for some time, we then call upon the transportation company which brought him here to take him back to the country to which he belongs. But, if the transportation company which brought him into Canada did not bring him from the coun-

try to which he belongs, then we cannot compel them to take him back to that country. We can only compel them to take him back to the country they brought him from, and if he was an undesirable in our country he may be just as undesirable in that country. So in order to secure ourselves we had this amendment passed, which gave us a right to exclude passengers who arrive otherwise than by direct passage or on through tickets purchased in the country in which they were citizens. That is the general statement. The particular condition was that there was a prospect, in fact a certainty, of a large movement of Japanese from Honolulu to British Columbia, and there was also the prospect of a large movement of Hindus from Hong Kong. We had an arrangement with Japan whereby Japan prohibited emigration direct from that country to Canada, but Japan had no authority to prohibit emigration from the Sandwich Islands to Canada, they being part of the United States. There were a good many thousands of Japanese in those islands, where times were dull, and prospects were good in British Columbia. There was every prospect of a large movement, and we successfully adopted this means of preventing that movement. The same provision applied to the movement that we apprehended from Hong Kong, and it also had the same effect. Of course it is a general provision, and is just as necessary and suitable in the case of undesirables coming through the United States as in any other case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to bring to the attention of the minister the case of immigrants who enter our ports with through tickets to the United States. They are carried through the Dominion as far as Sarnia, we will say, to the port of entry into the United States. I have knowledge of a case of that kind, where some 30 immigrants, who apparently had tickets to the United States, were turned back at the port of entry at Port Huron. Those men were placed on the Grand Trunk train and brought back to London, Ontario. So far as I could gather they were employed in London by the agents of the Grand Trunk railway, and in some other districts where they wished to make use of them; they were sent up into those districts to work. Now, if these immigrants were not fit for entrance into the United States, why should we be burdened with them in Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not understand how that occurrence could take place if there was fair play on the part of all parties concerned. Every immigrant who lands at a Canadian port destined for the United States is examined at the Canadian port of landing by a United States officer, under a tacit arrangement between the two departments. When the United States officer at the Canadian ocean port has examined an immigrant and approved him, the immigrant is then free to enter the United States when he reaches the border. If the examination made by the United States officer at the port of Halifax, St. John or Quebec, is not effective in allowing the immigrant to pass into the United States when he reaches the border, I shall be glad to be informed of the circumstances, and we will have the situation readjusted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I hope the minister will investigate that circumstance, because hundreds are turned back in the same manner. Personally I made inquiries about these people, having noticed them in Sarnia, and riding back to London in another car. They were taken off there, and I made some inquiries as to what was going to be done with them, and I received the information I have given to the minister. I am satisfied from what I can learn from the residents in our western country, that not only at the port of entry of Port Huron, but at other ports, many immigrants who have passages paid through to the United States are turned back at the border.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend has the particulars in regard to this case I would be glad to get them from him, or of any similar case hereafter that comes to his notice. Such a proceeding as he mentions is entirely contrary to our arrangement and understanding. I may say that our requirements in regard to the standard of immigrants are somewhat higher than the requirements of the United States, consequently there is a possibility of immigrants taking advantage of the more lenient laws of the United States in order to get into Canada; that is to say, ostensibly they are going through, but really they never intend to go through, and take advantage of the examination of the United States officers at the Canadian port in order to get into Canada. That is a very difficult situation, and one of the purposes of the Bill is to meet it as well as it can be met. We have certain provisions further on in the Bill which will go as far as we think it is possible to go in meeting that condition.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister certain officers in England for the purpose of bringing out immigrants to the province of Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Has he not a gentleman by the name of Burnett in his department, and what is he doing?

Mr. OLIVER. He is a salaried agent resident in York. We have no agents in England or on the continent who are conducting parties of immigrants to Canada.

Mr. HUGHES. Are his functions to send immigrants to Ontario or to the Northwest?

Mr. OLIVER. To any part of Canada that the immigrant desires to go. He is not to give anybody advice, but to give all the information he possesses.

Mr. HUGHES. This officer has been receiving letters from people who desired to come to this country. A man and his sons were sought to be induced to come to Canada to go to work as hired men. I think these people should be told that hired men only get employment for a few months in the year. To my mind that is one of the most serious things in connection with this business, that these men are rushed into the country under great inducements to work as harvesters when the work only lasts a short time. There should be some settled policy on the part of the government in this matter, whereby the immigration officers should show these people plainly and frankly when they come out as hired men what they have to expect. Whether they come out as labourers or as homesteaders, they should have all the facts placed before them; this family comes from near Carlisle. A young man who wrote me in Africa; I knew him very well. Burnett recommended this man with his family to come out here and hire on a farm in Ontario. I do not think there is any future for an ordinary man coming out here with a family to depend on a few months work only in each year.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not altogether agree with my hon. friend. The business of our agent there is to give information in regard to all parts of Canada, and the immigrant then makes his own choice as to where he wishes to go. It might not suit some men to go to the Northwest to take up farms, and it might suit them, if they so please, to seek employment at farm labour in Ontario. I am aware that there is at the present time a very strong demand for farm labour in Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES. For the summer.

Mr. OLIVER. And in the dairying districts for the winter as well.

Mr. HUGHES. And then these fellows hang around the towns in the winter.

Mr. OLIVER. Very true.

Mr. HUGHES. Oshawa is an instance of it.

Mr. OLIVER. I am well aware of that. I do not think it would be taken very kindly by the people of Ontario if we made a business of advising men who might be desirous of entering upon farm labour not to go to Ontario. There are, I think, every year cheap excursions from Ontario to the west for the harvest season, and it seems to me that the fact that a man goes to Ontario to take employment there is no guarantee that he is not going west to take a free farm in due course. I do not find any fault with our agent in giving this man and his son such information as they desired, and which led them to go to Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES. They have not gone; I am sending them to Alberta.

Mr. OLIVER. I hope they will do well in Alberta.

Mr. JAMESON. I intend to move a couple of amendments to this section and I think that probably the minister will find that he will be able to adopt them, but before I do so I wish to say that I have no desire to be understood as obstructing this measure. There is an editorial in the Ottawa 'Free Press', of to-day, the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

> Should the obstruction continue the opposition must not complain if the suspicion gains ground that they are influenced by the shipping interests who are known to oppose the proposed new immigration regulations.

I presume this alludes to the discussion which took place when the hon. Minister of the Interior moved the second reading of this measure some days ago. Upon that occasion I was one of those who spoke. I spoke very briefly as did other members interested in this measure, and we did not take up any great amount of time. I do not think that three hours discussion on the second reading of an important measure of this character should be construed as obstruction, and I sincerely hope that this editorial paragraph which I have read was not in any way inspired by any member of the government. It would seem to me that when an important measure of this character is brought down it is not only the privilege of every member of this House to offer such suggestions as he believes to be in the public interest, but it is the duty of every man who is interested in the Bill to make such suggestions as in his opinion will advance the well being of the country, and the observations that were offered by myself, and other hon. gentlemen on that occasion were entirely along that line. I wish to say a word with regard to paragraph (a) of section 3, which has reference to prohibited classes. It reads:

> (a) Idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons and persons who have been insane within five years previous.

Shall be excluded. I wish to move an amendment that:

The word 'previous' be stricken out and that in lieu thereof there shall be inserted the words 'who had two or more attacks of insanity previously.'

I find that the American Act is very much along the lines, so far as prohibited classes are concerned, of this Act, and it seems to me that that would be a very proper addition to make to that section. There can be nothing objectionable in it. At a later stage I wish to move another amendment to section (d).

Mr. OLIVER. I would very much prefer that my hon. friend would not press his amendment. I am quite aware that it is contained in the United States Act, and while we have taken advantage of a good deal of the work that has been done in the drafting of the United States Act we have not found it advantageous to follow it in all particulars. The reason we do not follow it in this particular is that we desire to have the Act as clear as possible, so that it can be administered fairly to all parties. We think that if the prohibition with regard to insanity is fixed at a period of five years it is within a period that is capable of demonstration and proof on one side, or the other, whereas, if we accept the amendment that my hon. friend has suggested, and which speaks of two periods of insanity at any time in a person's life, there arises a difficulty in regard to the evidence on one side or the other that renders very difficult the administration of the law. I do not think it is really necessary that the provision should be such as my hon. friend has suggested, and I know that it would render the provision very much more difficult of fair administration. The great purpose we have in bringing in this Act before the House, and the country is that we may have something which will appeal to everybody as setting out a certain policy and as providing for a fair administration of that policy, an administration that everybody will understand, and that everybody will have a fair chance under, leaving as little as possible to the uncertainty of the law. For that reason I ask my hon. friend not to press his amendment.

Mr. BARKER. I do not see the difficulty of the minister. What the mover of the amendment asks is that a man who has been insane within five years of his attempt to enter into this Dominion shall be excluded. The word 'previous' is absolutely needless. It cannot refer to the future; it must be in the past. A man who within five years from the time of his coming to this country has been insane should be excluded. The minister admits that, and therefore it is unnecessary to put in the word 'previous'. The proposed amendment is this: 'or who had two or more attacks of insanity previously'. My hon. friend from Digby does not limit himself to a man who within five years has been insane, but if at any time during that man's life he can be proved to have been twice insane he shall be excluded. I cannot understand the objection to it.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JAMESON. I would propose an amendment to subsection (d) which reads:

Persons who have been convicted of any crime involving moral turpitude.

I hope the minister will adopt this suggestion because I think it is along the lines he had in mind when drafting this Bill, although it seems to have been overlooked in this instance. Again, I have borrowed somewhat from the American Act and I propose, in substitution of this section, as follows:

Persons who have been convicted of a felony or other crime or misdemeanour involving moral turpitude, polygamists, anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the government of Great Britain, of Canada, or other British colony, possession, or dependency, or any foreign government.

We have no need for such persons in this country, and they ought to be excluded. In section 41 the Bill provides for the removal or deportation from Canada of certain persons of this class, and it seems to me that if we are going to deport people who exhibit tendencies of that character, it would be but the part of prudence to prevent them from entering Canada. My amendment is drawn with that idea in view. I can see good reasons why this amendment should carry, and I cannot see any reason why it should not. I move it, seconded by Mr. Barker.

Mr. OLIVER. The law already in force in Canada is practically in the words of the present Bill, and I believe that the provisions are satisfactory and sufficient. That provision of the United States Act has not had the slightest effect in preventing the entrance into the United States of any of these persons, because knowledge of the fact with regard to them in this respect can only be obtained by the confession of the person himself, and if he wants to come into the country he is not likely to make that admission.

Mr. HUGHES. Can you exclude a polygamist under the present Canadian law?

Mr. OLIVER. He can be deported.

Mr. HUGHES. Who pays the cost of the deportation?

Mr. OLIVER. The transportation company who brought the person here. At

present we can deport him any time within two years, but the Bill makes it three years, and the transportation company which carried him here must take him back.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But the government has expended money for deportations.

Mr. OLIVER. That was in cases where it was not possible to establish that the person arrived by a certain transportation company.

Mr. HUGHES. If the undesirable immigrant were bagged at the port without being allowed to land, you would get over that difficulty.

Mr. OLIVER. That is true.

Mr. BARKER. The minister uses the somewhat extraordinary argument that if an anarchist is admitted they will deport him, but if they know he is coming in they will let him in and deport him afterwards.

Amendment (Mr. Jameson) negatived.

Mr. OLIVER. I move that the following be added as paragraph 'I.'

Persons who do not fulfil or comply with the conditions or requirements of any regulations which for the time being are in force and applicable to such persons under sections 37 or 38 of this Act.

The section provides that regulations shall be passed by the Governor in Council with respect to persons mentioned in sections 37 and 38 as among the prohibited classes, and this puts it in the statute. I wish to put as much as we can on the face of the Act.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think the regulations would be just as effective without this, but I believe in the principle of incorporating it in the statute.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. OLIVER. This is a provision of the Australian Act. I need not enlarge on the difficulties of administering an immigrant exclusion provision. These provisons must be strong if they are to be of any value at all, and if we make them strong there necessarily will arise from time to time exceptional cases, so that without such a provision as this the law might work contrary to what is considered to be in the public interest. In Australia they found it desirable to give authority to the minister, who is responsible, to make an exception, and we have thought it would tend to perhaps do away with instances of difficulties which would seem to discredit the drastic provisions of the Act if he had this power.

Mr. HUGHES. There will be a record of all such cases?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

On section 5,

The Governor in Council may appoint a superintendent of immigration, commissioners of immigration, and such other officers as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any stipulated salary attached to each of these positions?

Mr. OLIVER. We have a general scale of salaries, but no statutory provision.

Mr. SPROULE. Do these agents, who are employed at Ottawa, come under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

On section 10,

Every officer appointed under this Act shall have the authority and power of a special constable to enforce any of the provisions of this Act relating to the arrest, detention or deportation of immigrants, aliens or other persons.

Mr. U. WILSON. Why should a constable have the power to deport?

Mr. OLIVER. He has not the power to deport, but has authority to use force in restraining or compelling detention or the movements of people under deportation.

On section 12,

For the preservation of the peace, and in order that arrests may be made for offences against the laws of Canada, or of any province or municipality thereof, wherein the various immigrant stations are located, the officers in charge of such immigrant stations, as occasion may require, shall admit therein any constables or other peace officers charged with the enforcement of such laws; and for the purposes of this section the authority of such officers and the jurisdiction of the local courts shall extend over such immigrant stations.

Mr. BARKER. Why do you want the word 'peace' in line 6?

Mr. OLIVER. We borrowed this section from the United States Act, and have followed the very wording of it.

Mr. BARKER. I think it would be stronger without the word 'peace.'

On section 13,

The minister may appoint three or more officers, of whom the immigration officer in charge shall be one, at any port of entry, to act as a permanent Board of Inquiry for the summary determination of all cases of immigrants or passengers seeking to enter Canada or detained for any cause under this Act.

Mr. U. WILSON. Where are the board of inquiry now established?

Mr. OLIVER. We have power to establish them, and we propose to do so, and the object is to do away with the arbitrary

methods of dealing with detention or deportation cases which prevails now. At present any action depends directly on the action of the superintendent, and we wish to have, as it were, courts of inquiry, the proceedings of which shall be of record.

Mr. U. WILSON. How many do you intend establishing?

Mr. OLIVER. We intend to have boards of inquiry at Halifax, St. John, Quebec and possibly at Montreal, and the principal ports on the Pacific coast.

Mr. HUGHES. What about the border points?

Mr. OLIVER. By the following section we have the same provision with regard to border points. Where there are not sufficient officers to constitute a board, we give authority to the one officer there who shall keep a record.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to know if the powers are to extend merely to investigation into the character of the immigrant and the mode of deportation and matters of the kind, or is it intended that the board is to have broader powers extending to the details of immigration generally? I think it would be worthy of consideration whether the board would be able to handle this matter better than having the work all in the hands of the minister, who is already overworked.

Mr. BARKER. I am not sure, but that, under section 13, the minister is encumbering the procedure unnecessarily. He has an officer at the port of landing, and all these proceedings are taken only in the event of a dispute as to that officer's action. If the minister sends two officers, in case of a protest against the port officers' ruling there may be a further dispute. If he were to send down one competent officer, and that officer agreed with the port officer, that should settle the matter. But, in case of difference, there could be such appeal as the minister provides.

Mr. OLIVER. Our object is to give the person who is the subject of detention an opportunity to present his case, to give him, so to speak, a fair trial, rather than, as at present, the department takes the responsibility of an arbitrary action without a form of trial.

Mr. BARKER. It is clear that the minister is trying to afford the immigrant—an appeal. But, in the case of a difference between the port officer, and the special officer of the department, why not have an appeal at once to the minister. You do not add anything to the advantage of the immigrant by sending two men. If you send one officer, and there is a difference of opinion between him, and the port officer the immigrant would have an appeal to the department.

Mr. OLIVER. That is true. Still, I should think that if there were a board of three, and two decided against the immigrant, he would be more apt to accept the decision of the two against one, than if it were a decision upon which the two differed.

Mr. BARKER. Still more, if you made it four against five.

Mr. HERRON. I would ask the minister to answer the question I mentioned a moment ago. Under the clause the operation of this board would extend merely to detention and deporting of immigrants. But has the minister taken into consideration the extension of the power of this board to the whole system, so that a board whose members shall devote their whole time to the work may deal with the whole range of immigration, thus relieving the minister of a great deal of work?

Mr. OLIVER. The provision of this Bill only looks to dealing with the administration of the Act at the port of landing. The suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Herron), goes very much further than that. We have not made any provision in the Act looking to that end.

Mr. OLIVER. For the reasons I gave in a previous case I ask that the words 'and persons who have Canadian domicile' be inserted after the word 'citizen' in the second to the last line.

Mr. BARKER. You mean, I suppose, a British subject having domicile?

Mr. OLIVER. Any person who has acquired Canadian domicile by residing in Canada for three years would have the right to come back if he once went away.

Mr. JAMESON. What is a Canadian citizen as distinguished from a British subject?

Mr. OLIVER. We want a definition that will show the distinction between a Canadian and a British subject who is not a Canadian, and we use the words 'Canadian citizen' for that purpose.

Mr. JAMESON. Then British subjects are not permitted to land in Canada as a matter of right?

Mr. OLIVER. No, not because he is a British subject. He has to be either a Canadian citizen or he must have Canadian domicile before he can land in Canada as a matter of right.

On section 23, jurisdiction of courts in cases of rejection and deportation restricted.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a new provision. It has been considered by the Justice Department so far as its form is concerned, but the policy of the section is a matter for the consideration of parliament. The Justice Department says that we have a legal right to pass such a section.

On section 25, passengers to be landed only at places designated by officer in charge—penalty for infraction,

Mr. BARKER. Who imposes that fine?

Mr. OLIVER. There is a provision in the latter part of the Bill.

Mr. JAMESON. Why is the very great latitude between the fine of $20 and $1,000 allowed?

Mr. OLIVER. It would depend on whether the Act was done with intent or with malice aforethought. There are possibilities in the case of steamers deliberately allowing prohibited passengers to get off at points where they would avoid detection and exclusion by our officers, and it is very necessary that there should be the power of a very drastic procedure in such cases. There are people who are prohibited from coming into Canada except on payment of a very high fee, and there is a great deal of money involved in the landing of such people free of charge. It is, therefore necessary that the punishment should be severe. If two Chinamen were landed outside the regular port of entry the saving would amount to this fine.

Mr. JAMESON. I am not objecting to the maximum, but I think the minimum is too low. It might be that it would be to the advantage of some transportation companies to be a little lax in their supervision of the landing of passengers because the passage money might exceed the amount of the possible penalty. My own observation in cases of this sort has been that as a rule the minimum and not the maximum penalty is applied. I do not know how the minister intends to have these new sections carried out. I suppose it will largely depend upon the instructions as to what the fines exacted shall be, but in my own experience I have found that the minimum fine is usually collected, and I think that $20 is too small.

Mr. LENNOX. This is intended to be the penalty with respect to each individual that shall be landed?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. It should be applied to each individual who is landed.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I would think it would be in each individual case, but this is not absolutely clear.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. LENNOX. I would move that after the word 'dollars' in line 32 the words 'in respect of each such passenger or person' be inserted, and that the words 'in each case' in line 31 be struck out.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. As we have made considerable progress, would it not be proper to rise and report progress and then let us adjourn?

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What will we take up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We will take up several of the minor Bills on the order paper that are likely to occupy the whole day.

Mr. U. WILSON. Will we go on with this Bill?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and then we will take up some of the minor Bills.

Mr. U. WILSON. This will be taken up first?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 22, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE LUMSDEN CHARGES.

Mr. LENNOX moved:

That the fourth report of the Special Committee appointed to investigate the charges and allegations made by Hugh D. Lumsden against a portion of the engineering staff of the National Transcontinental railway be taken into consideration on the 31st instant.

He said: I would suggest this date if it is convenient to the leader of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Quite so.

Motion agreed to.

ST. CLAIR RIVER SAND.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to bring to the attention of the government, especially the Minister of Public Works, a complaint made by the people in the western part of the province of Ontario in regard to the lease by the government of Ontario of the privilege of

taking sand and gravel from the Detroit river, or rather the River St. Clair, which is an international stream. That privilege has been granted for five years to a Detroit concern over a district running from the Indian reserve to the head of Point Edward, and comprising some 2,025 acres. Heretofore it has been the custom of the people of Sarnia, Wallaceburg, Dresden and other places desiring sand, to go to the neighbourhood and take it. They find now that before they can get any sand they have to pay a royalty to this Detroit concern, without whose consent they are not able to avail themselves of this public property. A great deal of feeling amounting to indignation has been aroused over the matter, and it seems to me that by reason of the interest which the Dominion has in a stream of this character, some action might be taken by this government to protect the rights of the people of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad that my hon. friend has brought up this very important matter. I may say that my attention has been already called to it by persons who complain of this exclusive right being granted by the government of Ontario to the company to which my hon. friend refers. Of course, if the sole right to the bed of the river is vested in the Ontario government, it would be impossible for the Department of Public Works to take action unless the operations of the company might be injurious to navigation. I am rather inclined to think that is the case, because a company dredging simply for the purpose of taking out sand would not be likely to have very much regard to navigation, and the result would be that deep holes would be left in certain parts of the river, which would prevent proper anchorage, and in other respects might be injurious to navigation. I may say to my hon. friend that I will have the matter looked into, and will see whether it is possible or desirable that action should be taken by the Department of Public Works in the matter.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee, on Bill (No. 102), respecting immigration—Mr. Oliver.

On section 26, bill of health,

Mr. JAMESON. If the minister will permit me to refer back to section 3, I would like to ask him if he thinks that the words 'persons afflicted with loathsome diseases, or with disease that is contagious, or infectious, or which may become dangerous to the public health,' would cover tuberculosis? I see, by the amended immigration regulations of the United States, adopted in 1907, that while they have made provision practically along the lines which the minister has followed in this Bill, they have expressly included tuberculosis. If the hon. minister thinks this clause will cover that point, I suppose there is no necessity to make an amendment, but otherwise, it would be well to consider the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. I may say that the matter was considered when we were drafting the Bill. Our view was that tuberculosis is such an insidious disease that if we mentioned it by name, and specifically included tuberculous people among the prohibited classes, the provision might be used to work unnecessary hardship, whereas the section, in its present shape, is sufficiently operative in cases where the disease is so developed that there can be no question about its existence. In such cases, the immigrant may be excluded under it. But if we were to include the word 'tuberculosis' in the section, it would cover cases which might show a tubercular tendency or a tubercular condition which it would not be right to exclude on that account. By leaving the section as it is, if the disease has reached such a stage as to be a danger to public health, the patient can be excluded.

Mr. JAMESON. As long as the minister thinks the section sufficiently broad to cover cases of tuberculosis, and the officers of his department are so instructed, I shall be perfectly satisfied, but I hope that the minister's view will be understood, because it is very important that we should guard against the introduction of that loathsome, and most deadly disease.

Mr. OLIVER. This provision is practically identical with that in the Act to-day, and which is operated under the interpretation I have given. We employ the section for the purpose of excluding patients who are evidently tubercular and whose condition is such as to constitute a public danger.

On section 28,

Medical officers appointed under this Act shall make a physical and mental examination of all immigrants and passengers seeking to land in Canada from any ship or vessel, except in the case of Canadian citizens. Such examination shall be made in accordance with and subject to regulations prescribed by the superintendent of immigration under the direction or with the approval of the minister.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the hon. minister contemplate having any examination of intended immigrants at the port of embarkation? I have alluded several times to the United States regulations, and I do not wish to unduly bring them into this discussion, but it does seem to me that, with

their very long experience, they ought to be in a position to know what is required. I find that, according to the provisions of their Act of March 3, 1893, they require the shipmasters to furnish a list of all passengers, and that the passengers shall be examined by the master of the ship or its surgeon at the port of embarkation. If that be not done, they are liable to heavy punishment—both the master and the ship owners. When the Bill before us was under discussion on its second reading, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) made a suggestion along this line, and I do not know whether the minister said that any regulations of that character would be enforced. But it seems to me such a regulation would relieve in a large measure the pressure on the officers on this side. I should like to have the minister's views.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 26 might be utilized to require the information which my hon. friend has suggested, but our view is that we cannot accept any inspection by any person who is not responsible directly to us, and therefore we have not provided for any examination. Section 26, however, would enable us to require the master to give us the information on the manifest. That, however, is a question of detail, and not of principle. Our principle is that the examination made by the officers responsible to us is the only one we can recognize. In that way we place the responsibility absolutely on the steamship company. If the company take passengers who do not meet the requirements of our law, they have to take them back, and the responsibility is theirs, not ours.

Mr. PAQUET. This section concerning inspection is perhaps the most important of all. What we should insist on is moral, physical and mental inspection.

Persons who have been convicted of any crime should not be permitted to land in Canada. In that connection, I express the opinion, founded on the statement of Mr. Scott, that we should provide for the moral examination of the immigrants on the other side. Whoever intends to settle in our country should be the holder of a certificate stating that he has committed no crime. This certificate might be issued by a magistrate, by the clerk of a court of justice, or by a clergyman. Let us insert a similar test in our legislation, and we shall have at our disposal a further means of keeping away undesirable immigrants. On the twenty-first of April, 1909, in the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Monk put this question to Mr. Scott: 'What objections do you see to it if the immigrant should hand to the examining authority on the other side that document which would show that the immigrant is not a criminal?'

Mr. JAMESON.

And Mr. Scott said: 'I would have no objections.'

I desire to make another suggestion. The ideal system would consist in a medical examination performed on board ship by a Canadian physician, appointed and paid by the Department of the Interior. He would be permitted to take the necessary time to make an inspection of a very scientific character.

You will allow me to make a few remarks concerning the medical inspection of immigrants at Quebec. Dr. Pagé has thoroughly organized the system of medical inspectors at that place. Those having any experience in the practice of medicine know how difficult it sometimes is, to discover mental disease. The physician is obliged to make long and repeated examinations. I think Dr. Burgess, medical superintendent of Verdun Asylum, is right when he says:

But, apart from the question of heredity, there is another and more remediable cause for the rapid increase in our asylum population, namely, the defective class of immigrants being dumped upon our shores. That a country so vast as ours should be more densely peopled is 'a consummation devoutly to be wished,' but the question of number should be secondary to that of character, and quite a large proportion of the immigrants brought in are of a low standard of mentality, some of them even having been inmates of asylums before coming to this country. In our own establishment, of the admissions since its opening, over forty per cent have been of foreign birth, and there are in residence at the present time not a few patients, who, if subjected to any proper examination, would never have been allowed to set foot in the country. The new Immigration Act, assented to in July, 1906, by which an immigrant probationary period in this country was extended to two years, has certainly been a great help toward reducing the number of undesirables foisted upon us, and by its aid we were able last year to bring about the deportation of some fourteen patients. There are, however, still resident no less than eleven persons whom we are morally certain come within the provisions of the Act, but in regard to whom we have been able to get no positive proof that such is the case. Insane, they are unable or unwilling to give any reliable information about themselves, and friendless, we have no one to whom to apply for it. This fact alone proves the crying need for a much stricter examination of every alien seeking our shores. All persons wishing to emigrate to Canada should be rigidly examined by liberally salaried medical officers appointed by the Dominion government, before being allowed to embark, and should furnish proof that they have never been insane or epileptic, and that their parents have never been affected with such diseases. The examining medical officer should be held strictly accountable for the mental calibre of the applicants for emigration passed by him.

I hope the minister will be able to go along these lines. I believe this Bill is a

step in advance. I would like a perfect Bill, and I believe that there is room for great improvement, even upon the present legislation. The government would be accomplishing a progressive work should they appoint a commissioner with power to investigate in order to enlighten the legislators of this country with regard to this great question of immigration.

Mr. OLIVER. In reply to the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Paquet) that there should be a moral examination of the immigrant before he leaves his own country, I would point out that, while that would be possible in the case of immigrants from the continent of Europe, it seems to me it would be either difficult or ineffective in the case of immigrants coming from the British islands. On the continent there is a general system of supervision of the people; a record is kept of every individual. Consequently, as I have suggested, it would be possible, in the case of immigrants from the continent of Europe to arrive at a very fair idea as to their conduct by such a scheme of investigation as my hon. friend suggests without unduly and unreasonably hampering the immigration movement. But I fear that, in the case of British immigrants who come from a country where there is no such system of keeping records of individuals, the result would be to hamper desirable immigration to a degree that would be beyond the benefit that we should derive. The deportation provisions of our Act are, I think, reasonably effective in getting rid of the morally unfit. That is the purpose, at any rate. And I think that the purpose is fairly served. So that, when an immigrant arrives in Canada, if we find within a reasonable time that he is morally unfit, we can, under the Act, return him to the country from whence he came at a minimum of expense to Canada. This fact —that they can be returned and that the expense of return has to be borne by the transportation company, and the effect of failure by the unfortunate person who is deported—seems to me to be a fair deterrent. I think the House will find, as we work along the lines of our present Immigration Act, that the effect will be to restrict the coming of the undesirables through the knowledge that if they come they can and will be sent back.

As to the suggestion that there should be a medical examination on board the ship on the way out, I quite appreciate the great advantage there would be in adopting such a plan. Certainly, it would give an opportunity for physical examination which does not exist in the rush and hurry that occurs in the landing at the ocean port. But, on the other hand, there would have to be considered the very large expense that would be involved in making such an examination as is proposed. But, if the matter is fairly examined, and if the immigrants who came last year and those who are coming this year be considered rather than those who came years ago before we put in force the restrictive and selective provisions of the Act under a selective and restrictive policy, I think it will be found that the conditions are not such as would reasonably require the additional expense that would be involved in my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not quite understand what rule the minister follows. At many of these points where immigrants arrive, he has physicians to examine them, and I suppose they also see at the same time that the immigrants fulfil the law in other respects. At many other important points his officials are not medical men, and therefore are not in a position to judge whether the immigrants are proper persons to allow into this country. As long as they have the necessary funds, which I think is $25 each, the immigration officers allow them to come into this country. They may be persons who are not altogether mentally right, and yet these officers are not qualified to judge, and therefore undesirables are allowed in. As an instance, take Sault Ste. Marie, where the minister stations medical men to examine immigrants coming in. But opposite my own town there is no medical officer. There are men there acting as immigration agents, and I am not saying anything against them, they are all good men. But how are they to decide whether a person is fit to come into this country? As long as they have the funds they are allowed to come in. There are other cases where I think this immigration law is violated, and the minister knows it; it is violated on account of the kind of officers he appoints. We all know that it is not very long ago when thousands of Japanese were allowed to come in at Vancouver. After one immigrant was allowed in with $25, he handed that money over to another one who is also allowed in, and so they kept the thing going on, and the official allowed immigrants in who were not able to comply with the law. We had another case at Halifax or St. John, where one of the minister's officers was letting in immigrants that were diseased, and that were certainly not the proper kind of citizens to allow into this country. But he was allowing them to come in and getting a rake-off for doing so. In that case all the minister did was to dismiss this official—at least I think he did, but he did not prosecute him for violating the law; and the result is that the next man he appoints is probably doing the same thing. But that is not the only case. There is a case before the public at Quebec to-day where an official appointed by the minister himself has been,

I understand, allowing these people to come in, though they have violated the law; he allowed a lot of them to come in that had not the necessary funds. The way they do it is a contractor will go down and hand the men the $25, and then they are allowed in and remain here as citizens. Yet the minister pays no attention to that. People can get into this country, no matter whether they have $25, or whether they are filled with tuberculosis, or anything else, because of the class of men the minister has acting as inspectors. When I read of these things taking place at Vancouver, at St. John, and at Quebec, and the minister paying no attention to them, I think it is time the people should rise and rebel against the kind of officials he puts there to carry out the inspection law.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not in mind all the instances my hon. friend has mentioned, and cannot reply as exactly as I would wish. He mentioned one case where thousands of Japanese, he says, were allowed to come in at Vancouver; and he placed the responsibility upon the immigration official at that place. My hon. friend is entirely in error. At that time the law did not permit the agent at Vancouver to prevent these people from coming in, nor was he able to prevent them until, as I mentioned last night in reply to the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), we got legislation which enabled us to put up a barrier against undesirables, then no more of them came in, and I think we have the same agent.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did not each one have to have $25?

Mr. OLIVER. Not at that time. In regard to general incompetence or improprieties on the part of the immigration agents, I may say to the hon. gentleman that we have to guard a frontier of 3,000 miles, with ports on both oceans, and it is not reasonable to suppose that we can always get a perfect or entirely satisfactory agent. When the people of Canada all become angels, then that will be possible, but not before. I am glad to know, however, that those officials my hon. friend is most acquainted with, those whom he sees most frequently he has no fault to find with. Now, I beg to say to my hon. friend that the minister is sitting in his place in the House, and no one in the House I am sure would find fault with him more quickly than my hon. friend if the minister were not in his place. The minister is in his place in the House. I beg to assure my hon. friend that complaints in regard to the conduct of any particular officers in any part of the country receive prompt attention, and justice is done as we understand justice in the matter. We do not claim perfection for the head of the Immigration Department or for any of its officers or officials, but we do claim that both officers and officials average up fairly with the rest of the community.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think the minister deals out justice to his officials as he says. I remember a case in the minister's department up in his own city of Edmonton, where one of his officials was found guilty of stealing money from immigrants, and he was put in jail. The minister paid his salary while he was in jail, and after he got out he increased his salary, and still keeps him as an official in his department. That is the way he deals out justice to his officials. He still has that official in Vancouver. I was surprised to hear him state that he had kept on this official at St. John. Then there has been a complaint against an agent at Quebec that he allows a contractor to go down and pay all the men $25 so that they can put it in their pockets and walk past the inspectors and then hand the money back to him again. That is how the minister deals out justice, a man who commits an offence is promoted and that is the kind of officials he has in many of these places along the frontier. Of course in my county they are good officials because you cannot get any but good men there, but when you go to Edmonton, and some of these places you get men of the class I have mentioned. I do not find fault with the minister, there are other departments where the same thing is done. At Sorel an official robbed the country by padding the pay-lists, and the Prime Minister had him removed to his county with a larger salary, that was a man named Roy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the Prime Minister has forgotten——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are all good in my constituency.

Mr. J. D. REID. —if he looks it up he will find that what I say is true. Another immigration agent of the Minister of the Interior, is Jackson, who was guilty of all the election frauds in South Oxford. He was sent to England as an immigration agent. It is with the class of immigration agents I find fault. I hope that when the minister is appointing any more agents, if he cannot get good ones in the constituencies where they are to be employed, he will come to my constituency where he will find good men who will do what is right if they are given the opportunity.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not able to follow all the hon. gentleman's statements but if they are all as incorrect as two I happened to catch, his criticism is not very damaging. He mentioned an instance of an

official of the Immigration Department in the west who was sent to jail for stealing from immigrants, and said that the minister paid his salary while he was in jail, and promoted him on his release. If the man mentioned is Wagner, whose case was up before this House on several occasions, I was not the minister at the time Mr. Wagner got into jail, and I have every reason to believe that he did not get any salary while in jail, nor was he promoted while in jail, nor was he employed by the department when he came out of jail, nor for a considerable time afterwards.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he employed now?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and giving every satisfaction. The man Jackson, whom my hon. friend has mentioned, is not in the employ of the Department of the Interior in any capacity whatever. As to the other statements my hon. friend has made, if he will become definite rather than incoherent, and will give us the instances by name and date, and place, I will guarantee him that every means will be taken to see that justice is done.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think it is well to do that any further than I have. I have mentioned the agent at Quebec. The trouble is that if the minister investigates that case the result will be that the offender will get a better position, and the country will have to pay more. The best thing we can do is to let him stay there until this party gets into power, when we can put a good man in his place.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister would not say that Jackson is not in the employ of the government. It is true he is not in the employ of the Department of the Interior, but it is well known that Jackson, who took an active part in the election trial in South Oxford, was appointed to an important position by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce defended his appointment in this House in a general discussion some years ago.

Mr. U. WILSON. I would again call attention to the desirability of having a doctor on board each ship that brings immigrants to Canada so as to thoroughly examine them on the voyage. I think that is particularly desirable because while we cannot prevent them getting on the ship, as the minister has no authority in a foreign country, the doctor would certainly have plenty of time on the voyage across the ocean to make investigation and report, and then permission to land might be refused to undesirables. We are passing a stringent law and ought to do everything we can to enforce it.

Mr. OLIVER. I have already spoken on that point. There is no doubt the method suggested would give opportunities for medical examination that we have not now, but it would also greatly increase the expenditure, and if we are to judge of the efficiency of the present law, and administration by the immigration of the present as compared with that of past years, it will be generally agreed that it is not necessary in the interests of a proper selective policy to make that expenditure. If it should appear from the experience of this year that it is necessary, I will be very glad to consider the proposition favourably, but it is my desire to keep the necessarily heavy expense of administering the immigration law as low as possible consistent with efficiency. I believe that with the campaign we are now making, with the warnings that we give, and with the attitude we have assumed towards the transportation companies, placing the responsibility on them, that we are in a very good position in regard to the exclusion of undesirables from Canada.

Mr. U. WILSON. I suggested the other day a method of furnishing the money without largely increasing the expenditure. I have been opposed for some years to the bonusing system, giving agents one pound for every man or woman that they send to this country. I think that is altogether unnecessary. In a recent speech the president of the New York Central railway told the people of the United States that unless they greatly increased the productiveness of their farms they would within five years be importing breadstuffs to feed their own people, and he added that it was desirable that experimental farms should be established in every county and every state of the union. If that be true, then the American people will shortly have to come to us for their foodstuffs, and in that light the giving of 160 acres of land free is quite an inducement to immigrants to come to Canada, without donating a bonus to some smooth-tongued agent who often induces undesirables to come to this country.

Mr. OLIVER. The bonus is only paid in respect of immigrants who will settle on the land—and to female domestic servants —whose presence in Canada may reasonably be expected to increase the production and productiveness of our land. It is true that the offer of 160 acres of free land is a wonderfully good offer, but it is no use unless people know about it, and we pay the $5 bonus to the booking agent on the ticket he sells to the farmer or farm labourer in order to advertise to them the offer that Canada makes. Our bonus policy is part of our advertising policy, and I believe we get more direct and indirect value from it than from any other part of our immigration expenditure. It is not correct to say that the bonus is paid in any way to induce the immigration of people of

Canada other than those who will go on the land or go into domestic service.

Mr. U. WILSON. I have been somewhat interested in this question, and I had supposed that from the number of immigrants of the farming class upon whom we are paying a bonus, that fully two-thirds of the population of the new provinces would be foreigners. I was surprised, however, to find by a recent report that of 808,000 people there in 1906, 444,000 were Canadian born. About one-half the population of Winnipeg are foreigners, and where are all these men gone to that you would expect to find in the rural districts. I believe that everything possible should be done not only to induce foreigners, but to induce our own people to settle on the land, and I do not think the bonus is doing very much good. We expect to get immigrants from Great Britain, but out of the 44,000,000 population I find that less than 2,750,000 are settled on the land, and in view of that I do not see how we can expect to get farmers from Great Britain. I think the probability is that a large number of the settlers on whom we pay a bonus are taken from the cities rather than from the agricultural communities.

Mr. OLIVER. The very fact that the proportion of farm occupants in the old country is small and that the number of occupants of the cities is large, is the very reason why we give the bonus in order that the advantages of Canada may be brought to the attention of the agricultural population. The report of the homestead entries in the west shows that we have been successful in some measure. The number of people of British birth who have taken homestead entries in the northwest in the past ten years is ample evidence that whether the agricultural population of the British isles is large or small, we under our present policy, secure a very considerable share of them for Canada.

Mr. U. WILSON. They do not have to be farmers to take a homestead.

Mr. OLIVER. I know, but if they take homesteads and retain them they must become farmers. The evidence is plain in the northwest that our administration in that regard has not been by any means unsuccessful.

Mr. EDWARDS. Can the minister say what proportion of the immigrants come because of the solicitations of immigrant agents, and what proportion come voluntarily?

Mr. OLIVER. It would be impossible to answer that question. It is impossible, of course, to draw the line between the immigrant who has been personally met by the immigrant agent and solicited or the man who has come to Canada through the medium of the advertisements published by the agents, and the man who may have come without any of these inducements. But it will be plain to any one that at the present day, when all the world is open to the immigrant, the man from Great Britain who comes to Canada in preference to going to the United States, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa or any of the other British colonies, must have made his choice because of information received and very likely because of information contained in the various forms of advertising in Great Britain, for which the Immigration Department is more or less responsible.

Mr. WRIGHT. I will draw the minister's attention to the fact that when this matter was investigated a few years ago the statement was made in evidence that these steamship companies had formed a pool under which a certain percentage of all the immigrants was set apart for each steamship company, so that, without regard to the agents fixing the destination of the immigrants, so many were assigned to Canada, so many to New Zealand and so many to each of the other countries that were absorbing immigration, and the booking agents simply sold tickets and took toll for the steamship companies, and did not add to or take from the total volume of immigrants coming to this country. If that is true, the companies will have a certain interest in trying to school immigrants coming to this country, who pass through their hands, to become farmers. The only test given by the minister was the number of those who homesteaded in the west. He gives no information in regard to the number in eastern Canada. Many of these people who go out west and take up homesteads simply stay long enough to prove them up, and then sell out to some man from Ontario, the maritime provinces or Quebec, and drift into the cities, as they are not farmers and do not like farming. A number of years ago the same kind of people were attracted to the northern part of the province of Ontario by promises of free grants of land; but they did not stay long, the great bulk of them drifting into the cities. I think that much the same thing has happened in the west.

Mr. OLIVER. There is always in every country a movement from the country to the towns and cities. That is how the cities exist; it is because of that natural flow of population to them. Population never goes from the town to the country; it always goes from the country to the town. It is not only the British or continental immigrants, but it is the Canadian-born, the British-born, the continental-born and the United States-born on the farms who ultimately build up the towns. It would be nonsense to suggest that because British

immigrants come to Canada and take up land, therefore, neither they nor their children, nor their children's children would ever become residents of a town; but there is no difference whatever between the British immigrant and the Canadian-born citizen in that respect. If there is, it is rather in favour of the British immigrant and his children staying on the land rather than going to the town.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would point out that the settlers from Ontario and Quebec, as a rule are people from the rural portions of the country, farmers and farmers' sons. The people who come from the old land are city people. Under such conditions, there would certainly be a smaller proportion of young men from Ontario who would drift off to the cities than these city people who come from the motherland and who are not farmers.

Mr. OLIVER. I have lived in the northwest for a long time and have followed the trend of immigration, and so far as my knowledge and experience go, the British immigrant to the northwest stays on the land as well, or better, than the Canadian settler, one reason being that the towns in the west are Canadian, whereas the country districts are of mixed population. In regard to a steamship combine, there is no doubt one, but it operates in exactly the opposite way to which my hon. friend supposes. Instead of the companies dividing the actual transportation of the immigrants among themselves, they each get their share of the total proceeds of the passage money, no matter to what country the immigrant goes. So that it becomes a matter of indifference to the steamship company where the immigrant goes so long as he goes somewhere. Under these circumstances, it is all the more necessary, if Canada is to get immigrants of a desirable class, that we should take means to place the advantages of this country before them.

Mr. WRIGHT. According to the minister's own admission, it is not likely that any steamship company will exert itself to bring immigrants to Canada when it has to turn over a portion of the profits to some steamship company that does not carry them at all.

Mr. BLAIN. When the hon. gentleman introduced this Bill, I put this question to him:

> Is there a demand from any part of Canada to abolish altogether assisted immigration?
>
> Mr. OLIVER. There is no assisted immigration into Canada so far as this government is concerned. I know of no demand to abolish that which in this case does not exist.

I think that was hardly an answer to my question, and I find from the discussion now, as I knew at the time, that there is a great deal of money expended by this government, which in reality is for assisted immigration. My hon. friend has pointed out that they paid bonuses upon farm labourers, and domestic servants, so that I do not quite see how he came to make the statement he did.

Mr. OLIVER. Apparently my hon. friend and myself hold different views as to the meaning of the term 'assisted immigration.' I understand it to mean assistance given to the immigrant personally to come to Canada. I replied that we gave no such assistance. I believe that at one time there was some assistance given to immigrants. There was a money payment made to them after they had taken up homesteads in the west.

Mr. U. WILSON. Do you remember the date?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot. It was a long time ago, and it did not last very long.

Mr. BLAIN. More than twenty years ago?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not recollect the date, but there was a time when there was a direct payment to the immigrants. That, however, has not been the policy of this government. It is absolutely contrary to our policy that any part of the passage money or expenses of an immigrant should be paid in order to enable him to come to Canada.

Mr. HUGHES. The assistance is given the steamship companies.

Mr. OLIVER. No. There was a time when assistance was given these companies, but that time has gone by, and now our money is spent entirely in advertising the advantages of Canada. If that be assisting immigration, then of course this government does assist immigration.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the bonus or assistance?

Mr. OLIVER. We do not assist the immigrant. There is a payment to the agent to recoup him for advertising in order to induce immigrants to buy their tickets from him. I draw a distinction between assisting, and inducing immigration. Our policy is to induce immigration by advertising the advantages of Canada. There is a distinction between that, and the policy of advancing money to enable immigrants to come to Canada. The latter is a policy which is now in vogue in Ontario, and I think British Columbia, as well. The governments of these provinces have seen fit to inaugurate a policy of what I would call 'assisted immigration.' We have not done anything of the kind. We spend many thousands of dollars in

advertising the advantages of Canada, but not one dollar is paid to any immigrant to bring him out.

Mr. WRIGHT. What proportion of the total immigration, and what classes are bonuses paid on?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not give the information. I am not sure that our returns are in such a shape that I could give it.

Mr. WRIGHT. As the department has spent a lot of money trying to reach these particular classes in Great Britain, and other countries, one would naturally suppose that these efforts would bear some fruit independent of any effort that might be put forth by the steamship booking agent; but I cannot help feeling that these agents take no other part than stand at the toll gate where people come to buy tickets, and get $5 in each case. I do not believe they are instrumental in bringing any immigrants to this country.

Mr. OLIVER. I believe my hon. friend's remark applies to some booking agents, but they are the agents who do very little booking. The booking agency business in the British Islands, and continental Europe is a special business, carried on the same as the grocery business, or any other. Every immigrant to Canada has to buy his ticket at a booking office. Just as in the case of other callings, some are enterprising, and some are not, and the booking agent who does a large business, makes money while the one who does a small business makes very little. The booking agent who is energetic and ambitious advertises to the public that he is a booking agent, and in addition the advantages of some country to which immigrants are likely to go, in order to induce them to buy their tickets from him instead of from his competitors. So that when Canada offers a bonus of $5 to these agents for bringing certain classes of immigrants to Canada, they advertise in the newspapers, and give lectures with the idea of getting the business. In that way we get ample returns in publicity for the money we spend, and in interesting the men to whom the immigrants must go to purchase their tickets. They are booking agents for every part of the world, and sell tickets to every part of the world. Everybody has heard of Cook's, for instance, who have booking agents everywhere, and sell tickets to everywhere. The result of our offering a bonus of $5 to the booking agents on tickets sold to agricultural people coming to Canada is that the booking agent advertises Canada, and particularly the agricultural advantages of Canada, because that is where the money is made. That is where we get some of our best advertising results. The Australian colonies are now waking up, and, I am sorry to say, are adopting our methods. But imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Besides, I do not think that anybody will suggest that our Australian cousins are lacking in enterprise or in good sense. They see what we have been successful in doing by this policy, and they have decided to follow it. It is true they are adding to it by a system of what I call assisted immigration. We are not doing that; we do not believe it is the best policy. We believe that the advantages which Canada offers are such that if they are brought to the attention of the people who are able to use these advantages, that is sufficient; and if we cannot get the people that way, we are content that they should go somewhere else.

Mr. WRIGHT. In criticising the minister in the efforts to promote immigration, I was merely pointing out that these booking agents seem to be not so much promoting immigration as taking toll from the immigrants who come to Canada. As to their advertising Canada and promoting the emigration of the class we desire, it is clear that the large population from which they can most easily draw is that of the towns. As the minister has pointed out, only a small proportion are those who are really on land. I am somewhat of the opinion that the booking agents convert a lot of those who pass through their hands into agriculturists—they have an interest in doing that. While I am on my feet, I would ask the minister if there is any person who looks after these booking agents to see if they are actually doing something to bring immigrants of the right class to Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. We have five salaried agents in England, two in Ireland and two in Scotland. Each of these agents has supervision of the booking agencies in a certain number of counties, and is expected to make visits to these booking agencies from time to time to see how they are carrying on their business. If we find that a booking agency is not doing our business in what we think a right and proper manner—if they are giving out improper advertising, misrepresenting the conditions in Canada or otherwise acting discreditably—we put them off the bonus list. Then, no matter to whom they sell tickets, we pay them no bonus. I think my hon. friend will agree that that has a fairly salutary effect.

Mr. WRIGHT. Do the salaried agents of the department make a proper report to the minister with regard to these booking agents? If so, I suppose that is included in the minister's report?

Mr. OLIVER. No, they are under the control of the Assistant Superintendent of Immigration in London. They receive their

orders direct from him, and make reports to him. These reports are not part of the records of the government on this side, so that I should not be able to bring them down. But the supervision of the booking agents is a part of their business, and I am satisfied that they attend to it. My hon. friend is entirely in error in thinking that the booking agents—the enterprising ones, I mean—do not spend money, and a great deal of money in directly advertising the advantages of Canada.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is there an age limit in regard to the immigrants for whom a bonus is paid to the booking agents?

Mr. OLIVER. My recollection is that the bonus on immigrants of 18 years or over is $5, and half the bonus is paid on those under 18. I do not give that as an absolutely definite answer. I can speak with greater definiteness on administrative matters when the estimates for immigration are under discussion, when I shall have the assistance of the immigration officer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the committee desire to discuss immigration questions generally, I am ready to accommodate myself to that desire. But, I may remind hon. members that the clause before the committee is that relating to medical examination of immigrants. I think that after this long general discussion, it would be better to come back to the clause before the committee.

Mr. S. SHARPE. On this subject of examination, what system of checking has the minister with regard to these immigrants? What is to prevent the booking agents making fraudulent returns as to the classes they book?

Mr. OLIVER. An account is kept between the booking agent and the London office on the basis of information received from this side. The booking agent claims a bonus on such-and-such a person. If the records here show that that person arrived and was of the agricultural class according to our information, authority is given to pay the bonus to the booking agent.

Mr. S. SHARPE. With such a good system, why does the minister restrict this bonus to a few agents? Why not offer it to any booking agent who will earn it, and so give Canada the benefit of the widest advertising?

Mr. OLIVER. This is open to any booking agents in Great Britain and Ireland except agents who may have shown by their actions that it is not desirable that we should do business with them. Prima facie every booking agent in the British Islands who has received a license to sell transportation in the British Islands is entitled to claim this bonus on fulfilling the conditions on which it is paid.

Mr. S. SHARPE. They are licensed by the imperial government?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Where is the inspection of the immigrants made?

Mr. OLIVER. At the port of landing.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. At no other place?

Mr. OLIVER. At no other place.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is the system we have always had?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The minister has no doubt noted in late American papers that about 4,000 have been deported from New York. Has he any idea of what their means of inspection is?

Mr. OLIVER. It is the same as ours, but it is much more elaborate.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would it not be far more satisfactory to have an officer inspect these immigrants on their way over? He could certainly make a far more thorough inspection. The minister will agree that it is impossible to make a thorough inspection of these immigrants as they are passing out of the boat, as I have seen it done at Halifax. I think they come out at the rate of five or six a minute. Why could not we have an officer on the boat all the way over who could make a thorough examination?

Mr. OLIVER. The only reason is the large expense. As I have already said, I think if we take the condition of the immigrants arriving this year since we have had our administration fairly tightened up, so to speak, and compare it with the condition last year, it will be found that our present system of inspection is fairly satisfactory. I think it would be generally agreed that really we do not require to go to the very large additional expense that would be involved in making the still more thorough medical inspection of immigrants that the hon. gentleman suggests. We have impressed the steamship companies very strongly that they cannot get undesirables through, and therefore they do not try to bring over undesirables as they have done in former years. Once they get that idea thoroughly grounded in their minds, we will have very little difficulty with undesirables. I may say that in some cases, in order to facilitate the work, we put a medical inspector on board the winter boat that calls at Halifax, and he inspects on that boat on its way to St. John. In the summer also, in the case of one of the steamship lines, we put on an inspector at Rimouski, and he inspects all the way to Quebec. That is not done on all the

lines, but we do it in connection with one of them. The system has its advantages, although it adds somewhat to the expense because it takes up more time of the medical officer, and it adds also to the expense of the steamship company, because we make them bear the cost of transportation.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Could the hon. gentleman say off-hand how much the medical inspection cost last year?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not. The committee will understand that questions of administration come up more pertinently when we are dealing with the estimates, at which time I would have the advantage of an officer of the department at hand to furnish me with facts and figures. But if it is desired, I can secure the information and present it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. One more question. I think all these ships bringing over immigrants have a medical inspector of their own on board, have they not?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why could not some arrangement be made with the ship's medical officer to inspect immigrants for the government?

Mr. OLIVER. I think I have had already occasion to say that we do not feel warranted in accepting the examination of the ship's physician when he would be responsible to the transportation company and not to us.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. I think the minister might try the experiment of putting a medical officer on one or two of those boats next summer, and let him report, not only in regard to the physical condition of these immigrants, but also obtain some idea of their object in coming over, whether they intend to become farmers, or farm labourers, or what they intend to do. I think the same medical officer who inspects them in regard to health could also ascertain a great many things about them in other respects, and make a report to the government that would be useful. I am satisfied it is impossible to make a proper examination of patients coming off the boats as they do at the present time, any medical man understands that. Take a case where the physician examines a man in the morning for tuberculosis, he examines him with a thermometer and perhaps finds the temperature normal, while in the evening that same patient might have a temperature of 102. I understand that the way the immigrants are examined is simply by looking at them. That certainly is not satisfactory, because it is quality and not quantity that we are looking for. I think the minister has improved the conditions a great deal, and I am sure he would like to improve them still further, but not being a medical man, he does not understand the difficulties. I am sure we are allowing in a great many diseased persons from abroad that could be kept out if we had an officer on board the vessel coming over. I agree that he should be responsible to this government. More than that, his report should be published in a blue-book so that members of parliament could read it. But it is utterly impossible properly to examine immigrants in the short time allowed the inspector. I have spent myself a whole day, from daylight to dark, examining eight or ten or fifteen patients, and been very busy. But here we find an officer putting through perhaps 500 persons in the same time. The thing is utterly absurd. I think the minister should try the experiment of putting a medical officer on one or two of those boats, it would not cost a great deal. I am sure if he did so the result would be so satisfactory that, notwithstanding the extra cost, he would continue the practice, and would also insist in getting other information about these immigrants. The physician could ascertain in regard to their moral standing by keeping his eyes and ears open, and he could learn a great deal about them which would enable him to judge whether they should be allowed in or not. I think he could be very busy the whole four or five days during the passage in examining the incoming immigrants.

Mr. EDWARDS. I certainly agree with the Minister of the Interior when he says that the physician who makes the medical examination on board should be under the authority of this government. The expense, of course, must be considered, but I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) is an excellent one, which could be carried out without very great expense. While I agree with the minister that it would not do to accept the examination of the ship's doctor, because he is not responsible to the government, and abandon the inspection by a medical officer on this side, it should be possible to have an arrangement for a comparatively small sum, with the ship's doctor, so that he could make a general inspection and give to our medical inspector a note of certain cases which would attract his attention, as calling for special examination.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not like to oppose my view to medical opinion, I do not take up that view of the matter. I do not often have to disagree with my own side of

the House, but I do not think it wise to have the medical officer of the ship either take upon himself to decide or to assist in deciding whether these people are fit immigrants. No man can serve two masters. A ship's doctor is employed by the shipping company and he cannot hold that office if he serves Canada in the capacity suggested.

Mr. BLACK. He would lose his job in 24 hours.

Mr. LENNOX. The shipping company is interested in forcing as many people into Canada as possible.

Mr. EDWARDS. But they are interested also in bringing in healthy ones, inasmuch as they are put to the expense of taking them back if they are not healthy.

Mr. LENNOX. That is true, but you are dealing not with people coming to the ship, but with people in the ship, and the question is whether they shall be allowed to enter Canada. It is to the interest of the ship's medical officer to sustain the company he is working for.

Mr. OLIVER. By section 26 of this Act we require that the master of the ship shall furnish the immigration officers a bill of health, certified by the ship's medical officer, giving particulars of the state of health of the people on the ship. That report is in the hands of our medical officer, as something to be taken into consideration.

Mr. PORTER. Are many immigrants who have been passed by the ship's doctor rejected by our officers and returned?

Mr. OLIVER. Hitherto we have really not had such a report from the ship's doctor.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the report of the ship's doctor refer more to contagious or infectious diseases?

Mr. OLIVER. This section will call upon him to give a statement as to the health of every passenger who is ill.

Mr. SPROULE. The ship's surgeon would only have cases of illness come under his notice when the patients applied to him for treatment. If we had a medical officer of our own on each of those vessels he could employ the time of the voyaye in going over all the passengers booked for Canada and examining them. Of course, with 800 or 900 passengers, he could not make a thorough examination, but he could make a better examination than is possible at the port of landing, where the inspection, in my judgment, is of a most cursory character. It is easy for many cases of disease, contagious or otherwise, to escape the observation of a medical officer who simply watches these people as they pass before him.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a good deal to be said in favour of that argument, but it is a matter of expense, and I am hopeful that under present methods it will be found not to be absolutely necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. The present methods are such that it is utterly impossible for any medical man, no matter how high in his profession, to acquire anything like an intelligent knowledge of the passengers. It may be dignified by calling it an examination, but that is about all.

Mr. JAMESON. In order to meet the point raised by the minister last night, he should add after the word 'citizen' in line 14, the words: 'and persons who have a Canadian domicile.'

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is all right.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 31, obligations of transportation companies,

Mr. SPROULE. How can you compel a railway company to build immigrant sheds?

Mr. OLIVER. In the United States they take the position that the transportation company is responsible for having brought an undesirable to the boundary and that the company should provide the accommodation necessary during the detention of that person at that point. I think that is a proper view of the matter. The transportation company should thoroughly understand the responsibility that rests upon it for the carriage of undesirable immigrants.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this section would compel them to provide accommodation for desirable immigrants as well as undesirable immigrants.

Mr. OLIVER. The intention of the provision in this clause is to require the company to provide accommodation for the detention only of persons held for examination as undesirables.

On section 33—landing of passengers,

Mr. JAMESON. In section 25 of the Bill, in case of a passenger leaving a vessel under certain circumstances contrary to the intention of the Act, the penalty is put at a maximum of $1,000 and a minimum of $20. In this section the penalty is put at a maximum of $500, and a minimum of $50. In the first instance it appears that the penalty applies merely to those who without any fault of their own perhaps allow passengers to escape or to land contrary to the law, while in the other case the

penalty applies to those who knowingly violate the law or permit it to be violated. It seems to me that there is a discrimination against the person who unwittingly allows passengers to land. Can the minister explain why this distinction is made?

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that when we amended section 25 we rather destroyed the symmetry of the Bill. I fancy that provision was intended to apply to the vessel; but we amended it to make it apply to the individual, which made the maximum penalty rather high. I would not be willing to make the maximum in that case the same as in this case.

Section 25 amended accordingly.

On subsection 9 of section 33,

9. Any transportation company or person interfering with an immigration officer in the performance of his duty under this Act, or knowingly and wilfully assisting in the escape of any person detained by an officer, or at an immigrant station, for any purpose under this Act, or giving false information to an officer, whereby such officer is induced to land or permit the landing of any person in Canada who otherwise would be refused landing for any cause under this Act or would be detained for examination, shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable to a fine of not more than five hundred dollars and not less than twenty dollars for each such offence.

Mr. JAMESON. Should not the minimum be raised to $50?

Mr. OLIVER. I think not. This is a case in which greater latitude might be allowed than in the preceding one. In subsection 8 it is desirable that the minimum should be fairly high.

Mr. JAMESON. I submit with all deference that no allowance should be made in favour of a person or company who interferes with an immigration officer in the performance of his duty. That is a serious offence and the penalty should be correspondingly serious. My observation has been that where there is a minimum, it is that which is imposed and not the maximum, and very often the fine is remitted or suspended pending good behaviour.

Mr. OLIVER. There are three offences included in this section. One is interfering, the other is assisting in the escape, and the third is giving wrong information. It seems to me that a penalty of $20 is sufficiently high in some instances of false information. When we try to cover three different classes in the one section, we should see that the penalty is fair in each case.

Mr. SPROULE. In clause 25 the failure of a company to comply with the regulation to prevent any passenger leaving the vessel at any time or place other than designated by the immigration officer 'shall be an offence against this Act and shall be punishable by a fine.' But in this subsection 9 we say 'shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine.' You make the one imperative and leave no chance whatever to escape, which would indicate that there must be some one who must prosecute, but in the other case it is optional.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am inclined to think that my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) is right in his contention. The case provided against in this subsection is similar to that of a man interfering with a constable or policeman who was trying to make an arrest. Persons who so interfere are treated as bad breakers of the law, and I do not see that those covered by this subsection should be treated with less strictness. You might have a mob who would be guilty of this offence, and they might say: It is only a matter of $20 in any event, let us teach this fellow a lesson not to interfere with our friends. There is no jail, and if no one identifies the parties, they pay nothing.

Mr. OLIVER. The imposition of the penalty is a matter for the discretion of the court. If we provide a fair minimum and maximum, we do all we can. We cannot convict and punish a man by legislation. All we can do is give the authority to the judge to do what he considers just.

Mr. LANCASTER. The first offence might be a very serious one, yet no magistrate will be likely to impose anything more than the minimum penalty for a first offence. Law breaking people know that. The average law breaker is as well posted in criminal law as the average lawyer. They do not expect to be mulcted more than the $20, and can raise that amount among themselves if so unlucky as to be identified.

I should be inclined to think that if any one interferes with an officer in the performance of his duty he ought not have the option of a fine. If an Ottawa policeman, having a prisoner in custody, or taking him under due warrant, and thus preserving the peace of the city was interfered with in thus discharging his duty, the judge would not let off with a fine the person who thus interfered. But in this case, the judge would be obliged to do so. I think it should be a jailing matter for a man to interfere with an immigration officer in the discharge of his duty.

Mr. MADDIN. It seems to me not wise to add confusion to the law as it stands. The Criminal Code provides for the punishment of parties interfering with public officers in the discharge of their duties. This section 9 adds confusion to the law. There is no good reason why a person guilty of the offence of interfering with an immigration officer should not come under the provisions of the Criminal Code. Subsection 29 of the interpretation clauses

of the code defines a public officer as follows.

'Public officer' includes any inland revenue or customs officer, officer of the army, navy, marine, military, R.N.W.M.P., or other officer engaged in enforcing the laws relating to the revenue, custom, trade or navigation of Canada.

This definition does not cover an immigration officer. But there is no reason why it should not. Is not the proper way, instead of enacting this subsection 9, to enlarge the definition in this subsection of the Criminal Code which I have just read. Under section 168 of the Criminal Code:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to ten years' imprisonment who resists or wilfully obstructs any public officer in the execution of his duty or any person acting in aid of such officer.

I do not think it will be suggested that an immigration officer is less a public officer than one of the Inland Revenue or the Northwest Mounted Police, or of any other administrative department of the government. Section 169 of the code enacts that:

Every one who resists or wilfully obstructs—

(a) any peace officer in the execution of his duty, or any person acting in aid of such officer . . . . is guilty of an offence punishable on indictment or on summary conviction, and liable, if convicted on indictment, to two years' imprisonment, and, on summary conviction before two justices, to six months' imprisonment with hard labour or to a fine of $100.

With regard to assault, section 296 enacts that every one is guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to two years' imprisonment who

Assaults any public or peace officer engaged in the execution of his duty, or any person acting in aid of such officer.

The very latest decision on the subject of interference with a public officer has been handed down by the King's Bench in Great Britain. The judges have gone so far as this: A local by-law was passed forbidding the operation of street cars beyond a certain speed limit. Constables were sent out to take observations of the running of these cars. Two of them took up positions at a measured mile apart with telephone communication between them. Some one who knew what they were doing sent word to the company, and the company instructed its motormen to run their cars between these points at a lower rate of speed than usual. This was held by the court to be obstructing an officer in the discharge of his duty. Why should we encumber our statute with a clause of this kind when we might bring these cases under the Criminal Code? If the present definition is not wide enough to cover officers of the Immigration Department let us amend it and keep our law uniform, and in proper shape.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Has the minister any idea how many immigrants are sent to the Winnipeg hospital?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not that information at hand, but I could get it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to have it. I understand that this government gives no assistance to that hospital.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a considerable vote every year for the Winnipeg hospital on that account. We think it is better to aid the Winnipeg hospital directly than to maintain a hospital of our own.

On section 37, immigrants may be required to possess prescribed amount of money.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a couple of amendments I would like to add to this section, so as to require that persons who claim to be tourists will have to have the same money qualification as immigrants. I think if a person claims to be a tourist he should have some money with him. I would ask that the words 'and tourists' be inserted after the word 'immigrants' in the third line; and again that the words 'or tourists' be inserted after the word 'immigrants' in the third line from the end. This will provide that in case a person claims to be a tourist and claims exemption from the restrictions of the law under that name, he shall at least have an amount of money with him equal to that required of an immigrant.

Mr. BURRELL. Is there any amount specified as a minimum under the Act?

Mr. OLIVER. Not under the Act. But under the Act an order in council has been passed which provides that the minimum is $25. But the money may be dispensed with provided the person is coming to work on a farm or is coming to the relatives who are mentioned in the order in council, who are willing and able to support him.

Mr. BURRELL. Is that the order in council passed two years ago?

Mr. OLIVER. No, that was not found altogether efficient, and we passed an order a few days ago which we think covers the ground better.

Mr. BURRELL. The first order was passed two years ago, was it not, that which prescribes a minimum amount?

Mr. OLIVER. That order was dated 11th September, 1908, and it prescribed a minimum amount of $25.

Mr. BURRELL. Was there not one in March or February of that year, when the

first order in council was passed dealing with this question?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I think the first order in council was put through in the fall of 1907. At any rate, the order in council that is now in force was passed within the last two or three weeks.

Mr. HERRON. Before the section passes I would like to read to the House an article, and ask the minister for an explanation. It is the statement of Mr. Bruce Walker, who I understand is the commissioner of immigration of Canada, who is in the United States at the present time. The statement was made in Chicago, and I am reading it from the 'Standard', of Strathmore, Alberta:

J. Bruce Walker, commissioner of immigration of Canada, made this statement recently at the Great Northern hotel in a discussion regarding modern methods of handling immigration. He said his country was benefiting by the mistakes of other nations, that it took care of all immigrants for one year and considered that heart, brain and brawn could be better interpreted than laws.

'The boundary line between Canada and the United States,' said Mr. Walker, 'is little more than a line between two states or two provinces. Our immigration laws are so similar that there is really a mere exchange of courtesies at the boundary, but once with our nation an immigrant becomes a ward of the government for a year. Once a newcomer enters the immigration area—that is Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—we care for him in sickness or distress, pay his doctor's bill, nurse him, rebuild his house if it burns and are responsible for his welfare. Why do we do it?—because it pays. We have found that the nearer the government comes to the immigrant the nearer the immigrant comes to the government. It makes him a better citizen. He feels that he has something better to depend on than even neighbours and friends. And from that feeling springs a regard for his adopted country that can be only likened to a man who adopts religion; he believes in it.'

The words 'drawing nearer' are familiar to most of us, but not in the context where they are found here. I would like to ask the minister if this statement of Mr. Bruce Walker is correct?

Mr. J. D. REID. When did he make this statement?

Mr. HERRON. I have not the date, it is only a piece of the paper that I have before me. I have brought this question to the attention of the government before, though perhaps not before the present minister. I have stated in this House that agents of the government have told me that they had instructions of this nature, and it has been denied by the minister. But I am still of the opinion that there is something in this statement, and I would like to hear what the minister has to say. At least, if the statement of Mr. Bruce Walker is not true, then I do not think he should be employed as representing this government in a foreign country; and if it is true, then I think it is very strange that foreign immigrants coming into this country should be treated in this manner. I do not see why an immigrant coming to this country should be treated in this way, nursed and protected as stated here, any more than a Canadian citizen or a man who would leave the eastern part of Canada, and go to one of the western provinces.

Mr. OLIVER. If Mr. Walker made the statements attributed to him he was, to put it mildly, mistaken. I cannot think he did make such statements, I believe he has been misreported or misrepresented in some way.

Mr. HERRON. This interview is apparently from Chicago.

Mr. OLIVER. If that is the authority for the statement I wish to say that the statement read is not true, and I will risk something in saying that Mr. Walker never made the statement.

Mr. J. D. REID. How do you know?

Mr. OLIVER. Because I know Mr. Walker, and I know he is not a man who would make a statement that is not true.

Mr. U. WILSON. An unfortunate circumstance occurred in London when Mr. Walker was assistant superintendent of immigration there. It will be remembered that we then got a lot of immigrants who were assisted by charitable organizations, and after it was all over Mr. Walker issued a circular criticising what had been done instead of finding it out at the time, and stopping it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Walker would be entitled to an increase in his salary for the good work he is doing on this line. How is it that immigrants from foreign countries are treated better than Canadians from the eastern provinces? I am inclined to think that Mr. Walker's statement must be true. Is it not a fact that the minister or his department looked after some Doukhobors when they were sick, and clothed them, and fed them, and is doing so at the present time?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what the department did in times past, but it is not doing so to-day.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did the minister not say that some of the Doukhobors whom I saw at Port Arthur are now in the insane asylum in his district?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say so, I gave the House to understand that this govern-

ment had nothing to do with these Doukhobors, the putting them in the insane asylum in jail or anywhere, that the matter was attended to by the provincial government.

Mr. J. D. REID. This carries out what Mr. Walker states, that the government brought these Doukhobors here, that they are looked after, clothed, and fed, and physicians provided to attend them. The only difference is that the provincial governments are looking after them, that the minister shunts the expense on the local governments. Is it that the government want to keep close to the immigrants coming into this country, that the immigrants have no politics, and the government want them to start out right? Young men from the eastern provinces have their politics fixed before they go there. I suppose that when the government want votes they take these Doukhobors out of the asylum as they did in my county when they wanted a few votes, they brought out the lunatics, and voted them. Just in the same way they can bring these fellows out, and vote them, and it pays the government to keep them in these ayslums for that purpose.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. This is a burning question with many people who have come to Canada, especially from the mother country. It is rumoured, and understood all over this country that if an immigrant comes here from a foreign country, a Doukhobor, or a Galician, or an American, he is taken hold of by this government, and treated in the most royal manner, quite in line with the article read. But, if the unfortunate immigrant happens to come from England, Scotland or Ireland, as soon as he lands here, all he gets is a swift kick and he is told to go about his business. He is not taken out west and furnished with beautiful farms and seed wheat free. The result is that a great many of these young men who have come from England to Canada are disillusioned, and to my mind, badly treated. Considering that the whole of the northwest was purchased and paid for by our fathers and grandfathers, the first people who should have a privilege are the sons of eastern Canada, and if there is any further favour to offer, it should be offered to people of our own flesh and blood. There is no use denying the fact that immigrants who have come from Great Britain have not been treated as well as those from foreign countries, such as the Galicians and Doukhobors. The reason for that must be that the government have some control over these foreigners when it came to election times, and that they know the people from the motherland can read and think for themselves. The article strikes at the root of a very serious question and implies a very serious charge, and the minister should see in future that so far as his department is concerned, even-handed justice should be dealt out to the people from all countries, and no special favours shown to the people who are not of our own blood.

Mr. OLIVER. I say most emphatically that it is, and always has been, the policy of the Immigration Department, so far as my knowledge of it is concerned, to deal fairly and equitably by all men It is true that there is no ban put upon a man by the Immigration Department because of his nationality, but it is not the less true that in the administration of the work of immigration, there is a preference shown, and properly shown, to the people of our own race. So far from my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) having justification for the statements he has given to the House, I will ask him or any other member of the House, or any person either in or out of the House, to produce any evidence that would in any way indicate the facts to be as he has stated. It is the policy of this government to secure the settlement of our vacant lands, and the improvement of our cultivated lands, by adding to our population those who will add to our citizenship, as well as to our labour. That is our policy, and in carrying out that policy we use due endeavour to secure the additions to our population from the people of our own blood, and when they come we treat them as they should be treated, and they are not the people who are complaining.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 152) to incorporate the Northern Quebec Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Turcotte.

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 171) respecting the Dominion Bank.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 172) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Black.

Bill (No. 168) respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 177) to incorporate the Morrisburg Ferry and Dock Company.—Mr. Broder.

Bill (No. 179) for the relief of Helena Mellor Fleming.—Mr Knowles

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 102) respecting immigration.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 37,

Regulations made by the Governor in Council under this Act may provide as a condition to permission to land in Canada that immigrants shall possess in their own right money to a prescribed minimum amount, which amount may vary according to the race, occupation or destination of such immigrant, and otherwise according to the circumstances; and may also provide that all persons coming to Canada directly or indirectly from countries which issue passports to persons leaving such countries shall produce such passport on demand of the immigration officer in charge before being allowed to land in Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. I move that in line 44 after the word 'immigrants' there be added the words 'and tourists,' and after the word 'immigrants' in line 46 there be added the words 'or tourists.'

Mr. U. WILSON. What is the object?

Mr. OLIVER. There may be people who will claim to be tourists as a means of avoiding some of the restrictions placed on immigrants. It is only right, if a person represents himself as a tourist, that he should have at least as much money as is required of an immigrant.

Mr. U. WILSON. I am willing to support any restriction which will lessen the possibilty of undesirables being admitted.

Mr. OLIVER. I move in amendment that after the word 'passports' in the first line on page 14 be inserted the words 'or penal certificates.' In Italy a certificate is issued to an emigrant, which is called a penal certificate. It does not follow that the person has been subjected to a penalty, but it is a certificate as to whether he has been or not; and we think that where such documents are issued by other countries, it is not unreasonable that we should require the immigrants to produce them. If an immigrant has not such a certificate, he will not be illegible. I move in amendment also that the same words be inserted after the word 'passports' in the second line, as well as in the first, on page 14.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 38,

The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order whenever he deems it necessary or expedient—

(a) prohibit the landing in Canada or at any specified port of entry in Canada of any immigrant who has come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from the country of which he is a native or naturalized citizen, and upon a through ticket purchased in that country.

Mr. OLIVER. It is suggested by the transportation companies that the words 'prepaid or partially prepaid in Canada' be added to the word 'country.' I do not think that the effect of the section will be injured in any way by the introduction of these words, and it is a provision which the transportation companies ask for.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. U. WILSON. I do not understand what is meant by 'partly prepaid.' How would that affect a person coming with a through ticket? I do not see how they could 'partly prepay' a ticket, and have a through ticket from the country in which they reside to their destination.

Mr. OLIVER. Take the case of the Canadian Pacific railway. They have a transportation route of their own from Liverpool or Antwerp to any point in Canada. They have arrangements for ticketing which take effect at interior points, both in the British islands and on the continent. Under their arrangements, a person in Canada who wishes to bring a friend from the continent or Great Britain, may buy a ticket from the Canadian Pacific railway office in Canada. The company is afraid that, unless these words are added, a person who came on such a ticket would be excluded.

Mr. U. WILSON. But what does 'partly prepaid' mean?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not clear on that point. I think that, in order to facilitate the business of the committee, and leave everything perfectly clear, it would be fair to simply make the amendment read 'or prepaid in Canada.'

Mr. SPROULE. But if the ticket is, let us say $20, and the Canadian Pacific railway reduce their portion by half, there is half practically prepaid in Canada. I do not see any difference between 'prepaid' and 'partly prepaid.'

Mr. U. WILSON. The difficulty I see is that the section requires the immigrant to have a through ticket from the place of starting to his destination. And a ticket bought in Canada would have to be a ticket of that kind. I do not see that 'partly prepaid' can do anything but cause confusion.

Mr. OLIVER. I move that the words 'or prepaid in Canada' be added after the word 'country' in subsection (a).

Amendment agreed to.

On section 38, subsection (c).

(c) prohibit for a stated period, or permanently, the landing in Canada, or the landing at any specified port of entry in Canada, of

immigrants belonging to any race deemed unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada, or of immigrants of any specified class, occupation or character.

Mr. U. WILSON. Perhaps the minister will tell us what he had in mind when he drew this clause. There must be some class to which it applies specially.

Mr. OLIVER. We have not, at the moment, any class particularly in mind, but we want to be in such a position that, should occasion arise, when public policy seems to demand it, we may have the power, on our responsibility as a government, to exclude people whom we consider undesirable. If this power is given to the government, then the government can be held responsible should there be a sudden influx of an undesirable class of people. We cannot tell at what time or under what circumstances there may be a sudden movement of people from one part of the world or another, and we want to be in a position to check it, should public policy demand such action.

Mr. U. WILSON. I thought this would refer probably to Japanese or some of these people with whom we had so much trouble before, and when the through ticket was the cause of it being made. Under this section, parties must come direct from their own country.

Mr. OLIVER. That is provided for under subsection (a). I understood the hon. member to ask with regard to subsection (c). Subsection (a) is exactly as my hon. friend has stated.

Mr. U. WILSON. And the other is the same.

Mr. OLIVER. No, subsection (c) is to give the government arbitrary power to prohibit the landing of any class of people. Suppose there was a sudden influx of people from some undesirable Asiatic or African country, we could, without ceremony, simply say: You cannot land.

Mr. BURRELL. Under section 38 the government is given wide powers, but I must say that I personally favour giving those wide powers. Of course, the minister sees that there are two broad aspects to this question of immigration—to encourage desirable settlers, and also to prohibit those who would be undesirable. We have to steer carefully—I suppose the minister is endeavouring to do it in this Bill—to avoid undue encouragement to those who would never make desirable citizens, and yet not to prohibit too harshly those who may desire to add to our population. We seem to be framing our laws a good deal along the lines of those of the United States. We know that in the earlier years immigration to the United States was practically unchecked. The civilization of the eastern states was strong enough to impose its character upon the larger part of the west. But the western states are filling up. They have received population from every part of the world, and they are experiencing difficulties and imposing checks. But their problems are not exactly the same as ours. Their lands are practically filled up, and they have not to tout for immigration. But we have our waste spaces which it is desirable to fill up with the right class of people. I offer apologies to the minister for speaking in this general way now. It would have been better to deal with these matters on the second reading of the Bill, but, unfortunately, I had no opportunity to do so. This Act on the whole certainly makes for progress along the right line. But I may say that in so far as it succeeds in prohibiting undesirable immigration, it depends entirely for its success on its administration by the executive officials. I would like to say a word as to that bonus question. I think that on the whole it is not wise to continue the bonus system. I quite appreciate the reasons the minister put up, namely, that it was in reality an advertising proposition, whereby the booking agents, although they got a bonus, really gave the country a quid pro quo in the shape of advertisements. In looking at these things in Great Britain, where I spent five months two years ago, in connection with the immigration of certain types into our own province, I had some occasion to come into contact with those people, and my own feeling is that these booking agents, who after all derive tremendous benefits from the government advertising and the government literature, can very well afford to dispense with the bonus, and that money could be put into a more direct method of advertising on the part of the government. The mere fact that they get a commission in transmitting people to this country is an inducement to the booking agents to work up their business, and it may also be said that the fact that they get a bonus would certainly stimulate them perhaps to hold out encouragements of a misleading character to people. I had occasion to see a good deal of this when I was in the old country. Of course, I admit it was in the winter time, when there was a great depression, which favoured the efforts of these booking agents, and even of some of the government's own agents, and when they sent large numbers of people to this country when it was not in the interest of those people that they should come.

Now, I think that the success of the minister's general scheme of immigration, and the success of this Act, will be de-

pendent in a large measure on the type of men that he puts on in Great Britain and other countries as official agents over immigration matters. My own feeling is that it requires an exceptional man to be a good agent, a broad-minded, fair-minded type of man, and not merely a man who has rendered some political service to the government, or even to the country at large, unless he is specially fitted for that sort of work. I have seen again and again many loose statements made by officials of the department who were not, I should think, qualified to speak of the general conditions in Canada in a way that would give a fair impression to people who desired to emigrate to Canada. I will give one or two instances to show the care that should be exercised in the selection of these agents. We know there is a tendency to paint everything in rosy colours before the eyes of intending immigrants, and never to show them any of the difficulties with which they are likely to be confronted. I have seen again and again statements made, in answer to inquiries, that would lead a man to come out to this country with the expectation that practically he had nothing to do but to go on to 160 acres of land, and in some mysterions way acquire a fortune without doing much of anything to earn it. There is another point. I believe that these agents should have a thorough knowledge of the whole of Canada. I was much surprised to hear a remark made by an hon. gentleman sitting in front of me, that of that enormous population in the northwest something like 440,000 were from eastern Canada. Well, if that is so, it shows a depletion going on from eastern Canada. Now, I say that the kind of immigration agent the minister should try to secure—because I take it for granted that his aim is to control the movement of immigration into all parts of Canada—is a man broad in his knowledge of facts, and with a fairly familiar acquaintance with the conditions in all parts of Canada. I know that these men have great power in their hands; and while it might be suitable and the best thing to do to direct some classes of immigrants into Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and other eastern provinces, it might be better in a great many cases to direct them to the western provinces. For instance, if a man wishes to go to British Columbia and seeks information regarding that province from the agent, the agent may know nothing about British Columbia. I came across a case in which one of the leading agents of the government admitted that his knowledge of Canada stopped short of the Rocky mountains, he had absolutely no knowledge except by hearsay of any of the conditions beyond the Rocky mountains. Although many inquiries were made along that line, he could not answer them, he could not give these people satisfaction, and to that extent we in British Columbia were deprived of getting good settlers. Now, I am free to admit that the minister has changed his policy somewhat within the last two years. Let me quote now a remark made two or three years ago by a strong Liberal and supporter of my hon. friend's government, speaking in this House:

> The federal government spent thousands of dollars in encouraging immigrants to the Northwest, but not one dollar in getting immigrants for British Columbia. Arrangements were made with transportation companies for cheap rates to the Northwest, and the self-same companies were allowed to compensate themeslves for these reductions by soaking those who had the courage to venture to British Columbia. So far as British Columbia was concerned, its chief function as a part of confederation was to produce revenue to be expended elsewhere in making this a great country.

I think the minister will admit that that policy was the one in force about two years ago. I am glad to say that in some directions the minister has recognized the fact that there is a considerable proportion of the population of Canada on the other side of the Rocky mountains, a region which he is endeavouring to bring to the notice of people in the old country who are suitable for its needs. Now, I think it should be clearly understood that the building up of the western country is better done at that end, and the money expended for that purpose is best spent on men who will frankly set before the public the exact conditions as they exist. Again and again I have seen men make failures in this country because they have been absolutely misled and induced to come out here with false expectations. I have always been under the impression that so far as Canada goes the facts are good enough. The potentialities of our country are all right in themselves, if they are put before the people in the right way. Let me give another illustration of a type of immigrant that we do not want. I remember a short time ago there was a case that excited a good deal of interest at the time, a criminal case, in which a man who had committed some crime was being testified against by his wife, and she had made a statement in court that he was in such a deplorable state of mind that he would threaten either to drown himself or to leave Canada. I frankly admitted, after speaking of these things, that if any man there was putting Canada just about the drowning point, he should not be encouraged to come to Canada, but should stay where he was. I have had young fellows come to me, and I have no doubt the government officials have had the same experience, with the most vague ideas of what coming to Canada

meant. I could give one illustration where a young fellow who had been working on the stock exchange as a clerk for 12 years had a fixed desire to come to Canada, and wished particularly to come to British Columbia. When I questioned him as to what his ideas were, I found they were somewhat vague. He had read the literature, he had seen some agents, and had an idea that all he had to do was to come here to change his life to something infinitely better. When I asked him if he had any money and what his prospects were, it was so hopeless a prospect that I fankly took my courage in my hands and told him to stay where he was. I believe there is as much wisdom in agents advising people not to come to Canada in some instances as in holding out false inducements to them to come. I do not say that all the men the government have in Great Britain are men of this kind, because some of them are very good agents and are doing the best they can to give us good settlers.

We must look at the whole question of immigration in a broad way. We have an immense problem which is just hinted at by the very section which the minister has been dealing with. Those of us who are familiar with the facts know what is in the minister's mind, we know that in connection with this clause we want as far as we can to build up a type of civilization in the far west, and in Canada generally that will be the same civilization that exists in, and has built up the east. That is what we are all aiming at, and therefore, although I thoroughly agree with the minister as to the wisdom of this clause, there should be great care in prohibiting undesirable immigrants, I certainly should like to see a generous interpretation of those clauses which permit or encourage immigration from Great Britain, because while it is desirable to prevent the settling of the west by a people unsuited for the country, and undesirable it is at the same time our duty to give every encouragement to, and not to partially prohibit or check the immigration of those people who although at first they may not fall on their feet, and succeed in their new surroundings, would, with their children, eventually build up the right kind of citizenship.

I am glad personally to see that in some respects the government's efforts are meeting with success. But let me refer to what occurred at the seventh conference of the Chambers of Commerce of the empire in Australia last year. That is a body of enormous importance not only in building up the various portions of the empire including Canada, but also in diverting capital to this country in greater amounts every year. Two or three representatives of Canada attended that conference. In the closing days the question of immigration was discussed, and the following resolution was proposed by Sir Alfred Spicer, president of the London Chamber of Commerce:

That the settlement in adequate volume of the Anglo-Saxon race in the British dominions is deserving of the constant solicitude of the home and colonial governments, who are hereby urged to consider what further or better steps than those at present exists should be taken to elaborate a general state-aided scheme at reduced rates to encourage emigration of suitable settlers under well-considered conditions.

I may remind the House that the imperial Chambers of Commerce with which various Canadian bodies are affiliated, have been working along this line for many years, from 1896 on, and they have been drawing attention not only to the need of building up Canada, Australia, and South Africa with the best types of British immigrants, but have also striven to show their own people the necessity of directing the flow of British capital to these various portions of the empire in connection with the immigration movement so as to build it up along concomitant lines. I think I will be pardoned for putting on 'Hansard' these figures of Sir Alfred Spicer's to show the striking changes that have taken place in this direction:

In 1894, out of a total departure from the shores of the United Kingdom of 156,030 British emigrants, only 47,636 were bound for parts of the British empire, while 103,394 were destined for foreign countries—of whom 104,001 went to the United States. Fifteen years later, Sir Albert continued, in 1907, the total of British emigrants reached 395,680, of whom no fewer than 212,672 chose another part of the British empire as their destination, while 183,008 left for foreign countries—the United States claiming 170,264. So that, whereas only 30·5 per cent of the British emigrants in 1894 were retained within the empire's borders and 69·5 per cent strayed to foreign climes, in 1907 the proportions had turned round to 53·8 per cent in favour of the British empire against 46·2 per cent for all other parts of the world, an improvement in the empire's power of absorption of Britain's surplus population of no less than 23·3 per cent. Finally, the number of emigrants to places within the empire in 1907 was nearly five-fold the number that went there in 1894, whilst the number going to foreign countries had not doubled —the actual increases between the two years being for the British empire 165,035 and for all other countries 74,614.

In that connection Sir Alfred Spicer's final remarks were:

The London chamber, therefore, considers that on imperial grounds, on commercial and financial considerations, the home and the colonial governments should do all in their power to stimulate and assist in the more rapid peopling of imperial areas, by evolving some plan in conference, encouraging, as the

resolution suggests, 'emigration of suitable settlers under well-considered conditions.'

Some discussion took place on the question of aid to immigration from Great Britain. I do think personally that there should be a generous interpretation of these clauses by the minister when he comes to deal with the type of a settler to whom Sir Alfred Spicer has been alluding. As I understand, a clause has been passed providing that no immigrant would be allowed to land here if he had been aided by money given to him or by charitable organizations. It is true we are doing some work of that kind in Great Britain, and I believe they are also in Ontario, but after all I think the minister will admit that a man who is healthy and strong, and whom there is nothing to reproach with mentally or bodily, although he might not have been able in the crowded centres of Great Britain to make his way, and save money, should be the subject of generous interpretation of our Canadian laws so as to give him a chance. After all, although he may not have the money, and although some one may have helped him, he may make the most valuable type of citizen we can get. So I suggest in closing that while we all hope for the success of this Act which I cordially say I believe is making for better things in our immigration policy, I feel there should be an exercise of wisdom in the selection of our immigration agents, and in their methods, and a broad, sane, and generous interpretation of those clauses both of encouragement, and prohibition. Without such an interpretation, and without that wisdom of appointment I do not think the Act can be a success. If it is administered in that spirit the minister can confidently expect to do a great deal more on the right lines.

Mr. OLIVER. As to the character of the immigration officers, I may say that we can only work with the material available, and I think it is a fair statement that our immigration officers are fairly representative of the intelligence and honesty of the people of Canada. We hope to improve the condition as it seems necessary and becomes possible. Because we have a certain condition to-day it does not follow that we should rest easy and pay no attention to the possibilities of improvement. My hon. friend may depend upon it that we recognize very thoroughly the absolute necessity of working through officials of honesty and intelligence, and that from time to time we shall take such measures as will secure us officials of that character. My hon. friend suggested that there was a good deal of misrepresentation on the part of our agents in Great Britain, as to the conditions in Canada. I do not think he is warranted in that belief. The literature that we publish for circulation in the old country is very carefully prepared, and with a special view to the necessity of not raising any unreasonable or unwarranted expectations in the mind of the intending immigrant. Our principal piece of literature is the 'Atlas' upon which I think I may say a large majority of the members of the House have complimented the department. That is the standard of the literature we circulate and on the fly leaf of all the literature we issue, except the 'Atlas', we give notice that the only people we advise to come to Canada are the people who are going to engage in farm work or domestic service, and we warn all others to only come on such information as they may secure outside of our literature. With regard to the question of assisted immigration I have only to say that while finding no fault with any other government which sees fit to adopt a policy of assisted immigration, our conclusion is that in Canada, and for Canada the best results are to be achieved by simple advertisement of the advantages of the country, depending upon the attraction of those advantages to bring here the people we want. It is the spirit in the man that is more important than the frame of his person. The spirit of enterprise and determination which makes him willing to take the risks involved in coming and to raise the money for that purpose, is the most valuable asset of the immigrant—more valuable even than his physical strength. It is that part of the immigrant's character that we are not so well assured of getting when we undertake to assist him in coming to this country. We are content to find ourselves with a smaller number if we get the men of a better quality. My hon. friend has suggested that we should be lenient in the interpretation of our regulations as respects our kinsmen from the British islands. His suggestion is right and proper, and it is a part of our policy and administration. Let it be distinctly understood by each member of the committee upon whom rests the responsibility of legislation, that if he deems it necessary to pass a law restricting immigration the fact of that law being upon the statute-book places upon the government of the day the responsibility of enforcing its provisions. The restrictive provisions of our immigration law which are now in force, and which will be in force under this Act, mean hardship in many cases. There are heart-breaking instances, hundreds of them under its administration. But, it is the law, not of the government, but of the parliament of Canada, and it expresses the mind of our people in regard to these questions. The responsibility of the government is to carry out the will of the people thus expressed. It is impossible to enforce a harsh statute in a soft way. I would wish that every member of the House should appreciate the full measure of his responsibility in endorsing the dras-

tic exclusion provisions of this immigration law; he must share with the government the responsibility for the hardship which occurs under it. It would not be acting fairly by the country, and the government would stand to be condemned, if having been authorized by parliament to enforce certain exclusion provisions, the government did not give effect to those provisions. I do not think there is any member of the House who appreciates more than I do the terrible hardships that arise under the administration of this immigration law; but under the responsibility which I hold from this House, and from the country, I have a duty to perform, and I wish to perform it, while as leniently as possible, yet as honestly and as fairly as possible, and as much in accord with the instructions of parliament as possible.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. One way in which the minister can avoid these hardships of immigrants when they arrive in this country is by having the inspection made as far as possible on the other side of the water. My hon. friend says that it is difficult to do that. It is difficult; if it were not, any one could do it, but we expect him to find a way in which it can be done. If my hon. friend saw the heart-rending scenes that take place when families are broken up on the landing of the immigrants, I think he would endeavour to find a way by which this would be done. It is a big task, but there is nothing too big for the Canadian government when it is right.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. I wish to suggest that there is a certain kind of literature which the department might use with great advantage much more than it does. I hold in my hand a book which I believe has been got up under the direction of the Minister of Agriculture. A copy of this book should be put into the hands of every booking agent on the other side of the ocean. Complaint has been made that certain parts of Canada have not been properly looked after in seeking for immigrants. Here is a book which gives full information in regard to the resources and productions of every province. With regard to British Columbia, it gives all particulars about minerals, the fisheries and the lumber of the province. The book is published in German, French and English. I have read it in the three languages, and I must say that if it had a greater circulation, it would do a great deal of good. Such a book is not thrown into the waste basket, but it is put into a library where it can be taken down any time. If 200,000 copies of this book were sent abroad, I believe they would do a great deal more good than some of our agents. I have recommended it a great many times, and a great many copies have been sent through my influence to countries where it can be read. I think this book is much better than the atlas to which the minister has referred. Another thing I must say for it is that it is thoroughly accurate. It gives full particulars about our homestead regulations and about every part of Canada. I hope it will be put into much more extensive circulation than it has been in the past.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be glad to take notice of what my hon. friend has said, and to see what we can do in the way of circulating the book in question; but I may say to my hon. friend that whereas the atlas which we circulate very freely costs some seven cents, I fancy that the book to which he refers, in the binding such as he has, would not cost less than 75 cents or $1; so that to circulate it in very large numbers would cost very much in comparison with what we do at present in the way of circulating literature. In regard to the inspection of immigrants on the other side of the Atlantic, I cannot change the view which I have already expressed, that it does not seem to me to be practicable. It has been suggested here to-day that an inspection might be had by a medical officer responsible to this government who would be on the ship and who would make the inspection on the way out. That would give us a better inspection, but would not altogether relieve the situation of which my hon. friend has spoken, and I will admit that I do not know of any way of absolutely relieving it. We come nearest to doing so, I think, by impressing thoroughly on the steamship companies that undesirables will not be accepted. Then, in their own interest, they check them on the other side. This is a case in which too great leniency is not mercy, but cruelty, because if we exercise leniency to-day, advantage is attempted to be taken of that to-morrow, and where we let one undesirable in to-day, a dozen will have to be turned back to-morrow because of that one having been let in. I think it is more merciful to have a strict and impartial administration of the law than it would be to show leniency in special cases.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I quite agree with the hon. minister, and that is what we are trying to assist him in guarding against. If this doctor whom it is proposed to put on board the ship were put on the dock at Liverpool, he could turn back the undesirables there, and this would avoid the breaking up of families when they arrive on this side. If the minister made up his mind, I think he could find a means of having the inspection done on the other side.

Section 38 agreed to.

Mr. JAMESON. With the consent of the committee, I would move for a reconsideration of section 37.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. JAMESON. Just before Mr. Speaker left the chair at six o'clock, the hon. minister moved an amendment to clause 37 requiring tourists landing at any port in Canada to show the same amount of money as an immigrant may be required to produce. I was not in the House at the moment, and I understand that this amendment went through without discussion. As representing a part of Canada very largely interested in the tourist business, I feel impelled to lay before the minister the facts, as they present themselves to me, in connection with the amendment. I do not know whether it has been the minister's privilege to visit of late the maritime provinces, but if so, he must have noticed, particularly if his visit were made during the summer months, that a very large tourist business has developed there of recent years. The business is not only very large, but very profitable, and engaged in by a very large number of people. In almost every county of the maritime provinces are a number of summer resorts where thousands of American visitors spend the summer months. To insist on such a provision as that proposed by the minister, would likely bring about a condition of things which will not be conducive to the well-being of this very profitable business, the development of which is the outcome of a great deal of time and energetic work I may say that some years ago there was a similar provision—in fact I believe it exists to-day—in the immigration laws of the United States, and I know that people from Nova Scotia going to Boston—well-to-do people who were merely going there on a visit—were held up on the docks, perhaps on a stormy day, amidst crowds of people, and compelled to declare the amount of money they carried with them. The experience was most disagreeable, many protests were made, and as a result of this, many people refrained from travelling by the lines where they were subjected to such indignity. The fact, I think, was also brought up in this House last session that some very distinguished people entering the United States from Mexico last year, or the year before, and also people entering Buffalo from Canada were held up in this way, and some were actually turned back. They were put to a great deal of trouble and inconvenience simply because they had not the necessary amount of money in coin of the realm about their persons. These people were not immigrants in any sense of the word, but well-to-do travellers who were simply visiting the country for a short time. If there were an existing evil in this connection in Canada, if immigrants were endeavouring to pass themselves off as tourists, I can understand that this amendment might be necessary; but unless that condition actually exists and has become a source of evil, I do not think it advisable to place a restriction of this kind in the Act. We have been told by the hon. minister that every member of parliament must share with the government the responsibility of these restrictive measures, and that is what gives me the warrant to say here, on behalf of the maritime provinces, that it would very prejudiciously affect the tourist business in those provinces, by creating a prejudice in the minds of American tourists against this country. Suppose, for instance, that some officious officer is stationed on the dock when a steamship arrives from an American port. This man may consider it his duty to hold up every passenger, even ladies travelling with their children and without the protection of their husbands. One can easily understand how irritating it would be and how inconvenient to a lady to have to show what money she may have in her possession. Ladies travelling, as a rule, are very careful lest their money be lost or stolen, and consequently they frequently only carry in their pockets the smallest amount required. For that reason, if for no other, they ought not to be subjected to this serious inconvenience and indignity. Similar experiences have happened to our own people on visiting American ports and created in them much indignation and a very unfavourable impression. One can easily understand how prejudicially the enforcement of such a position would affect in particular our tourist traffic. I strongly urge that the hon. minister would reconsider this amendment and have it struck out.

Mr. OLIVER. When I explained the amendment to the committee, it seemed to be well received. I thought it reasonable that while tourists are exempt from the immigration restriction, still there was no reason why they should not show at least the amount of money which the mere immigrant would be required to have as the condition of his entering the country. Our difficulty in administering the law is that if a man says he is a tourist we cannot produce any evidence that he is not, and in such a case our restriction as to the possession of money would become of no effect. It was not with a desire to in any way hamper the tourist traffic or interfere with legitimate tourists that I proposed this amendment, but in order to prevent the existence of a loop hole by which the purposes of the Act might be avoided. Let me point out also that this provision does not say that the tourist must have a certain amount of money. All that it does is to authorize the Governor in Council to pass regulations in that regard. It is not required that the regulation shall be of any character which would tend to interfere

with tourist traffic. All we ask is that power be granted the Governor in Council by regulation rather than by statute, so that the regulations may be varied from time to time to suit the varying conditions. I can assure my hon. friend that, under this section with the amendment as proposed, there is no danger such as he anticipates, but every care will be taken in framing regulations that the ordinary travel, including the tourist travel, shall not be unduly interfered with.

Mr. BARKER. I agree entirely with what my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) has said. I myself know the inconvenience, the excessive annoyance, created by American regulations of very much the same purport as those the minister proposes to make under this Bill. Some two years ago, two respectable men employed in Hamilton, started on a trip to Buffalo. They were stopped at Niagara Falls bridge by a couple of gentlemen with stars on their shoulders, who asked them where they were going, and whether they were going to find employment in Buffalo. They said they were going to visit their friends in Buffalo—they were merely going on a trip for the day, intending to return that evening. But the officers chose to say that they did not believe these men, and in the presence of the whole trainload of people, put them off the train. Naturally, they were indignant. Of course they could have gone before an official of the United States and proved their case—as if they had been before a police magistrate—and, perhaps, might have been allowed to proceed. But they preferred to come home. They spoke to me about the matter, and I called the attention of the government to it. The government corresponded with Washington, and there were all sorts of expressions of regret, but these were of no value to these two men. They were as decent, respectable men as the minister or any member of this House. And I can only say that, if I know the minister, and he had been treated as these men were, the atmosphere would have been blue for several acres round. It was simply an outrage. No person, except under the greatest necessity, should have been exposed to such an insult. I recollect also the case of a couple of English gentlemen who sought to pass from Mexico into the United States, but were stopped and turned back because they had not the evidence to satisfy a government official. Now if the minister (Mr. Oliver) can point out that there has been any real grievance or trouble about immigrants posing as tourists, and so getting into the country, this might be a subject for consideration. But I doubt if he can mention one case of an immigrant having tried to pass himself off as a tourist. Such a provision as is here proposed should not be on the statute-book and should not be in regulations passed by the government under which visitors coming into the country may be subjected to such insults, unless there is the gravest necessity on grounds of the public welfare. There is not a word about tourists in the Bill as he drew it. Why does he drag it in now? He should be slow to bring in such a proposal. It is an insult to tourists and visitors to say that a man may be called upon, on a public wharf or in a public railway station, to show how much money he has. You could not ask much more of a suspected pickpocket. I should be quite willing to see every regulation that is reasonable authorized, but nothing of this kind should be placed on the statute-book except under the direst necessity.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that regulations would be made under this provision of the law to provide for the admission of tourists. Otherwise, this might work hardship.

Mr. OLIVER. That is why we do not make provision in the statute—because a measure of elasticity is required in dealing with this question. Therefore, we provide for it under regulation. We ask authority to make regulations that will be effective, that is all.

Mr. WRIGHT. Has the hon. minister had any complaints of difficulties arising at any of the main points at which tourists enter Canada—of immigrants smuggling themselves in under the guise of tourists? I happen to represent a riding that is visited every year by many tourists, nearly all from the United States. I should be sorry to see an enactment either in this statute, or by regulation, to interfere with those coming in the summer time to enjoy our northern country. These people would feel it very keenly if they were stopped at the border and made to show that they had a certain sum of money in their pockets. Very few immigrants enter Canada by way of Niagara, I suppose. I trust that this regulation will be so made and administered that officers should not assume an arrogant air with tourists.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend may be perfectly satisfied that there will be no such regulation or administration as would have the effect he fears. The fact that there have been arbitrary actions on the part of United States officials does not at all indicate that the same action will be taken by officials on our side of the line. We handle our business in a somewhat different way. The fact that we have had exclusion officers at work for nearly two

years, with very little complaint, although they have turned back many people, is, I think, evidence that we have officers fairly competent, and not a discredit to either Canada or the government. It is not a question of administration under the Act, but a question of the Act giving sufficient power to the government to enable it to frame regulations that will be effective for the purpose desired. Our difficulty is that under this new Act, if a man claims to be a tourist, he is free of the country and can come and go as he pleases. Having given him that right by the terms of the Act, which he did not have before, I think it is only reasonable that we should have authority by regulation to see that he did not have any advantage over the ordinary immigrant.

Mr. JAMESON. I do not understand how the minister hopes to avoid trouble and friction over this matter. He says it does not follow that because there has been trouble occasioned by officious officials at the United States border, the same thing is going to occur in Canada, because our officials may conduct themselves differently. Now, I believe it is true that Canadian officials are more courteous to the travelling public, and particularly to ladies, than are American officials; at the same time, I think there is a good deal of truth in the remark of David Harum that 'there is as much human nature in some people as there is in others,' and if you happen to have appointed an officious official at any place he will cause a good deal of friction and dissatisfaction before you have got rid of him. The minister says this provision is placed in the Act merely to give him authority to make certain regulations. Well, if regulations are going to be made they will have to be carried out. We do not want to place on the statute-book any law which we are not going to live up to. If an evil exists along this line, then it may perhaps be the duty of parliament to frame this section so as to give the minister that power. But we have yet to learn from him that this evil does exist, we have yet to learn that immigrants come in to our country styling themselves as tourists. But if such a thing should occur, we have in subsection 10 of section 33 a provision which would meet that case, and which reads:

Every person who enters Canada as a tourist, or traveller, or other non-immigrant, but who ceases to be such and remains in Canada, shall forthwith report such facts to the nearest immigration officer, and shall present himself before an officer for examination under this Act, and in default of so doing he shall be liable to a fine of not more than one hundred dollars, and shall also be liable to deportation by order of a board of inquiry or officer acting as such.

Mr. OLIVER.

Surely that provides a remedy in case any of these immigrants class themselves as tourists, and under that guise get into the country. Another difficulty arises. Supposing a man presents himself at any port and says: I am a tourist, and the official says: No, you are an immigrant. In such a case, I presume, it would be for the individual to prove that he was a bona fide tourist. But I may say for the information of the minister, that as regards tourists coming to the maritime provinces, they would not have any difficulty in proving that they were not immigrants; at the same time it would be distasteful for them to be held up by some official, and perhaps be required to remain for a few hours or a day until they could communicate with their friends at home. I do not think it is well that we in Canada should place such obstructions in the way of friendly intercourse between the peoples of Canada and of the United States. The class of people who come to the maritime provinces and present themselves as tourists come from the United States. If they were immigrants actually seeking entry into Canada, they would not be likely to come to the maritime provinces, I presume the west would be their goal. As regards people coming from European ports and presenting themselves at the maritime provinces port, I think the minister may rest assured that no person disembarking from a steamship and presenting himself as a tourist, would do so if, as a matter of fact, he was only an immigrant. It would be well known by the officials of the ship that he was an immigrant and not a tourist. For all these reasons I do not think the minister should press this amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend and others who have spoken have asked what instances there were of the necessity of this provision. There are no instances, because the necessity for it has not yet arisen, and will not arise until this Act comes into force. Under the Act we are operating under now, a tourist is a person who is passing through Canada, and such person would be free to pass without the production of the money qualifications. But under this Bill we propose to give the tourist who comes to tour in Canada the privilege of coming in as a non-immigrant, a privilege which he has not under the present Act. Under the present Act and under the present regulations every man, whether he be a tourist or an immigrant, may be required to produce the $25. Now we propose by the new Act to relieve the tourist in Canada from the disabilities of an immigrant; but in doing so it seems to me that it is not unfair that while relieving him from disability in some particulars we should protect ourselves by regulations in the case of the money qualification.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman were going to England and passed through Niagara Falls, and were held up there to show how much money he had in his pocket, I think he wolud be very angry and indignant.

Mr. JAMESON. Will the minister give his reasons for inserting that provision in the Act and yet declining an amendment moved last evening to prevent the coming into Canada of that very class of immigrants? That is to say of any person who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the government of Great Britain or Canada or any part of the British dominions.

Mr. OLIVER. The reason is the same as the one I gave last night, that the question whether the applicant for entrance to Canada is of this class or not in the large majority of cases cannot by any possibility be settled at the port of entry. The only way we can decide that is on evidence secured, and we secure that evidence after the man has come into Canada and on the establishment of the facts we are entitled to take certain action. Although the provision is in the United States statute it is not effective, it does not protect the United States from the entrance of all these classes of people and I do not think there is any object in burdening the statute with a provision that is on the face of it absolutely ineffective.

Mr. BARKER. The minister's ideas of an Act of parliament then is that it may be capable of proof, and he may know that a man is of the character and class that will justify his expulsion from the country, but although he knows that he will let him enter.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister said last night that although this provision to exclude anarchists and those who favour the overthrow of government from the United States was on the American statute-book it did not prevent the entry into that country of that undesirable class of immigrants. I have looked the matter up and so far as I can ascertain that provision was enacted in the United States in 1903; it may have been in a previous year, but so far as I can ascertain it was then first embodied in the statute. The United States have had much more experience than we have in immigration and if we fail to profit by the mistakes which they made in the earlier days of their immigration we are open to censure. They found in time that an undesirable class of immigrants were entering the country and they put on their statute-book a regulation stopping at the very gateway of their country that undesirable class of immigrants. The minister says that the Act has not excluded these people. I am willing to accept his statement up to a certain point, I am willing to say it will not always be possible to prove that a man is an anarchist, but I say that according to the Bill now before us a man may be an avowed anarchist, he may come to Canada and there will be no possibility of excluding him. He will have the right of entry into this country, and after he has entered, then, forsooth, the minister turns around and, under section 41, the machinery of the Act is set in motion, an investigation is had, learned gentlemen sit on the case and perhaps an order is made to deport this undesirable person from the country. I say that is locking the stable door after the horse is stolen, and it is not profiting as we should do by the early mistakes of the United States. There are several classes of undesirables whom the minister desires to exclude, but it is not always easy to prove that immigrants are of the classes mentioned, for instance persons with a loathsome disease or a disease dangerous to the public health or persons convicted of any crime involving moral turpitude. These provisions are in the Act, but the minister does not say that we can prove that immigrants are of these classes. To leave the Act in such shape that it is not possible to refuse admission to an avowed anarchist, although we have the machinery to deport him afterwards, is contrary to all rules of reason and every principle of common sense.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot agree with my hon. friend. When we undertake to interfere with the right of expression of opinion, the right of personal liberty, to question the right of men to say what they please, we should only take action when we have it within our power to establish the facts. I do not think it is right or reasonable that we should declare a man to be of these classes until we are in a position to know and to prove it, and we can only do that, in the large majority of cases, after he comes inside our country.

On section 42, deportation of head of family.

Mr. JAMESON. Subsection 5 says that where the head of a family is ordered to be deported all dependent members of the family may be deported at the same time. It seems to me that, if the intention is that all the members of the family shall be deported with the head of the family, that may be a very severe and harsh regulation. It of course might turn out that if the other members of the family were permitted to remain in the country they would be able to provide for themselves. I have not examined the section very closely, but it seems to me there may be a little confusion

in that sentence and the next following one in the same section.

Mr. OLIVER. The intention is, as I believe it is expressed here, that if the head of a family has to be deported, those who are dependent upon him should go with him. It is not said that they shall go, but that they may go. The next sentence deals with the case of the head of a family who has failed to support a dependent member of that family. We consider such a person an undesirable citizen, and we provide that if the dependent requires to be deported, the head of the family upon whom that individual is dependent should go out with him.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the minister will allow me to refer to section 39, it seems to me that should be left out altogether. It provides that if an immigrant comes from a foreign country through another foreign country to Canada—say an immigrant comes from Italy through the United States to this country—the minister can compel the steamship company that brought that immigrant from Italy to New York to deport him from Canada. Surely the minister would have no control over steamships that bring immigrants from one foreign country to another foreign country. Therefore I would think it better to leave the clause out altogether.

Mr. OLIVER. It is quite true that if a company had no Canadian connection, nothing could be done; but the purpose is to compel the company to make the deportation when it has a Canadian connection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Has the minister ever had an instance that could be brought under this clause?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, many instances. Although there are many cases which for the reasons stated by my hon. friend this provision will not cover, there are other cases which it will cover, and it is very desirable from our point of view that we should have this provision.

On section 43—detention of certain prisoners for deportation.

Mr. U. WILSON. Is the minister particularly anxious to make the limit three years? I observe that Dr. C. K. Clark, who is the head of the insane hospital at Toronto, suggests four years, which he says will afford better opportunity for thorough investigation, and make the provision more efficient.

Mr. OLIVER. At present the term is two years. We wish to extend that to three years, for obvious reasons, and partly because that is the term in the United States; and it is convenient, in the interchange of undesirables, that our regulations should, when it is right and proper, be the same. I would very much prefer that the term might be allowed to remain as it is in the Act for the persent. The extension we are making is an improvement to that extent from my hon. friend's point of view.

Mr. U. WILSON. I think, from reading the American report, that the American officials are not satisfied with three years, and would like the term lengthened. I cannot see why there should be any limit of time in regard to getting rid of an undesirable. There is an insane hospital in Montreal where 39 per cent of the inmates are foreign-born, and in the Toronto insane hospital in 1906, 1907 and 1908, out of 424 inmates, 210 were foreign-born. If the term were longer, many of these might be deported, and I think we should have a right to deport undesirables at any time we see fit.

Mr. OLIVER. We have provided elsewhere in the Act that Canadian domicile shall be acquired by residence of three years. I think it reasonable that if a man lives in the country for a certain length of time he should have certain recognized rights.

On section 45,

Every person ordered to be deported under this Act who has been brought to Canada by ship, shall be reconveyed free of charge by the same transportation company which brought him to Canada, from the place in Canada where he is being detained or held for deportation to the port of embarkation whence he came to Canada, and in the same manner as to passage accommodation by which he was brought to Canada; and similarly every such person brought to Canada by a railway train or other vehicle shall, subject to the regulations under sections 31 and 32 of this Act, be reconveyed free of charge by the transportation company which carried him to the place in Canada where he is rejected or where he is being detained for deportation to the place in the country whence he was brought or to the country of his birth or citizenship.

Mr. OLIVER. The intention is that the company which brought the undesirable out shall have to take him back free of charge to the man himself as well as to the government. As the section stands, it requires that the steamship company shall take him from the place in Canada where he may be detained to the ocean port where he landed, and thence to the original port of embarkation. The steamship companies object to this. They say they are willing to take the deport back to the port at which they embarked him, but that the railway company which carried him to the place where he is detained should bring him back to the port. In accordance with that view I beg to move that section 45 be

amended by striking out all the words after 'the' in the sixth line to, and including the word 'Canada,' in the tenth line, and substituting the following: The railway company or companies which brought him to the place in Canada where he is being detained for deportation to the ocean port where he was landed, or the nearest available winter ocean port, as may be directed by the board of inquiry, and thence he shall be conveyed free of charge to the port of embarkation whence he came, and in such manner as to passage, and condition as may be directed by the officer in charge.

Mr. JAMESON. It will be very difficult to show what railway company carried him from the port of landing. When an immigrant lands on the dock, a record is kept of him, and it is known by what ship he arrived; but once released, he is free to chose any railway he pleases by which to leave that port.

Mr. OLIVER. The point is well taken. I see the difficulty, but on the other hand the steamship companies hold that they should not be required to pay the expense of inland transportation for which they were not responsible, and for which they received no benefit. I do not wish that any interest in the country should be harshly dealt with, and I propose this amendment in deference to the contention of the steamship companies, although there is the difficulty my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. JAMESON. I am bound to say that I approve of the section as it is. A steamship company, which has the right of inspection, and selection of these people, should take the responsibility. It is unfair to a railway company, which takes a man in perfect good faith, to be compelled to pay the expense of bringing him back. That man is as free to come, and go as anybody else, and the innocent railway company, which is not required to have an inspection of him, has to transport him back to the place where the steamship company can take him up. It is the duty of the steamship company to see that the immigrants they bring out are the right class. They have been making a lot of money out of this business, and if reports are true, and if the stringent measures in this Bill are warranted, these companies are not very careful in their selection. If they will bring undesirables to this country who have to be deported, they should bear all the expense.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend says. If I might withdraw for the moment my amendment, I wish to move another amendment to the wording which will make the section more effective, and we might have an opportunity of discussing the amendment I am asking to withdraw before the Bill comes out of committee. I wish to give due consideration to all the interests concerned. Yet I feel very strongly the force of the arguments my hon. friend has presented. I ask for leave, therefore, to withdraw the motion, and to move that the words 'the same,' be struck out, and that 'such,' be substituted, and that the words 'by which he was brought to Canada,' be struck out, and 'as may be directed by the officer in charge,' be substituted. As the Bill is printed, the deport must be taken back with the same accommodation as that with which he was brought. Sometimes, this is not desirable. So, instead of making it mandatory that the steamship shall take him back in the same class as that in which he came out, the matter is left to the discretion of the superintendent of immigration.

Mr. JAMESON. That is better than the other amendment that the minister has suggested, but this may be a little tough on the deport.

Mr. OLIVER. Sometimes a man who has come out first-class falls on evil days and is not a proper subject for first-class transportation going back. I think it is fair to leave the matter to the discretion of the superintendent.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to have the section as amended stand until the end of the Bill, so that we may consider it further.

On section 48—penalty on transportation company permitting escape of persons ordered to be deported; duty to notify immigration officer when such person escapes.

Mr. JAMESON. Failure to notify renders one liable to a penalty of not more than $20, and not less than $10 for each offence. But for negligence, or connivance leading to escape, the penalty is not more than $500 and not less than $50. Should there be this difference in the penalties for practically the same offence?

Mr. OLIVER. They are hardly the same offence. One is negligence in allowing escape, and the other is negligence in notifying.

Mr. JAMESON. But the person who allows a deport to escape is likely to fail to report the fact of that escape. It seems to me that it would be better to stiffen up the penalty.

Mr. OLIVER. The party who is guilty of both negligence in allowing to escape and failure to report is guilty of both offences and liable to both penalties.

Mr. JAMESON. But, in order to impose the larger penalty, it would be necessary to prove both offences, and that is not contemplated under the section.

Mr. OLIVER. The man who has knowledge of the escape may not be the man who is responsible for it. The man who is responsible is liable to the large penalty, while the man who has knowledge but is not responsible, yet fails to report, is subject to the smaller penalty.

Mr. JAMESON. Has the minister considered in what form this manifest is to be, that is, whether the manifest which has to be presented will contain the names and description of all the passengers, or whether there will be a number of manifests? According to the regulations in the United States, these manifests are so arranged that they do not include more than thirty names, and in that way it is possible to arrange the passengers into classes. How does the minister propose to carry out that section?

Mr. OLIVER. The provisions of this section are practically in effect under the existing Act. I am not familiar with the form of manifest, but there is a form which complies with the requirements of the section.

On section 51, manifest of outbound passengers.

Mr. OLIVER. The steamship companies complain in regard to this provision that the manifest is not complete until the vessel has actually sailed, and to require the completion of the manifest so as to hand it to the immigration officer before the vessel sails, would unduly delay the sailing. This is merely a provision to keep tally of the people who are going out of the country with a view to checking them as they come back, and it is proposed that the manifest shall be produced on the return voyage. In order to meet the case, I would move that the words 'before clearance has been given to such vessel' in subsection 1, be struck out, and the words 'on the return voyage of such vessel to Canada' be substituted therefor.

Mr. JAMESON. Does this relate to vessels which ply between maritime province ports and United States ports, or does it mean vessels of the transatlantic lines?

Mr. OLIVER. As it reads, it would be applicable to both, but it is not intended to apply to both. The principle purpose is not in regard to Atlantic passengers, but to Pacific passengers. There is a difficulty about the identification of Asiatics, who claim entrance as returning passengers, and we want to have a tally of the outgoing Asiatics, so that we may have better opportunities of checking the incoming ones who claim to be returning to Canada. It is really with a view to that traffic that we desire this provision.

Mr. JAMESON. At the same time, does not the minister think that while he may be intending to erect this section against that class of steamship lines, it will also apply to steamship lines on the Atlantic waters as well? Now, although perhaps this is not the occasion or the proper time, I want to say something with respect to the passenger traffic which is carried on between the maritime ports and American ports. At the present time, ships which ply between these ports are overloaded to such a degree that I think they are positively unsafe; they are overloaded to such an extent that the people cannot get proper accommodation, and some day there will be a serious accident attended with great loss of life. I think these companies require to have a license which limits the number of passengers they are entitled to carry. But they do not declare the number of passengers which they carry, and after they leave the dock, it is reported next day in the papers after sailing that such and such a steamer left such and such a port in Canada for such and such a port in the United States, with say 500 cases of lobsters and about 600 passengers. I am told that when they get near the limited number of passengers they are entitled to carry, then only about one in five of the passengers is counted as they go on board. In that way the ships are overloaded to such an extent as not only to produce discomfort to the passengers, but to involve great danger of accident, in which some of the passengers, in all likelihood, would be lost. Perhaps this is a matter that comes under the purview of the Marine Department, but whichever department it belongs to should see that when the vessel receives the number of passengers she is entitled to carry, no more should be allowed to go on. At present the officers wink at that provision of the law, and there is a great deal of dissatisfaction and fear in the minds of the travelling public that serious accidents will occur.

On section 51, manifest of outbound passengers, proviso, re exemption of vessels between Canada and Newfoundland, or the United States.

Mr. JAMESON. That section should properly be aimed at the very condition I spoke of, and yet I have no doubt that the steamship companies will apply for and obtain such an exemption from the requirements of the section that the safety of the travelling public will not be conserved. I think the minister should consider that, and I would be glad to have the section stand in order that he may look into it further, and he may then see as I do that there is necessity to protect the lives of people travelling by these lines.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill is to deal with immigration, not with navigation. Necessarily the two questions overlap at times. It is because the trade between the mari-

time provinces and the New England states is not an immigration trade that the vessels engaged in that trade are expressly exempted from the provisions of the section which, as I have said, was intended to apply particularly to Asiatic trade. The condition to which my hon. friend objects is a matter for the consideration of the Department of Marine, and he would find his remedy there for the condition he mentions and not in connection with the Bill regarding immigration.

On section 59—proportionate number of passengers to area of decks.

Mr. JAMESON. Is there at present any inspection of vessels coming to Canadian ports, in reference to the accommodation provided for immigrants? Not very long ago there was a rumour in the United States that all was not well on these steamships, and a lady who represented either a protection society or was correspondent of a newspaper crossed and recrossed the Atlantic in the steerage. She reported that the conditions were positively revolting, and that although for years there had been a law which was supposed to be carried out for the protection of steerage passengers, the people were herded like cattle, there was insufficient provision for cleanliness, the ventilation was deficient, and the general conditions surrounding steerage travel degrading. Is there a thorough inspection of steamships arriving at Canadian ports to ensure protection for the immigrants? I do not mean a casual supervision which might take place after the ship is cleaned up, but have any of the officials of the department actually experienced the conditions prevailing during a voyage across the ocean in the steerage? Is it the duty of the department to see that all the comfort and protection that is contemplated by this Act shall be extended to steerage passengers?

Mr. OLIVER. Our agents at Liverpool, London, and Glasgow are instructed to inspect every immigrant vessel leaving these ports, and to report upon its condition. In the voyages I have made myself across the Atlantic I have taken occasion to inspect the steerage accommodation, and I have found the conditions very good. Our effort is to secure the best conditions possible under all the circumstances, and the evidence is that the conditions have materially improved within recent years upon all vessels, and while the accommodation on the older ships may not be all that is desirable, on the more recently built vessels the most fastidious could not complain of the accommodation which is given at the price at which it is given. It is really a credit to the companies and a credit to civilization.

Mr. JAMESON. I can understand that when the minister is on board one of these ships the officers would have everything in first-class shape. But the fact that the minister found everything right would not convey to me any assurance that at other times there may not be undesirable surroundings for the immigrants. I would suggest to the minister that he should have some trustworthy person make an actual steerage trip across the Atlantic and back without the knowledge of the steamship companies so that he might experience the actual conditions which prevail. That would be a practical way of testing whether the steamship companies are living up to the laws. There have been complaints made by immigrants from time to time that the accommodation afforded them was not what they were led to expect when they purchased their tickets. I know instances of that sort, and I dare say we all know of such instances. Of course, these complaints may not have been well founded; but Canada is now doing a large business in this way, and it seems to me only right and proper, if he can, that the minister should make an effort, by some person on whom he can rely, and whom the steamship companies will not suspect, to ascertain what conditions actually prevail under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. member for Digby has evidently given this matter a great deal of consideration judging by the amount of time he has consumed in the last three or four days in discussing it. But I would like to ask him to state, as a result of the minute examination he has made, how the minister is going to control a shipping company that has its head office in London or Berlin, and that makes a contract to bring out several hundred people to Canada. These people pay their money and take the choice of the line on which they come out. Will he tell me how the Minister of the Interior or his officials are going to control such a company?

Mr. JAMESON. The committee is now considering clause 59 which prescribes just what the conditions of these ships shall be. If the government of Canada or the minister has no control over the matter, and any Act of the parliament of Canada relating to it is not workable and cannot be enforced, why does the minister include that section in this Bill?

Mr. CARVELL. The minister may make regulations and employ inspectors, and the department might go to one of these companies and say, unless you comply with certain requirements that we set up, we will use our influence to allot the next batch of immigrants who come out to another steamship line; but I would like to know how he can control a contract made by a company controlled in Great Britain or in Germany.

Mr. JAMESON. I think the question which the hon. gentleman is struggling with will be made clear to his mind if he will read this section a little carefully. He knows, as every other hon. gentleman in this House knows, that if there is an evil existing, if as a matter of fact these steamship companies are not giving accommodation or the treatment they should give, and nothing is known of the fact, it is going to continue, and there will be no end to it; but if it becomes public, if the newspapers take it up, as they would, and if the minister sends one of his officers to inspect the voyage and report on the facts as they exist, I have not the slightest doubt that with the penalties provided by the Act and the publicity, that steamship company would bring about a reformation.

Mr. CARVELL. Suppose they do not, what then?

Mr. JAMESON. If they do that, they will be debarred by public opinion from receiving any considerable amount of traffic. My hon. friend knows that where there are competing lines, as there are across the Atlantic to-day, if one line is held up as not giving a satisfactory service, while another is doing so, the evil will largely correct itself, and the penalties should complete the cure.

Mr. CARVELL. It is just as I thought. The hon. gentleman is admitting that the minister has no jurisdiction at all over these companies. He thinks that publicity will cure the evil. I only interfered to show that the hon. gentleman has taken up an enormous amount of time and has accomplished nothing. I would like to see some business done in this House to-night.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask the minister if he accedes to the view of the hon. gentleman sitting beside him, that he has no jurisdiction whatever over these companies?

Mr. OLIVER. What I said, when the question was raised first, was that we had made an inspection of the immigrant vessels when they were leaving the port of embarkation, and that we used such endeavours as were within our power to bring about improvements in the conditions of the immigrant passengers. That is what we have been doing constantly during several years past, and we think we have achieved some beneficial results. So far as my knowledge goes, the conditions are certainly more favourable on the steamships recently built over what prevailed a few years ago.

Mr. EDWARDS. If the steamship company does not comply with the regulations, what step will the minister take?

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. OLIVER. The provisions are laid down in the Act. We presume by the Act to impose certain penalties.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman at the minister's right says he has no jurisdiction at all.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer the question, because, so far as I know, we have not undertaken to enforce these penalties. So I do not know whether our law in that respect is defective or not.

Mr. U. WILSON. Would you not try if you had a case of that kind occur?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. U. WILSON. Then you think you have the power?

Mr. OLIVER. We are assuming that we have the power. This section is a legacy coming down from time immemorial in the legislation of parliament. It was adopted in the Immigration Act now in force and transferred from that to the present Bill, simply because it was in the old statute.

Mr. U. WILSON. I do not think any company will try to evade these things if the minister tells them that if they do he will enforce the law. They are very anxious to do the business, and they know well that if they interefere with the immigration department they will get into serious trouble.

Mr. OLIVER. We have ways and means outside the letter of this statute, but as to what the effect of this statute may be, I am not prepared to give an opinion.

On section 75, officers to wear uniform when on duty.

Mr. JAMESON. Is this the same as under the existing law?

Mr. OLIVER. No, neither this section nor section 74, providing how uniforms shall be provided for the immigration officers, is in the present Act.

Mr. JAMESON. Are these uniforms furnished by the department or by the officials? Also will the minister tell us something of their appearance?

Mr. OLIVER. These provisions are not yet in force.

Mr. U. WILSON. I think it has been the custom of the immigration department for years to furnish uniforms for its officers. At Halifax, Quebec, and other places that has been done, and done to a very extravagant extent. These officers have had as much as two or three suits a year sometimes. I remember that, some time ago, I took the trouble to look into this

matter. The minister should be able to state offhand whether he intends to furnish uniforms or not.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say that we did not provide them, but I said there was no provision in the present law on that subject. We think it better to have it in the statute, and in providing that the officer shall be required to pay one-third, we think we have arrived at an arrangement which will tend to check undue extravagance in uniforms. I think we all agree that it is right that these officers should be in uniforms, that the public may know who they are, and what their authority is.

Mr. U. WILSON. I understood the minister to say he did not know whether he was furnishing uniforms or whether that was the intention.

Mr. OLIVER. What I meant in that connection was that I did not know whether we would furnish the uniforms or whether the men would get them on their order. But the provision as to paying will be governed by section 74—that one-third of the cost shall be charged to the officer.

Mr. WRIGHT. The minister can tell us how it has been the custom to furnish these uniforms. Would the officer go to some tailor, and simply pay what the tailor charged?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that definitely. I could explain more definitely if it were a question on the estimates of the Immigration Department, and I had the officer of the department here to advise me. I think the uniforms used now are ordered at each place where they are required—that is, uniforms for the officers in Halifax are ordered at Halifax, and so on. I do not think there is a general contract.

Mr. U. WILSON. The prices heretofore paid have been different in different places.

Mr. EDWARDS. Why is it specified that one-third of the cost be charged to these men? In the penitentiaries, for instance, are the guards charged one-third of the cost of their uniforms? Why not have uniformity in regard to your uniforms?

Mr. OLIVER. We desire to have uniformity in the department. The reason why we have adopted this idea of requiring the official to pay for a portion of the cost is to check his asking for too many uniforms. It may be an innovation so far as the government service is concerned, but we think it a proper innovation, and ask the committee to adopt it.

Mr. EDWARDS. If it is a good principle in this case, why not adopt it in other branches of the service?

Mr. OLIVER. There is a difference between an immigration officer, and, say, a penitentiary guard.

Mr. EDWARDS. Or a customs or excise officer?

Mr. OLIVER. There is a greater resemblance there. I do not know what arrangement is made in the Customs Department, but I think the committee should sanction this proposal in regard to the immigration service.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the minister think that fifty per cent would be a more effective check?

Mr. OLIVER. It would, but I think that one-third is not an unfair proposition. I think it is an improvement over the present condition. I believe it is based on some arrangement existing to-day between the railway companies and certain of their employees. I think it is fair to the government and not too severe upon the employee, and gives the government a certain measure of protection that seems desirable.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is quite proper that the immigration officers should be in uniform. But why adopt the principle in this department of paying two-thirds of the cost of the uniform and in another department paying the whole cost? If you are maintaining a principle in one case, it seems to me that you are stultifying yourself in another. If, for instance, the government says that customs officers must wear a uniform of a certain kind and quality which has to be paid for by the officers themselves, then I see no reason why the same thing should not apply here. If the government fix the quality and character of the uniform for officers in one branch of the service, let them do the same thing in other branches of the service.

On the schedules,

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If the minister would permit me, I would like to offer an amendment to section 2. I may be out of order, and if any one raises the question of order, I will not be able to do so. But I feel it my duty to suggest the following amendment to clause (j), and to insert after the word 'transport' in the thirteenth line, the words 'not including cattlemen'. My reason for doing so is that the Bill as now framed constitutes a cattleman, an immigrant. The steamship companies feel that it would oblige them perhaps to hold their vessel on some occasions ten or twelve hours in the city of Quebec. That delay might cause them to miss the tide, and if they missed the tide they might be detained 24 hours or 48 hours, and all that merely because there happened to be one

cattleman on that steamer. The steamship companies have sent a petition in asking the government not to make immigrants of cattlemen. The cattlemen themselves claim that they have a right to the privileges of Canadian citizenship, and should not be classed as immigrants. The Dominion Live Stock Association have passed resolutions asking that the government should not hamper their trade any more than is absolutely necessary. Unless the minister has some good reason that I do not know of, surely he will accept the amendment I am proposing. The fact of a man being a cattleman should not deprive him of his rights as a citizen. This does. The minister's Bill last session especially mentioned cattlemen but the present Bill does not. He gets over it ably by inserting the word 'transport'. The live stock trade is of such importance that it deserves the attention of the government and I hope the minister will agree to amend the Bill by inserting in the thirteenth line of section 2 after the word 'transport' the words 'including cattlemen'.

Mr. MILLER. I do not see any special reason for that amendment to carry.

Mr. OLIVER. Last year we inserted the word 'cattlemen' in the section, and my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) took very strong exception to this word being inserted, as placing the cattlemen in a class by themselves. This year we carefully omitted this word, and I am astonished to find him asking that this objectionable word be inserted in the Bill. Having met his views as expressed last session, I think in all fairness he should allow the Bill to remain in its present shape, and should not again raise the question of cattlemen. I agree that cattlemen are as good as other men, and this Bill treats them the same as other men. If cattlemen are Canadians or have acquired Canadian domicile they have the right to return to Canada. We make special provision in our interpretation for men who have been resident for three years in Canada, and, therefore, have acquired domicile. If a man is to all intents and purposes an immigrant, I cannot cenceive why he should be relieved from his position as an immigrant because he happens to have been employed in attendance on cattle.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Does the Bill not constitute cattlemen as being immigrants unless they have been in Canada three years?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, certainly.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. That is what I objected to, that does not apply to any other men.

Mr. BICKERDIKE.

Mr. OLIVER. Every other man who has not been in Canada for three years is an immigrant. Why should not the cattleman be an immigrant the same as any other man?

Amendment negatived.

On the schedules,

Mr. EDWARDS. There seems to be no form among the schedule for the certificate of the ship's physician as to the health of immigrants.

Mr. OLIVER. Provision is made for that in section 73.

On section 45,

Mr. OLIVER. On looking over this section it seems to me that all interests will be served if the section were agreed to as amended.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

INSPECTION OF GLASSWARE IN MILK TESTS.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the testing, marking, sale and use of glassware used in connection with the testing of milk, and to authorize the Governor in Council to make regulations with respect thereto, and for the imposition of penalties for offences in contravention thereof.

Mr. FISHER. This resolution explains itself. There is a complaint that these bottles are not correct sometimes, and that there is at present no means of securing their accuracy. In connection with the distribution of the money at cheese and butter factories, it is important to have them accurate.

Mr. BLAIN. What kind of glassware will be included?

Mr. FISHER. The bottles that are used in what is known as the Babcock test for butter fat in milk.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 184) to provide for the testing of glassware used in connection with milk tests.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the payment to members of the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources of their actual reasonable disbursements incurred in travelling to, returning from and remaining at meetings of the committees of the commission or attending to the business thereof.

Mr. LENNOX. What have been the expenses so far?

Mr. FISHER. Apart from the civil government vote, I think the only expense incurred has been that for the meeting held in Ottawa in January last.

Mr. LENNOX. I refer more particularly to the expense incurred by the government in connection with the establishing and carrying on of the work of the commission. I saw it announced that the chairman stated that he would make an application for $50,000.

Mr. FISHER. It is evident from the programme set out by the commission for the coming year that they would require a larger sum than is provided in the main estimates. The staff consists of a secretary in subdivision (a) of the first division, two officers in subdivisitn (b) of the first division, two in (b) of the second division, and two in (b) of the third division. There are some slight office expenses for stationery and printing. I will bring down the memorandum of the chairman of the commission on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. Are these officers appointed by the commission?

Mr. FISHER. They were appointed under the Civil Service Act, Mr. James White, geographer of the Interior Department was transferred to this office, as I think was also one of the stenographers, and they are all appointed under the Civil Service Act.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 185) respecting the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. May I ask what will be the business to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. We shall take up the resolutions and Bills on the order paper which are not of a contentious character.

Mr. LENNOX. After that?

Mr. FIELDING. There are several resolutions—one in regard to the Montreal Harbour Commission, two Bills which stand in the name of the Postmaster General, the Bills which have been introduced to-night, and several other Bills which are not likely to be of a contentious character.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.07 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 23, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 183) to incorporate the Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Railway Company.—Mr. Rivet, for Mr. Devlin.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 186) to amend the Irrigation Act. He said: There are two distinct provisions in this Act. One is an amendment to the amendments that were made the session before last. Drainage is deemed to be a function of the provincial government, and while the Irrigation Act places the control in the three provinces in the hands of the Dominion, the amendments of the session of 1908 permit drainage works to be carried on under provincial jurisdiction, subject to certain requirements.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Does the Act apply to British Columbia?

Mr. OLIVER. No, only to the three prairie provinces. The governments of the two western provinces find that, in dealing with drainage, there are two classes—the least important and the most important; and the amendment is simply to enable us to dispense with the filing of elaborate plans in the case of minor drainage schemes authorized by the provincial government. The other provision is to authorize expropiration where necessary for reservoir sites for the purpose of conserving water for irrigation. There is a provision already for preservation of such sites where the land is the property of the Crown, but in some cases some part of it may have passed into private hands, and that small part might render useless the reservation of the rest.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The nice question arises here as to the jurisdiction of this parliament to legislate at all with reference to irrigation. When the Bill comes up for its second reading, we ought to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WATER-POWER IN THE BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 187) to confirm and declare the rights of the Crown with respect to water and water-power and relating to the diversion, acquisition and use of water in the railway belt in British Columbia. He said: As the House is aware, the proprietary rights in a belt 20 miles in width on each side of the main line on the Canadian Pacific railway, where it passes through the province of British Columbia, has, under an arrangement between the Dominion and the province, become the property of the Crown in the right of the Dominion. Up to a time, it was assumed that the province administered all water rights within that area as well as throughout the rest of the province. However, a couple of years ago, a case was entered in the Exchequer Court for the purpose of deciding definitely whether the jurisdiction in regard to water within the railway belt resided in the Crown in the right of the province or in the Crown in the right of the Dominion. The Exchequer Court gave a decision that the right rested with the Dominion. Since then, I am given to understand, the Supreme Court, on appeal, has confirmed the decision of the Exchequer Court. Of course, in order to reach a final conclusion the matter will have to be carried to the Privy Council, and that decision will be the one that will rule. In the meantime, the rights to water which have been granted by the provincial government are in a state of uncertainty. The provincial government having been declared to have no right in this matter, grants issued by that government have not—to put it mildly—a satisfactory legal status. The purpose of this Bill, then, is, first to declare, in accordance with the decision of the court, that the right to the water rests in the Dominion, and, second, to make provision for carrying forward the rights which have been granted by the provincial government until they can be readjusted or until a final decision is reached. It is for the purpose of preventing or avoiding a practically chaotic condition in regard to water rights in the railway belt so as to put them on a definite basis during the interval which necessarily occurs between the first decision of the Exchequer Court and the final decision of the Privy Council. At the same time, there is a demand for development in the railway belt, and it is proposed in the same Act to make provision for authorizing development as the circumstances may require, so, that in the first place, the rights granted shall not be in a state of chaos, and, in the next place, development need not be tied up awaiting the decision of the Privy Council.

Mr. J. G. HAGGART.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It is an interesting question that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has raised. On the second reading of the Bill, of course, we can discuss it fully. He states that by a decision of the Exchequer Court, confirmed by the Supreme Court, the right to legislate in reference to lands which have been conveyed to the Dominion is given to the Dominion parliament.

Mr. OLIVER. In water rights.

Mr. J. HAGGART. In reference to water rights, or any other. That is a power vested in the provincial authority, and I doubt very much if any court in the land has decided that, by the conveying of the land to the Dominion government, the right to legislate for that area is thereby conveyed to the Dominion. The Dominion can, either by regulation or by Act of parliament, decide on what terms the right conveyed to it—which is no greater right than that which is conveyed to an individual—shall be exercised. But the right of regulation, the right of legislation in reference to these lands, is in the provincial government, and by no conveyance of land can that right be transferred to the Dominion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NATIONAL BATTLEFIELDS.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 188) to amend the Act respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to remove some of the practical difficulties which the commission having charge of the National Battlefields at Quebec have experienced under the statute, by which they were created two years ago. Provision is made in that statute that, in case it is desired to acquire property which has to be expropriated, the provisions of the Railway Act are to be followed. But a literal compliance with the provisions of the Railway Act, with regard to the expropriation of property, would necessitate the filing of plans and the taking of other formal steps which are scarcely applicable to the circumstances of the acquisition of property for the purposes of the National Battlefields Commission. To get rid of that difficulty, and to provide a more ready, and as we think, a more efficient means for carrying out the purposes for which the commission was constituted, this Bill proposes to repeal that section of the original statute and to substitute for it the section contained in the Bill, under which the provisions of the Expropriation Act will be followed. The original statute con-

stituting the commission requires that all propositions for the acquisition of real estate, before being acted upon by the commission, shall be sanctioned by parliament. The effect of the change in procedure which this Bill, if adopted, will introduce, will merely be that, after parliament has given its approval to the proposition to acquire any particular piece of property for the purposes of the commission, the proceedings, in case expropriation is necessary, shall be in accordance with the general provisions of the expropriation Act, and the price of the property to be paid by the commission shall be settled by proceedings taken in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill relates to the expropriation of property. Does it contemplate dealing with the Ross rifle factory, and is it the intention of the commission to take over that property?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is a matter which it is not necessary to consider, so far as the provisions of this amending Bill are concerned. It would be a matter for the commission first to consider, and then for parliament to act upon, if the question came up for practical consideration.

QUESTIONS.

MONTREAL—OWNERSHIP OF HIGHWAY TO VICTORIA JUBILEE BRIDGE.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Who is the owner of the highway, from the limits of the city of Montreal, that is to say, the Emigrants' Burial ground, to the Victoria Jubilee bridge?
2. Is the government aware that all who pay toll to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for crossing the bridge must of necessity use this highway?
3. Whose duty is it to keep the said highway in a good state of repair?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH:

1. There appears to be an uncertainty as to who is the owner of the roadway from the limits of the city of Montreal to the Jubilee bridge (at least as to the line between the property of the city and that of the Grand Trunk railway). This line has never been definitely determined, but engineers have now the matter under consideration.

2. The government has no information, but it is generally understood that the roadway is used by people who pay toll to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

3. The Grand Trunk Railway Company maintain and keep in repair that portion of the approach to the bridge on its land.

SALE OF HALF-SECTIONS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. Has the N. ½ section 29, township 5, range 8, west of the 1st meridian in Manitoba been sold? If so, when, to whom, and at what price?
2. If not sold, is it for sale now? If so, at what price?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. No, it has not been sold. This land, being part of a school section, can only be disposed of at public auction.

2. No, it is not for sale now; and it is not the intention to hold any auction sales for school lands in Manitoba this summer.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

Has the N. ½ of section 29, township 5, range 8, west of the 1st meridian in Manitoba been sold? If so, to whom, when was the sale made, and what was the price per acre?

Mr. OLIVER:

The north half of section 29, in township 5, range 8 west of the 1st meridian, has never been sold.

TRIP OF ALEXANDER McLEOD TO THE YUKON.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. Did Alexander McLeod, of McLean, McLeod & Black, of Morden, Manitoba, ever make a trip to the Yukon, or any other place for the government? If so, where and what were his duties?
2. How much per day did he receive, and how long was he in the employ of the government?
3. What were his expenses and what is the total amount he received?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes, commissioner of land titles, Yukon.
2. $10 per day, 133 days.
3. $1,594.57.

Mr. McLeod was accompanied by Messrs. Rinfret and W. F. Povah, but as he rendered only one account for the expenses of the whole party it is not possible to dissect his account showing the amount properly chargeable to himself.

A. G. WAKEFIELD, RANCHVALE, MANITOBA.

Mr. ROCHE:

Was A. G. Wakefield, of Ranchvale, Manitoba, in the employ of the Immigration Department during the years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903 and 1904? If so, what duties did he discharge, and by whom was he appointed?

Mr. OLIVER:

Mr. Wakefield held no appointment, but performed duties as land guide, and correspondent for the Immigration Department in the years named, under an informal arrangement.

SHIPPING REGISTERED IN CANADA.

Mr. WALLACE:

What is the amount of tonnage of shipping registered in the Dominion of Canada, and how many seamen are engaged in same?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The total net tonnage of vessels on the register books of the Dominion on the 31st December, 1909, was 718,352 tons. The total number of men and boys (inclusive of masters) reported as employed thereon was 36,430.

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. LEWIS. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask a question of the government. In doing so, I wish to say that while I do not represent the opposition, which is now being led by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. J. Haggart), and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and while it is distinctly understood that I represent only myself, still I believe that every hon. gentleman around me will back me up. I desire to ask the government whether they are in a position to give the House and the country some definite statement before we adjourn for Easter in regard to tariff negotiations with the United States. This House is about to separate for a week, and will not re-assemble until the day before the time fixed for the application of the maximum clauses of the United States tariff to Canada, if they are to be applied. Does not the government consider that it is due to the business community of this country to give some indication as to whether we are to expect a tariff war or not? I wish to assure the government that the members of this House on both sides of it, I believe, are behind the government, provided they stand to their guns and do not give away one iota of our rights. I understand that the whole matter is dependent upon the importation of pulp-wood free into the United States.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. I am afraid that, with every desire on my part to inform my hon. friend and the House generally of what they naturally desire to know in this matter, I am not in a position to give any statement to my hon. friend. He will no doubt understand that in negotiations of the character which it is known are now in progress, it would be impolitic in the highest degree to make any statement until a conclusion has been reached. At the conclusion of the conference which I had the honour to hold with the president of the United States in Albany, a brief statement was given out in these words: 'The president and Mr. Fielding have been in conference, and while no conclusion has been reached, the matter remains as one of friendly negotiation.' That was the condition at that moment, and that is the condition to-day. I am very hopeful that an early arrangement will be reached. But I can assure my hon. friend that I do not think any good purpose would be served by our making any further statement on that subject to-day. I am satisfied that the desire he has and that we have is the same, and he will agree with me, on reflection, that it would only be embarrassing the situation for the government to make any statement at this stage.

Mr. LEWIS. If the House will allow me to make one remark, I wish to assure the hon. the Minister of Finance that we are behind him in standing by the guns of Canada in this matter. While I realize that perhaps he would not feel at liberty to give any information on certain points, still he must remember, and the Prime Minister may be assured, that in so far as they stand by Canada in this matter we are behind them irrespective of party. I wish to say this also——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot enter into a discussion after he has put the question.

Mr. LEWIS. I merely wish to state to the minister my intention of giving him——

Mr. FIELDING. I accept my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. LEWIS. I want to say to the minister that I am with him.

Mr. LENNOX. Before my hon. friend (Mr. Lewis) had propounded his question, I had taken the liberty of sending a memorandum to the Minister of Finance on a question I proposed to ask him, and which I do not think will involve the disclosure of any state secrets. I wish to ask the Finance Minister this question: Having regard to the fact that parliament is now in session, will the Finance Minister assure the House that he will not agree to admit the United States to participation in the intermediate tariff, or otherwise substantially to alter the tariff conditions between Canada and the United States, without first submitting the proposals to parliament? I do not think an answer to that question would involve the disclosure of any secret, but it will enable us to understand that we shall be consulted before anything is done.

Mr. FIELDING. I am obliged to my hon. friend for his courtesy in sending me in advance a notice of his question. I agree that an answer to it would not involve the disclosure of any secret, but it would involve a declaration of policy, which I think would rather embarrass the freedom of negotiations which we desire that the government should have. I must ask my hon. friends on both sides of the House rather to assume that the government are thoroughly seized of the importance of the whole question, and are dealing with it in the manner which they conceive to be consistent with the best interests of Canada. I do not think my hon. friend, on reflection,

will feel that he ought to press this question. In respect to what has been said by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Lewis), I may say that if there are to be any guns in the matter, we will be exceedingly glad to have the hon. gentleman along with us behind the guns. But if we can avoid the use of guns at all, that will be much better.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPROULE. Before we separate for the holidays, I want to ask the government a question about the probable length of the session. When we go home, no doubt many questions will be put to us as to the probable duration of the session, and consequently I would like to ask the First Minister if he is in a position to give us any information with regard to what measures the government propose to put through, and what others they propose to bring down, any information which will enable us to estimate more closely how long the balance of the session is likely to last.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad to say to my hon. friend that any additional programme of business we shall lay before the House will be of a very light character. We shall have some supplementary estimates for the coming year; we shall have resolutions about dry-docks, and we may have some other matters which at the present time I am not at liberty to disclose. But on the whole, I think there is nothing to prevent us from having a very early prorogation.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention to go on with the Insurance Act and the Banking Bill? These are two important measures.

Mr. FIELDING. Although the Insurance Bill is a lengthy Bill, it is one which the House considered last year with great care, and this year the Senate has also given it a great deal of attention, and I think it is in such good shape that we can deal with it without its delaying us much. I am beginning to despair of getting the Bank Act through, and if there is no reasonable chance of getting it through this session, it will stand over until the beginning of next session.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to ask the Prime Minister as to the progress that is being made by the committee appointed by himself for the revision of the rules of this House for the purpose of shortening the sessions. There is a strong feeling in reference to the matter through the country, and I would impress upon the Prime Minister the necessity of something being done this session in regard to revising the rules, which are now a hundred years behind the times.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am able to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Lewis) that we had a meeting of that committee this morning. We shall have another meeting almost immediately after the recess, and in the meantime I will be very glad to receive all communications that come to me from my hon. friend suggesting amendments to the rules.

Mr. LEWIS. But does the Prime Minister promise anything?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will be very glad to promise every possible consideration.

MANITOBA FISHERY REGULATIONS.

Mr. BRADBURY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew the request to the government for a copy of the new regulations regarding the Manitoba fisheries. I made my request across the floor of the House, and I have repeated it to the acting minister. I understand these regulations are not printed, but that they have been submitted to the acting minister for approval. What I desire to have is an opportunity of seeing them before they are passed by council, if it is possible. I think that I could, perhaps, save the minister a little trouble by seeing them. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were in his place I know that I would have no trouble in seeing them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I thought it was understood between my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) and myself that just as soon as the regulations were drafted and ready for consideration my hon. friend would see them. I certainly thought that I had given him that understanding. The deputy minister of the department informs me that these regulations are now being prepared, and they will be submitted to my hon. friend.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is all I desire. I would like to get a copy of them. I made application to the department, but I could not get them there.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Until the regulations become law I do not think it would be wise for the department to give copies out, but the hon. gentleman can unquestionably see them.

COTTON'S WEEKLY.

Mr. HERRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to an article in reference to a complaint from the publisher of 'Cotton's Weekly.' He claims that his paper is being unjustly discriminated against. I put certain questions of the order paper on the 2nd of March to which the Postmaster General replied, but his reply does not seem to

be satisfactory to the publishers of this paper. I would draw his attention to one part of an editorial written in reply to the Postmaster General which is as follows:

Do you not know that the Montreal 'Star' and 'Witness' and the Toronto 'World,' 'Globe' and 'Telegram' are sending bundles of their papers through the mails to parties who order an occasional bundle at a rate sixteen times lower than what you are compelling me to pay? Are you not aware that every little local paper is doing the same thing whenever occasion arises?

I have no interest in these matters beyond a desire to see fair play, justice and equity meted out to all publishers alike. I suppose there is a provision in the Post Office Act which allows the thing to be done under certain conditions. What I would like to know is how the Postmaster General learns what papers, when sending bundles, keep within the letter of the law and what papers do not? How does he know that a 'Globe' bundle, or a 'World' bundle, is all right and the bundle of the poor man's paper all wrong? Can 'sample' bundles be sent by the rich man's paper, while the poor man's paper for doing the same thing is an outlaw? Is one supposed to be respectable and the other assumed to be disreputable?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX. I need not say that I bear no ill will to the publisher of 'Cotton's Weekly'. That gentleman seems to be under the impression that the department is discriminating against his paper. Such is not the case. I have fully explained to Mr. Cotton, and to his many friends in the country that there is no discrimination, but that we are simply putting his paper under the ordinary regulations of the department. But Mr. Cotton has started a campaign against the department, and against the minister. I have nothing to say about that except what I have already stated in the House. Since I made that statement to the House the other day, which I need not repeat, because my hon. friend will find it in 'Hansard', Mr. Cotton in his paper has made a statement in regard to the accusation of discrimination against his paper. I find there is an affidavit from his business manager, in which it is stated that:

I, the undersigned, H. A. Webb, business manager of 'Cotton's Weekly,' being duly sworn, do depose and say: Not being a subscriber to the undermentioned newspapers, and not being engaged in the business of a news agency, I did send for a special bundle of the following five papers, namely, the Montreal 'Daily Star,' the Montreal 'Daily Witness,' the Toronto 'Daily Globe,' the Toronto 'Daily World,' and the Toronto 'Daily Telegram,' for each of their issue of March 1, 1910.

And he adds further that these papers came in bundles to him without bearing the address of any one inside. Well, I do not dispute this statement. It may be quite true that a gentleman might have asked these various offices to send a dozen of each of these papers. The House will notice that these are all well known papers having, in every part of Canada, a very large number of subscribers. I might explain to the House that papers, such as the Toronto 'Mail', Toronto 'Globe', Montreal 'Star', or the Montreal 'Witness', are first sent to the post offices as they have a very large circulation, the post offices have excess to their lists of subscribers, and the papers settle their accounts with the post office. But we do not affix the stamps on each parcel because we would have to use too large a quantity of stamps for that; so that it may happen that in a case like this a bundle is sent without bearing the individual addresses of the subscribers, because there is such a large quantity of these papers in the post office in such cities as Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, or Winnipeg.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that all these papers are sent in bundles to news agents all over the country?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and there is a proviso in the law by which the news agent benefits by the special rate. But the case of Mr. Cotton is radically different. In the first place he has comparatively few subscribers, but he sends his paper to friends who distribute it. The rule of the department is that a paper must have bona fide subscribers, and where the paper is sent them in bundles the rate is one quarter of a cent per pound. As regards this particular case I am not satisfied; probably there may be a mistake. I want to know the circumstances of each case, and I have written to the postmistress at Cowansville where the bundles were received. The following letter was sent out to-day to the postmistress:

The postmistress will find herewith a clipping taken from 'Cotton's Weekly' of 17th March, and her attention is particularly called to the following paragraphs:—

That I particularly called the attention of the postmaster of Cowansville to the fact that no postage stamps are affixed, and that he held up said bundles until he could communicate with his superior postal authorities.

That the said bundles were later delivered to me without postage stamps affixed, evidently upon the direct instructions of the superior postal authorities.

There is no record in the department of any communication from the postmistress upon the subject referred to, nor any instructions having been given. The department desires to be informed whether the statements referred to in this clipping are correct; if so, to whom the postmistress wrote for instructions; and to furnish the department with copies of any instructions she may have received from any officer connected with the postal service.

As the postmistress is aware, the duty of seeing that proper postage is paid upon newspapers and periodicals rests with the postmaster at the office where they are posted, and not with the office of delivery, unless any packages have specially been marked as short paid, when, of course, it is the duty of the delivering office to see that the deficient postage noted on the parcel is properly collected before delivery is made. If, however, the postmaster at any post office of delivery has reasonable grounds for believing that copies of newspapers and periodicals recognized as entitled to statutory postal privileges are being received at his office for delivery at a cheaper rate of postage than should properly be paid, it is the duty of the postmaster at once to notify the department of each instance, if possible procuring the wrappers upon which the address appears, so that steps may be taken by the department to properly investigate each case.

Mr. HUGHES. If a newspaper, for instance, the 'Globe,' sends a bundle of newspapers by post to a news agent in Lindsay, is that prepaid?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, it is prepaid.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Postmaster General to say that when a bundle is sent in cases like that, a list of subscribers to whom the papers are delivered is furnished.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. But most of these news agents receive a large number of papers in addition to those for subscribers, which are sold over the counter. The list cannot be reliable, because the number will change perhaps twice a week, and a news agent may send in an order for 25 or 50 extra copies.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course in this as in any other matter it is a question of good faith. A leading newspaper has no interest in hiding its status or its number of subscribers, and the department must take their word. The weight is taken at intervals, and while, of course, the weight of the newspapers is not uniform from day to day, the Saturday issue being much heavier than the ordinary issues, very few errors are made in regard to the weight, by the postal officers. This business is followed very closely, and I can assure my hon. friend that no errors are made.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the Postmaster General quite certain that campaign literature, for instance, is not sent out in the bags furnished to the newspapers not prepaid?

Mr. LEMIEUX. These bags are examined at the office where they are sent, and we have an officer at the station where they are delivered to the postal clerk. As regards the adding of campaign literature, even the adding to a newspaper during a campaign, of special sheets printed say in Toronto and sent to other papers is made the subject of a special charge for that weight. A member on this side of the House saw me in reference to that recently as a newspaper in his riding had been charged for campaign literature sent in this way, but the regulations of the department are such that such a charge could not be avoided.

Mr. HUGHES. The regulations are all right if the inspections are right.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The inspection is all right.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, advance and pay to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, hereinafter called the corporation, in addition to the money, if any, heretofore authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by any Act, and which has not at the date of the passing of any Act founded upon these resolutions been so advanced, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of six million dollars, as are required:—

(a) to pay off and retire debentures of the corporation of the par value of one hundred thousand dollars, maturing in the year 1910, and,

(b) to enable the corporation to complete the construction of the terminal facilities of the port of Montreal, for which plans, specifications and estimates have been approved by the Governor in Council, and to construct, such additional facilities as are necessary to properly equip the said port, and in respect of which plans, specifications and estimates have, previous to advances being made, been approved by the Governor in Council;

2. That during the period of construction of the terminal facilities mentioned in these resolutions the interest payable on the debentures receivable by the Minister of Finance in exchange for such advances shall be deemed to be money required to complete and to be part of the cost of construction thereof, and such interest may be paid out of the said sum of six million dollars.

3. That the corporation shall upon any advances being made deposit with the Minister of Finance debentures of the corporation equal in par value to the advance so made, repayable within twenty-five years from the date of issue, and bearing interest payable half-yearly, at the rate of three and one-half per centum per annum.

4. That the principal and interest of any sums advanced under any Act founded on these resolutions shall be payable, subject to the second of these resolutions, out of the revenue of the corporation mentioned in section 8 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896, and shall be a charge thereon as if the sums so advanced had been borrowed by the corporation under said chapter 10.—Mr. Fielding.

Mr. FIELDING. This resolution proposes to extend to a further amount the

aid which the government have been for some years granting to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. In former times the Harbour Commissioners issued their own debentures, but for some years now the government have been assisting the works of the Harbour Commissioners by lending them the government credit, thus enabling them to obtain the money at a much lower rate than they could raise it by the issue of their own debentures. The first loans were made by the government at 3½ per cent, and as the money market conditions improved the rate was reduced to 3 per cent. Now that money has become a little more expensive we are fixing the rate on the new loan at 3½ per cent, the idea being that in each case the Harbour Commissioners shall be charged as nearly as may be what the money costs the government. The sums already authorized and loaned by the government being about exhausted, and there being still important work to be done, the commisssioners have applied for an extension of the amounts so to be loaned.

We are proposing by this resolution that further advances shall be made to them to the extent of $6,000,000. That will be distributed according to the plans of the commissioners, the time is not limited in the Bill, over a period of about three years. The purposes for which this loan is required are to extend the general system of harbour improvements, and terminal facilities, which is already at Montreal, and which, even in its present condition, has, I think, won in the highest degree the commendation of the people of Montreal, and of many others outside of Montreal, who are interested in the work to apply $100,000 to meet maturing debentures, which were issued years ago under the old system; and to extend the operations of the Harbour Commissioners, including wharf construction, deepening the harbour adjacent to the wharfs, lessening St. Mary's current by dredging, construction of sheds on wharfs, extension of the present harbour system of railway tracks, providing proper unloading facilities, and improved methods of handling cargoes. These in general terms indicate the nature of the works on which this money is to be expended. In every case, before expending the money the commissioners are obliged to submit their plans and specifications to the Governor in Council, and get their approval. The arrangement has worked very satisfactorily in the past. The present Harbour Commissioners are men who have met with the highest approval of the public interested in this great work, and I think the extension of this loan will meet with the favour of the House, and the country. I should add that the interest on these loans has invariably been paid with promptitude. It is proposed, in accordance with the principle contained in the Railway Act, that during the period of construction, when no money can be earned, the interest on the sum advanced shall be deemed to be a part of the cost of construction. The interest on the sums which the government have advanced to the commissioners has been fully paid up to the 31st of December, last, so that the transaction as between the government, and the commissioners has been a very satisfactory one. The commissioners have had the aid of the government credit, the work has been well done, and I think the whole transaction is one that finds favour with parliament, and the country.

Mr. J. HAGGART. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, he has not the plans of the proposed extension.

Mr. FIELDING. No, not to cover fully the period of three years. The commissioners will only send us plans of the work from time to time. The plans for past works have been submitted before any money has been expended, and that will have to be done in the future; but no plans have yet been submitted under this Bill, though the general charter of the work proposed is understood.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I do not understand how they made an estimate of $6,000,000, unless they had plans. Information as to where this work is to be done, and how it is to be done is very necessary. I was once on a committee appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the improvement of harbour facilities in the port of Montreal. A plan was then suggested for building new docks a little below St. Mary's current. The opinion I formed at the time was that all the money you may expend for docks, warehouses, and other facilities in Montreal, as at present proposed, will never accomplish anything, and that a big new plan ought to be adopted for building a large dock below the city, with warehouses alongside of it, and railway tracks on each side. I cannot of course speak of the present plans, as I know nothing about them; but I should judge from the remarks of the Finance Minister, that they are on the line of fixing up or tinkering with the works at present in Montreal. My opinion is, not that you should abandon these works, because they can be utilized, but that you should have a bigger scheme than you have at present. I would like to ask the minister what depth of water is to be provided for—35 feet or 30 feet?

Mr. FIELDING. The question of deepening the St. Lawrence channel is not in the hands of the commission. I think the Marine and Fisheries Department provides

thirty feet of water, though as to that I would not speak positively.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It is proposed to deepen Lake St. Peter to a depth of thirty-five feet, and you need at least the same depth in the harbour of Montreal. What I want to know is, are the commissioners providing a sufficient depth in the harbour to meet the new requirements of navigation on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite sure they are; but when the Bill comes for a second reading, I shall be glad to give my hon. friend a more direct statement. I have no reason to complain of the operations of the Montreal Harbour Board on the ground that they are too small. They are quite comprehensive enough, considering the amount of money involved. The commissioners have outlined in a general way a scheme of harbour improvements which has been largely advertised in the public press. When I say that there are no plans, I mean that there are no plans that the government have approved of; but the commissioners have very large and generous views. They have plans which may not have attracted the notice of my hon. friend, and if it is desired that these plans should be brought here, I shall be glad to have them brought. If we were called upon to approve of the whole scheme of the Montreal Harbour Board, it might call for a good deal more than $6,000,000; but the proposed works are entirely in line with a very comprehensive scheme which they have adopted after having made a very careful examination of harbour improvements and terminal facilities on the continent of Europe, in England and in America. So that I am sure that what they are doing is in accordance with a broad scheme, and is not a mere tinkering with the old conditions. But I shall be happy, when the Bill comes for a second reading, to bring all the information which my hon. friend desires.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister give us an idea of the amount of money already expended and the estimated expenditure after this whole scheme is completed?

Mr. FIELDING. The scheme, so far as the government is called upon to approve of it, contemplates this $6,000,000 extended over a period of three years. I do not say for a moment that that will be the end of it, because the business of Montreal, with the business of the whole Dominion, is developing rapidly, and I should not be surprised if at the end of three years there should be a demand for a further sum; and I have no doubt that if the commissioners require it, and have paid interest in the meantime, parliament will be glad to provide it. But in providing for three years, I think we are looking as far forward as is desirable at present. As to the amount of money already expended. The amount outstanding of debentures of the Montreal Harbour Commission is $13,142,000, of which debentures to the amount of $1,972,000 are held by the public; but the government loans, represented by debentures deposited by way of security, amount to $11,170,000, to which this $6,000,000 will now be added.

Mr. S. HUGHES. Do the proposed plans take into consideration the place below the rapids?

Mr. FIELDING. The limitations of the harbour have been enlarged. The scheme is in that respect a broad one, and some of the works are below St. Mary's current.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understood the minister right, he said that we were not exactly loaning the money, but giving them the power to borrow on our credit?

Mr. FIELDING. No, we loan the money.

Mr. SPROULE. And we advance them the money?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. A portion is to pay off the expiring debentures of the corporation at par value during 1910. To whom are they payable?

Mr. FIELDING. To the outside public, not to the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the Harbour Commissioners do issue debentures?

Mr. FIELDING. They did in former years, but they are not issuing any now, except for the purpose of depositing them with the government as security.

Mr. SPROULE. The interest payable on the debentures is receivable by the minister, and the commission pass their debentures over to the government in lieu of money?

Mr. FIELDING. In return for our advancing them the money they give us the debentures, which we hold as security.

Mr. SPROULE. There is nothing in the resolution to show the assent of His Excellency the Governor General?

Mr. FIELDING. That is never found in the document itself. It is found in the intimation made to parliament when the resolution is moved, and that was made.

Mr. J. HAGGART. My hon. friend said that of this $6,000,000, a portion is to be retained as before for the payment of interest during construction, and he intimated there were other portions in the same position. What is the amount which is retained by the government for that purpose?

Mr. FIELDING. The sum so paid, in the form of interest on construction, and therefore part of the capital, amounts to $355,000. As to what is to be paid after this, that will be a matter for the future.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What is liable to be paid at present on the sums borrowed before?

Mr. FIELDING. There is nothing due. The matter has been adjusted to the 31st of December last. The total sum charged as interest during construction was $355,000. There is no interest account outstanding at present.

Mr. J. HAGGART. They borrowed a certain amount for construction before this $6,000,000 on similar terms. We have been paying ourselves interest out of the amount we lent them. Has that total amount been paid?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the matter was adjusted to the 31st of December last, and all interest properly chargeable in that way was charged up. The government received it by adjustment of the account, and the amount so charged, as distinct from the expenditure on the works themselves, was $355,000 There is no outstanding amount, no liability not dealt with in the way I have described.

Mr. SPROULE. We have paid them out of the loan?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. In the adjustment of the account they are entitled to charge up, as portion of the cost of the work, the interest on capital during construction just as would be done in case of a railway and for the same reason.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The work has been constructed and finished, and that ends it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister gave two sets of figures which represent that amount we have advanced up to the present to the commission, namely, $13,142,000 and $7,170,000. What is the explanation of the different figures?

Mr. FIELDING. The sum of $11,170,000 represents the amount which the government has lent to the Harbour Commission. The sum of $1,972,000 represents debentures held by the public and which were issued before the system was adopted of the government lending the money and the commission giving the government their debentures. As these $1,972,000 debentures fall due, the government will have to provide for them.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What interest do you receive on the $11,000,000?

Mr. FIELDING. On the first loan 3½ per cent, on the others 3 per cent. The market is, however, higher now and money costs us 3½ per cent or a fraction more, so that we are charging 3½ per cent on this loan.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 191) to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FIELDING moved second reading.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I have no objection to the second reading, but before the third reading I would like to see the plan of the harbour, and what is proposed to be done.

Mr. FIELDING. I will see that whatever information is available of that kind will be on the table before the third reading.

Mr. SPROULE. When the late Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works, the government was represented on the commission and kept substantial control over the works. What control has the government now?

Mr. FIELDING. At one time the Harbour Commissioners were rather numerous, representing various interests associated with the commerce of Montreal. Several years ago that system was changed, and the government appointed three commissioners who have the entire management. They are Major George Washington Stephens, Mr. C. C. Ballantyne and Mr. L. E. Geoffrion. They are appointed by the government, responsible to the government, and all plans and specifications and whatever they propose must be submitted to the Department of Marine and Fisheries before any work is done or money expended.

Mr. SPROULE. And assented to?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it must receive the approval of the government before they can spend any of this money. I think this is as complete control as the government could have under a system of commission.

Mr. SPROULE. The government have no engineer in connection with this work? There is no revision except the plans being submitted to the department to be examined here and approved?

Mr. FIELDING. The commission themselves have very capable and competent engineers to assist them. After their plans are completed and sent for approval they pass under the revision of engineers of the department, so I think the matter is fairly guarded.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Who is the chief engineer?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Cowie is the gentleman who has for many years been over this work, an engineer of high standing.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these commissioners paid by the government?

Mr. FIELDING. Out of harbour earnings. They are under control of the government and are paid out of harbour earnings.

Mr. SPROULE. Out of the appropriations?

Mr. FIELDING. Out of earnings —charged to revenue.

Mr. BARKER. Is this expenditure audited on behalf of the government? Is there control such, for instance, as examination by the Auditor General?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not. We have followed, in that respect, the system which has been in existence for many years. Perhaps there may be something to be said in favour of audit by the Auditor General. I have not had the matter brought to my attention before. It may be well worthy of consideration.

Mr. BARKER. I should think it would be. It looks as if this were to be the government's property some day. Therefore, we shall not get the money back any more than if we had spent it directly on the work.

Mr. FIELDING. I think there is something in that. Of course, the Harbour Commission have an efficient system of administration, and, no doubt, the matter is in good shape. There is a public report every year which is accessible. I will discuss with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is the proper officer in charge, whether these accounts ought not to be submitted to the Auditor General.

Mr. SPROULE. How could you do that if the accounts are not paid out of consolidated revenue?

Mr. FIELDING. If we wish to do it, we could have the Auditor General given necessary power.

Mr. SPROULE. The Auditor General acts under authority of law, and there must be a limit.

Mr. FIELDING. The treasury board has the right to qualify the Auditor General in respect of other matters.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Fisheries Act, chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by—

(a) Defining the standard size of the barrel in which oysters are sold, bartered or trafficked in;

(b) Prohibiting the taking, buying, selling, possessing or exporting of fish for the purpose of converting it into manure, guano, or fertilizer, or for its manufacture or conversion into oil or manure or other fertilizing product, without a permit from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and

(c) Providing for the bringing into force, by proclamation, the regulations prepared by the International Fisheries Commission between Great Britain and the United States, now before the House, and to authorize the making of regulations to secure their enforcement, and fixing penalties for their violation. —Mr. Templeman.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Under the present Fishery Act, there is no provision as to the size of a barrel of oysters. Consequently, there is no assurance to the purchaser that in purchasing a barrel he will receive a certain quantity. One purpose of the Bill to be proposed will be to provide that a barrel of oysters shall be of equal dimensions with the barrel ordinarily used for the sale of flour—seventeen inches diameter at the top or bottom, nineteen inches at the bulge and twenty-eight inches in height.

Another proposed amendment is to regulate the taking of fish to be used as a fertilizer. The present law provides that no one shall catch fish to be used for this purpose. That is too sweeping altogether, inasmuch as there are many fish that can well be used for fertilizing purposes. The proposition is to give the minister power to name fish that may be used for manufacture into fertilizer.

It is proposed also, under the Bill to be submitted, to authorize by proclamation the regulations agreed upon under the International Fisheries Commission relating to the taking of fish in international waters.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What did the minister say with regard to the prohibition of the use of fish as fertilizer?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We propose to give the minister power to define the kind of fish that may be taken to be used for this manufacture. For instance, there are dogfish and other voracious fishes that are of no use for human food. The minister will have power to authorize the use of such fish for manufacture into fertilizer.

Mr. J. HAGGART. There nas been a discussion in the House two or three times

about dog-fish, and it was stated that they were being utilized for that purpose.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. As a matter of fact the present Act is being violated every day, because they take dog-fish and utilize it as a fertilizer. I was asked the question if farmers might not use the surplus for manuring their lands, which I believe they are doing down in the maritime provinces. No doubt under the new provisions the minister will permit that to be done.

Mr. BLACK. There are places in the maritime provinces where farmers are manuring the land with young shad and young salmon. They have weirs for catching fish, to which the farmer goes when the tide is out; he takes home for food what is large enough, and what is small he dumps into a cart and carries off to his farm for manure.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. Dog-fish has been a great injury to the fishermen along the coast, both because it destroys the nets and destroys other fish, and it seems almost a hardship that a man must get permission from the minister before he is allowed to take these fish and destroy them. The Act proposes to prohibit the taking of dog-fish to be converted into oil or manure except on license by the government. I think that is not advisable. I think the destruction of dog-fish should be encouraged rather than discouraged. They make good oil and they make a good fertilizer. Along the shores of Northumberland Straits and in parts of the county I have the honour to represent, they catch these fish to a considerable extent and use them as a fertilizer. I am sure that if the minister were to take the views of the fishermen he would find that they are in favour of encouraging the destruction of this dog-fish as much as possible; and farmers would say that it is a hardship to them to have to get a permit to use dog-fish. I think it would be better to allow freedom in the destruction of these voracious fish that are of no use for food. There is another thing the Act should cover, and that is the wholesale destruction of useful fish by steam trawlers. They operate with large nets, and take great quantities of fish, of which they throw overboard those that are not useful for their purposes. A great waste is going on in that way. Fish that would be useful if allowed to escape are thus being destroyed, and the fisheries along our shores are being depleted by the use of these steam trawlers. Some provision should be made against the taking of these smaller fish, or if they are taken, they should be allowed to escape instead of being killed in nets and allowed to drift along the shore.

Mr. TALBOT. While this subject is being discussed I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the taking of small and immature bar fish in the St. Lawrence. For years I have been drawing the attention of the department to this subject, and I have also had occasion to speak to Prof. Prince about the immense destruction of bar fish that is taking place. It is the finest fish we have in the St. Lawrence. They are caught by the thousand, but so small that the fishermen after catching them are ashamed to bring them on the market, and they sell them to pedlars who go about the country retailing them from house to house. They catch fish of from four to seven inches in length that are almost useless for food, nobody would dare to bring them on the market, because he would be laughed at; and so they are destroying that fish by the hundreds of thousands every year. It is really a pity, because it is one of the finest fish we have in the St. Lawrence, and attains a size of two or two and a half feet in length, and a weight of from six to nine pounds. Some stringent measures should be taken to prevent the fishermen selling this fish to the pedlars for distribution. There should be a close inspection made, and nothing of that kind should be allowed on the river. It is now allowed all the way down the river on both shores for a distance of 60 or 75 miles. It is the finest fish we have in the St. Lawrence when allowed to mature, and I consider it a perfect scandal that they should be destroyed in this manner. The fish resemble the bass.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to express the same view as my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm). I think it will be a hardship to require the people who catch dog-fish along the coast first to get a permit from the authorities before they can use them for manure. I trust the minister will make an exception in the case of destruction of dog-fish and permit, not only the catching of them, but encourage it, because this fish is destroying the other fish that are of use. It is really one of the greatest scourges we have on the Atlantic coast. The dog-fish arrive in the summer time when the water gets warm; they come up from the south, they tear up the nets, they eat up the other fish that are in the nets, and practically the fishermen have to go out of business when the dog-fish arrive. The government has at present two or three places on the coast of the maritime provinces where these fish are purchased and turned into manure. This has been going on for a few years, and while it has lessened the quantity to some extent, still the Atlantic ocean is so large, and these fish are so numerous, that there will not be any material lessening of them by means of these establishments. A

great number of them, however, are being caught and turned to some useful purpose. It is also not an uncommon thing for fish to decay before they are taken out of the water. Occasionally a fisherman's net sinks, and when he is able to find it, with a quantity of fish in it, they are of no use except for manure. The difficulty of going for a permit in isolated cases of this kind would be great, and I trust that in the regulations which may be made the minister will keep that in mind. The idea of the minister is a good one. He wishes to preserve the fisheries, and of course we all agree in that object. But I trust the regulations will permit exceptions to be made in the case of destructive fish, and also in cases where it would be to the advantage of everybody that these fish that are not fit for food may be used as manure. I also agree with my hon. friend from Antigonish in what he says of steam trawlers. The steam trawlers operating on the banks are chiefly owned outside of Canada; they are increasing in number. A few years ago they were almost unknown on our coast, although there are many of them in in use in Britain and in the North Sea. But they are coming across the Atlantic now to operate on the banks of Newfoundland, and along the coast of Nova Scotia. They are very destructive engines. They catch not only the mature fish that are fit for food, but they also catch the small ones. The trawler is a steamboat that drags a large net along the bottom of the sea, with a wide mouth, and it takes in everything, both small and large. The small ones are crushed to pieces at the end of the net, and I suppose twenty-five per cent of the fish caught in these trawlers are of no use whatever for food, because they are too small and immature. I think you will find, on investigation, that they have destroyed the fisheries to a large extent in the North sea, and it would be a good thing if we could keep them away from the Atlantic coast altogether. It would require, of course, international arrangements to do that. I have no doubt that the government of the United States would be quite willing to enter into arrangements by which these trawlers would be prohibited on the banks and along the coast of eastern Canada. I have drawn the matter to the attention of the minister on several occasions. As the hon. member for Antigonish has mentioned it, I merely wish to say that I am in full accord with him, and I would like to see something done in that connection.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Why is it necessary that there should be a permit issued by the government to enable persons to catch these deleterious fish, that are such an injury to other fish, and sell them for manure?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I quite agree with my hon. friend that there should be no permit necessary in the case of fish that are not fit for food and are better destroyed. Of course, it is different in the case of mackerel, herring, codfish or any of the food fishes. If these food fishes are caught and used as fertilizer it should be stopped, but I trust that the minister will not ask for any permit for catching and destroying fish that are better destroyed.

Mr. SPROULE. Should not that have been included in the reference to this International Fishery Commission, and have been dealt with as well? I notice in the last part of the resolution the words:

> Providing for the bringing into force by proclamation the regulations prepared by the International Fisheries Commission between Great Britain and the United States, now before the House.

I did not understand that these words were before the House. I understood the minister to say, when the orders of the day were called, and in answer to my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), that they would be ready in a short time, and that he would be prepared to go over them with my hon. friend.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The proposed regulations prepared by the commission were brought down in the shape of a return, and have been printed and circulated.

Mr. SPROULE. What was it that the minister referred to in answering my hon. friend from Selkirk? He spoke of fishery regulations.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Those were in reference to Manitoba.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Those were local regulations in reference to Lake Winnipeg, while these have reference to international fisheries in boundary waters. These are the regulations framed by Professor Prince and Mr. Jordan, the two commissioners.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Have these international regulations been brought down to the House?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, they were brought down in the shape of a return, and they have been printed. The treaty under which these regulations have been framed provides that they shall be brought into force by joint proclamation of the two governments at a date to be fixed in the future. I assume that they will be brought into force in time for the fishing operations of this year, but this resolution provides that the Fishery Act may be amended in such a way as to empower the government to proclaim these fishery regulations. It has been deemed advisable by the Justice De-

partment that the power of proclaiming these regulations as law should be in the Act. I may say, in regard to what my hon. friends from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) have said in connection with the catching of these voracious fish, that it is thought necessary to have some amendment to the present law. The present law reads that 'No one shall catch fish for the purpose of using it as manure'; consequently, every person who takes dog-fish and converts it into fertilizer is violating the Act as it stands. Our desire is to amend that clause and give the minister power to define what fish or marine animals may be used as fertilizer. If it is done by means of permit, there will be no difficulty in granting permits to any persons who want them. It is merely to define what fish and marine animals may be used for this purpose. I know that at the present moment on the Pacific ocean there is a company aiming at the capturing of sea-lion, hair-seal and dog-fish for the purpose of converting them into fertilizer. There is no question that a permit should be given to any person who will capture and convert them into fertilizer.

I am advised with regard to trawlers, that as soon as a trawler was brought to this coast from Europe—I believe there is only one on the Atlantic coast at the present time—an order in council was passed prohibiting the operation of that trawler within the three-mile limit and within bays. I would assume that outside of the three-mile limit, this government has no control, and it would be a matter of international regulation. At all events, within the three-mile limit the use of trawlers, which my hon. friends say is very destructive to fish, has been prohibited.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. It is quite true that an order in council has been passed prohibiting the operation of these trawlers within the three mile limit. It is also true that as far as the Canadian parliament is concerned it has not jurisdiction beyond the three mile limit. That is a matter of international regulation. But, I submit that the time has come when the department or the government might seriously consider the making of some international arrangement whereby the operation of these trawlers could be prevented or controlled. It is a fact that along the shores of Nova Scotia the fishermen have to set their trawls outside the three mile limit; they have to go five or six miles out. I know that along the shores of Antigonish county when the steam trawler 'Wren,' was operating last year, and the year before the fishermen had to take up their gear because they were afraid it would be destroyed by the steam trawler. The regulation which has been passed, and which exhausts the jurisdiction of the government in the matter does not to any substantial extent protect our fishermen along the shores. Those engaged in the cod fishery practically had to give up business last year, and the year before. Their gear was threatened with destruction by this trawler. The trawler, while manoeuvring during its operations, will destroy the nets of the fishermen without those in control of it being conscious of the fact, and I would urge upon the acting minister, as I have urged upon the minister, that the matter be taken up as soon as possible, and some regulations brought about to prevent the operation of the trawler within ten miles, or, at all events, within six miles of the coast. The order in council prohibits fishing within the bays, and harbours of Canada, but what is the meaning of bays and harbours? The Americans have put a certain construction on it. They claim it means three miles from the shore, following the sinuosities of the coast. The Canadians have always contended that the three mile limit means three miles outside of the land measuring from headland to headland. If the Canadian interpretation were followed it would not make so bad a situation for our fishermen, but as it is, the practice being to follow the sinuosities of the shore in determining the extra territorial limit our fishermen are subjected to great annoyance and injury by these trawlers. I would request that an endeavour should be made to prevent this. This government it is contended could control its own subjetcs, and make it illegal for any Canadians to engage in this kind of fishing which is very destructive. But if such an attempt were made the same thing would happen here as happened in the old country. The moment Canadians were forbidden to fish in trawlers, they would fly some other flag, possibly the French flag. A number of French trawlers are fishing on the banks outside the three mile limit, and the department could not stultify itself by prohibiting Canadians from what other French and other fishermen do. A regulation of that kind was passed in Scotland some time ago, and the instant it was done Scotch and English trawlers registered in a Norwegian port flew the Norwegian flag, and then they could fish outside the three mile limit of Scotland with impunity. The only way to relieve the situation, and save the fishermen is to have some international regulation made prohibiting the operation of trawlers at least within six miles or ten miles of our coast.

Mr. HENDERSON. My reading of the regulations would be that a time is already fixed in some instances for the coming into force of the regulations. In my section the fishermen are relying on the wording of

the regulations as given out by Dr. Starr Jordan and Professor Prince, and are governing themselves accordingly. For example with reference to the size of a mesh for taking small fish in Lake Ontario we are told:

No gill net or other movable net of less than four and three-fourths inches mesh, extension measure, as actually used in fishing, shall be drawn, set, placed, or maintained for whitefish or lake trout in these treaty waters.

No gill net or other movable net of less than three and one-eighth inches mesh, extension measure, as actually used in fishing, shall be drawn, set, placed or maintained in Lake Erie—

And this is the part to which I more particularly refer:

—or of less than two and one-half inches mesh in Lake Huron, Lake Superior, and Lake Ontario, for fish other than whitefish or lake trout.

The above restrictions shall take effect on and after January 1, 1911.

The fishermen in my section quite understand that whatever may be done by the government in the way of a proclamation these regulations shall not be brought into force, at least those in regard to the size of the net, until January 1, 1911. I understand that the minister proposes to authorize under an Act of parliament a proclamation declaring when these regulations shall come into force. It is important that these regulations shall not be brought into force at once. The fishermen have large quantities of nets on hand, and if they are compelled to use a mesh even one-eighth of an inch larger than what they are using now, it would be a serious matter for them, as they would have to throw away their nets and purchase new ones. I hope the minister will not bring the regulations into force at an earlier date than January 1, 1911; I would rather impress on him the necessity for extending the time for bringing these regulations into force for another year. The nets the fishermen now have will last for two years from the first of January last, and it would be only fair to the fishermen to allow them to use their present nets until they are worn out, especially as the difference in size is so very slight.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The authority that is taken under the resolution is to empower the Governor General by proclamation to bring into force the international regulations prepared by the International Fisheries Commission appointed under the treaty signed at Washington, April 11, 1908, between Great Britain and the United States concerning the fisheries in waters contiguous to Canada and the United States. With regard to the date on which these regulations shall be brought into force, if I remember rightly, under the treaty both governments have to proclaim them as taking effect on a certain date. We might, with the concurrence of the United States government, fix the first of January 1911 as that date. It is quite true, as my hon. friend says, that the first of January, 1911, is mentioned in one of the regulations as the date on which it shall take effect, which is rather peculiar, in view of the fact that the regulations might not be proclaimed until after that date. However, I think it is the desire of both the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and of the United States government that these regulations should be proclaimed so as to have effect during the fishing season of 1911. It is not deemed possible to have the regulations effective before that date, and therefore it is not at all probable that they will be proclaimed as taking effect before that.

Mr. HENDERSON. What time of the year would the hon. minister consider to be the fishing season? The class of fishing to which I refer is carried on all the year round, except perhaps during the warmer weather in summer. Some of the regulations may be brought into force sooner than others; but there would be nothing lost to the department by extending the time even for another year in the case of the regulation to which I refer, as there is only ¼ of an inch difference in the size of the nets. I hope that the minister, in preparing any legislation in regard to this matter, will deal as leniently with the fishermen as he possibly can.

Mr. SINCLAIR. When the minister said that there was only one trawler operating on our coast, I presume he meant one Canadian trawler. There has been a large increase in this method of fishing in the last few years. In 1907, according to statistics which I have, there were seven French trawlers which came across the Atlantic and operated on the banks of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland; in 1908 there were fourteen; and last year there were about thirty. They have been a great annoyance to the regular fishermen on the coast, both Canadian and American, and I am informed that there are no other trawlers at all operating on the Atlantic coast. These trawlers are nearly all owned in France, and they are invading our waters. These banks on the coast of Nova Scotia are the breeding ground of the codfish and the haddock, which are the most valuable fish we have; and if they continue to operate there, I have no doubt that these valuable fisheries will be destroyed. Therefore, I wish to impress upon the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries and on the Prime Minister the importance of dealing with this question if there is any possibility of obtaining international arrangements by which these trawlers will be prohibited from operating on the banks. A few years ago arrangements were made

by which the seal fisheries of the Pacific coast were protected by international law, and I consider that the protection of the breeding grounds of the codfish and the haddock on the Atlantic coast is of equal importance. I have the best reason for believing that the government of the United States would join with the government of Canada in anything that could be done to prohibit that mode of fishing. The banks on which these fish are found are not very large or numerous. They are confined to a few hundred miles, and there is a large fleet of Canadian and American vessels engaged on these banks. The fishermen's method of fishing is to put their gear into the water, leave it for a time, and then take it up. In the meantime, these trawlers come along and destroy it, so that when the fishermen take up their gear, they find only a few remnants left, and often their whole outfit is swept away. I trust that the matter will be dealt with seriously, and that if possible international arrangements will be made to control or prohibit parties engaged in this destructive method of fishing.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The question which my hon. friend has raised is a very large one, of an international character, and we cannot at the moment make any declaration. If we are going to have regulations dealing with trawl fishing, there is no doubt that it will be necessary for the United States, Great Britain, France and all other countries engaged in that industry to participate. I do not know whether in the past any negotiations have taken place looking for the regulation of trawl fishing. I am aware that trawlers are coming to both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. We have power to regulate them only within the three-mile limit, and that has been done on both coasts. I will direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the observations of my hon. friend in 'Hansard', and will impress upon him the importance of giving full consideration to this question.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I wish to ask the minister if the regulations set out in this return have been adopted by the American government without any change beyond what is shown here. I understand that some objection was taken to them and that efforts were made to have some changes made in them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The regulations have not been adopted by either government and will not be adopted until they are proclaimed concurrently by both governments. The regulations as printed were agreed to by the two commissioners, and it simply remains for the sanction of both governments to make them law. That, I understand, is the present position

Mr. SINCLAIR

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has there been any change made by Professor Prince, and the representative of the United States?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The regulations stand just as they are?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand so.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has the American government made representations asking for changes?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Not to the knowledge of the department.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it the intention of the department to stand by these regulations or does it intend permitting changes to be made?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The intention is to proclaim these regulations just as soon as the United States government do. We must act concurrently. The regulations become the law of both countries on the same day, but I think the treaty provides that changes may be made from year to year on the unanimous decision of the commissioners.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. This return shows what regulations are agreed upon between the two commissioners, but I understand that representations have been made to Washington by some parties interested in the United States to have changes made, and Professor Prince has been in Washington again. I would like to know, because some of my constituents are interested, whether it is the intention of the government to permit any changes?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am informed that the department has no knowledge of any proposal to make any change, and does not know that the American fishing interests are asking for any. I would assume that, as the regulations have been agreed to, no changes will be made, but I think the treaty itself provides for the making of changes from year to year on the unanimous consent of the commission.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The United States government virtually say in the treaty that they are going to secure the assent of the various states interested to a proclamation carrying into effect these international regulations. The minister is no doubt aware that, so far as the great lakes are concerned, any property rights in the fisheries belong to the states, and are held by the states, and that the various states have different regulations. For instance the regulations of New York state, on Lake Ontario, and those on Lakes Erie and Huron, are different. It was suggested, at the time the treaty was made, that it would be advisable to have the control, and the regu-

lation, and the governing power vested in the federal government. I have followed this question, and I cannot see that the American government has secured the consent of the state governments to permit the federal government to deal with the fisheries on the Great Lakes at all; and until such time as the federal government of the United States has secured that consent, I do not see how it can have any status at all in the matter. Why then should we make any regulations with them at all of an international character? We have taken power to make international regulations. It seems to me we are travelling a little far in agreeing with the United States to do certain things, when the Americans can back out of their agreement by saying that the state rights interfere, but will insist all the same on our sticking to our bargain. Another point is that the Americans have not taken any steps towards a close season. I do not see that any attempt is made under these regulations to have a close season at all. To my mind it is absolutely necessary for the protection of our fisheries that there should be a close season. In looking over the regulations, I find that the American position is that assumed by them all the way through. Is it the intention of our government to go into a deal of this kind with the federal government of the United States without that government having the authority from the various states to carry out its bargain?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My understanding of the question of jurisdiction in the United States is that while the various states have control over the fisheries within those states, when the United States government make a treaty with a foreign country, that treaty supersedes state rights. I believe that such is the opinion of the Washington government.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What authority has the hon. minister for that statement? The entirely opposite view was taken with reference to the Sault Ste. Marie Falls.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that is the view of the Justice Department at Washington.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Where do you find it?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. gentleman is catechising me on a legal point. But it is not at all likely that the United States government would have entered into this agreement unless the federal authorities thought they could enforce the regulations they were preparing.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Has the minister read the correspondence brought down last session on the matter? The correspondence shows that the federal government 'hopes' to secure the co-operation of the state governments.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am stating the international aspect of the question, as I understand it. Whether I got that impression from the public press or from some return or document, I am not sure.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. It is just an inspiration.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Why would the federal government at Washington appoint a commissioner, and enter into a compact with Canada to do certain things, if they did not believe they had the power to enforce their regulations?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The documents show that they say they 'hope' to be able to get the various state interests to consent. If the various states consent to allow the federal government to deal with the matter, then the federal government may act to some purpose, but they have not done so.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend is not a little mistaken in the view he takes. The states of the union are not in the position of riparian owners in the case of water rights. They are in exactly the same position as the northwestern provinces in this confederation. The federal government is the owner of all riparian rights, not only in the lands but in the water.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What is the hon. member's authority for that?

Mr. CONMEE. The constitution of the United States, and the fact that the states of the union are not owners of the land as are the old provinces of Canada. I think my hon. friend will not pretend to dispute that.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) cannot quote a single case in United States jurisprudence to bear out his statement.

Mr. CONMEE. I can put the matter the other way—the hon. member (Mr. J. A. Currie) cannot find any evidence to the contrary.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I will give an instance. At Sault Ste. Marie, the state of Michigan had granted water rights to a certain portion of St. Mary's falls to a private individual. These power rights became vested in a company or syndicate. When the Waterways Commisison endeavoured to treat with the St. Mary's falls, a protest was entered, the matter was fought out and the decision of the court was that the riparian rights belong to the state, and not to the federal authority.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member is entirely mistaken; the facts of the case are

not as he has stated. What happened on the American side is pretty much what happened on the Ontario side. The province of Ontario gave a charter for the development of power on the Canadian side. The state of Michigan did the same. To give that development on both sides, the company got United States federal authority. The action of the courts to which my hon. friend refers upheld, not the authority of the state, but the authority of the private owner. But the state itself was not the riparian owner. The American courts have held that the riparian owner, if a private party or company who have purchased from the state—that is, from the federal government—has an interest in the riparian rights which has to be satisfied. That case is not fought out yet, but I think it is conceded that the riparian owner, whether individual or company, must be compensated for his rights.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. From whom did the owner get his title?

Mr. CONMEE. From the federal government of the United States?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. No, from the state of Michigan.

Mr. CONMEE. He got legislation from Michigan

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. He got his title there.

Mr. CONMEE. How could he get the title from Michigan to develop a power, when the state of Michigan did not own the land? All the land is sold through the medium of the United States. The state of Minnesota, except with regard to land that has been given to it for school and other purposes, does not own the soil of the state. And the state of Michigan is in the same position.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I am sorry for the hon. member (Mr. Conmee), for he is very much astray. The case he cites shows only that he has not the faintest, hazy idea of the situation. The fact is that the state of Michigan gave that power to a private individual and granted the land under the river in fee. The case has been fought out, and it has been decided that if the federal government takes over a water right, it must compensate that owner. As to what the hon. member said about a state of the union not owning the land, there is no state in the union that will submit to have its ownership of its own soil challenged.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member (Mr. J. A. Currie) is entirely ignorant of the history of the United States. I do not say that what I have been contending in this matter applies to such states as the state of New York. But, as to the state of Michigan, the state of Minnesota and others, they are in exactly the same position as our own northwestern provinces—they do not own the land at all.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Who owns the water-powers of New York on the St. Lawrence—the state authority or the federal?

Mr. CONMEE. I will not speak as to the state of New York, for it was a Crown colony before it became a state.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It has been decided that the power rests and is vested in the state of New York.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend (Mr. J. Haggart) has heard information read in this House which ought to give him light on that subject. The state of New York has no power over and cannot give control of the St. Lawrence river. It has no legislative jurisdiction over it. It gave a water-power to the very company over whose Bill we sat up all night recently, but before the right was complete, it had to be ratified at Washington.

Mr. J. HAGGART. But surely the hon. member knows the distinction. The federal authority has rights of legislation in regard to navigation, and, so far as state rights interfere with that of the federal authority, they are set aside. But all the profits that come from the users of water-powers on the St. Lawrence in the United States belong to the state adjoining.

Mr. CONMEE. No, that has been fought out in the United States very fully. The most important case arose on the Michigan side of the river at Detroit, over a question of building docks. It was held that the riparian owner had certain rights which must be satisfied before even the government of the United States could place a dock there. Now, that is not quite the case on our side. In this country the Crown can assume control of that very well.

Mr. J. HAGGART. How could a private individual get his right—from the federal authority?

Mr. CONMEE. I assume so.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. member is drifting to his water-powers again. I don't like to get into these water-power deals. Let us keep to the point. What authority in the United States is it that issues the fishing licenses on the Great Lakes?

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) has water on the brain to-day. I am not responsible for what the various states may have done. The provinces in this Dominion have issued fishing regulations, and the province of Ontario collects

a license fee for fishing. The states of the union do the same.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I might suggest that as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is now in his place, he might be allowed to assume his role.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member (Mr. J. Haggart) wants a higher authority than myself? I am quite willing.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The question simply is whether the states consent to give the whole jurisdiction to the federal authority. That is a simple question, and I am sure the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will recognize not only how simple it is, but how pertinent to the subject under discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question the hon. member has put is a fair one. I believe that, at the present time, the accepted doctrine in the United States is that the treaty-making power is the paramount authority and supervenes the rights of the states. I do not agree in everything that has been said by the hon. member for Simcoe with regard to the rights of the states and the rights of the federal government. But in this matter I think it is now accepted that the treaty power of the United States is the supreme authority and supersedes the rights of the states.

Mr. J. HAGGART. No doubt that is the authority under which the arrangements were made. The federal power of making a treaty supersedes state rights, and the federal government contend that they have the power to enter into negotiations of this kind although the property may belong to the state.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 192) to amend the Fisheries Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LAND TITLES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. OLIVER, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 125) to amend the Land Titles Act. said: The registration of titles in unorganized territory is provided for by this government. In what is now called the Northwest Territories, that is to say, the country lying north of the three prairie provinces, provision is made in the Land Titles Act for registration within that territory. There has been very little granting or transfer of titles in that territory up to the present time, but a condition has arisen where the actual title has been earned, and it is desirable that the title should be granted. No provision has yet been made for the registration of title within those territories, and no such provision is possible without an amendment of the Act. The conditions are such, there being so very few titles to register, that it is not thought advisable to establish a registry office within that territory at the present time, and we ask for an amendment to the Act to allow the titles in the Northwest Territories to be registered at Ottawa. It is simply a temporary provision, until progress requires the establishment of an office actually within the territory.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. OLIVER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 141) to amend the Indian Act. He said: This Bill contains three clauses, the provisions of each of which are entirely distinct. The first clause provides for the better protection of Indian lands. It is, of course, an understood principle, that the Indians have the sole right of occupation of their reserves. But in the opinion of the Justice Department, the procedure whereby that exclusive right of occupancy is to be exercised—the procedure by which it may be enforced, is not altogether efficient, and it is on the advice of that department that I am asking for this amendment. The second section relates to contracts made by the Indians which would obligate their band or communal funds. While it has always been an understood principle of the Indian Act that band funds or Indian property, that is, tribal property, cannot be obligated by any agreement entered into by the Indians except with the approval of the government—although that has been the understanding, there seems to have arisen some question about it, and it is thought desirable to remove that question by he provision of section 2.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Has this an ex post facto effect?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it would not have any ex post facto effect.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It might have.

Mr. OLIVER. It was not intended to have. Section 3 is intended to put beyond question the absolute right of the Indian to the money that he is entitled to receive from the government; that is to say, to declare that it is not subject to attachment by legal process.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I do not yet seem to be very clear with regard to the first clause.

It applies where there is a dispute between an individual, a corporation or other parties and the Indians as to the ownership of land?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. HAGGART. That has to be decided by the Exchequer Court?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What court has jurisdiction at the present moment?

Mr. OLIVER. That seems to have been the difficulty. While the law declares the position, the procedure is not defined. This is designed to provide the procedure.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is this clause intended to apply to the difficulty which at present exists with reference to the Oka Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It would apply to it. The jurisdiction seems to be exercised by the local courts in Quebec as to the ownership of that particular property. Now the jurisdiction is removed from the local to the Exchequer Court. It may be the better plan, but we want to know the facts.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. It has not any reference to the Oka case. In that case the question before the courts is: Is that an Indian reserve? One step in the procedure has been taken, and as the House knows, we have made arrangements to carry the case to the Privy Council. This legislation is not dealing with that case at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be very reasonable to suppose that this legislation does apply. It says:

If the possession of any lands reserved or claimed to be reserved by the Indians is withheld, or if any such lands are adversely occupied or claimed by any person.

The question is to be determined by the Exchequer Court. This statute, I would take it, would apply to all such cases in future. These cases have been pending in other courts for some time.

Mr. OLIVER. I would think that if the Oka case had not been in the courts then possibly this would apply, but, of course, the Oka case having been entered in the court and being under judicial investigation—

Mr. J. HAGGART. The last dispute with the Indians is not in the court at all; it only occurred a month or two ago.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a stated case before the courts for the purpose of settling the question as to whether this is an Indian reserve or not. I would take it for granted that so long as that case is under consideration and until it has reached its conclusion it would not be proper that this legislation should intervene. But it will be clear that if there is a necessity for such legislation, and in our estimation there is a necessity for it, we cannot very well postpone it, because there happens to be a case in the court which might be affected by it. If there is any danger of a clash I would much rather have the exception declared in the Bill, but my understanding is that it is not necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Justice is right at the minister's hand, and this seems to be of sufficient importance to get the advice of the Justice Department on it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to ask the minister to leave this Bill over and not put it through to-night, as there are some members of the House who are not present, and who would like to be present when the Bill is passed.

Mr. OLIVER. On the point raised, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) understands that the rule is that cases under procedure are not affected by a law made after the proceedings were instituted. That is his view, and I think it is certainly fair and no doubt is good law.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Ex post facto legislation would be interpreted in the strictest sense in favour of the contention that the legislation should not apply. The point is this: Disputes have arisen between the Indians and parties there with reference to the cutting of wood. The question as to the right of cutting wood, or of the ownership of the property, has not yet gone to the courts, and it would, under this legislation, have to come to the Exchequer Court. I think that all cases in dispute as to ownership with respect to Indian lands must be decided by this court.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the intention.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that section 2 declares that:

No contract or agreement binding or purporting to bind, or in any way dealing with the moneys or securities referred to in this section . . . . shall be valid or of any force or effect, unless and until it has been approved in writing by the superintendent general.

That would cover the annuities paid to Indians?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Consequently they cannot barter off their rights without getting the consent of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the purpose we have in view.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that was the law now?

Mr. OLIVER. Everybody supposed that was the law, but apparently there has been some mistake on the subject, and we want to make it the law unquestionably. It is not introducing a new principle; it is merely affirming a well recognized and accepted principle.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Has this an ex post facto effect?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. J. HAGGART. This would not cover applications of money made in an unjustifiable manner with the partial consent of the department of roads, or repairs, or anything of that kind without the full legal consent of the Indians to it? It does not cover the past; it is intended for the future.

Mr. OLIVER. I would think that it could not legally cover the past, and certainly in administration I would say that it should not and that it is only in the future that it should have effect.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is this law intended to apply to Indian lands in the older provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not quite appreciate why the right of trying a question between an Indian and an ordinary man in Nova Scotia should be removed from the Supreme Court. Does this take away the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to try a dispute with reference to land or trespass which might be a very slight matter? I believe that questions of that kind should be tried in the Supreme Court of the province without going to the Exchequer Court which with us is regarded as a very clumsy remedy. We do not have the Exchequer Court in the province more than once in two years, and to secure a remedy from it is considered rather difficult. It is true we do not often have suits with Indians, but we would like to have the right to settle them when they do arise in the same manner as ordinary suits. As to whether the law is retroactive or not I quite agree that it is not retroactive unless it is specifically made so, but it is a different proposition when you come to deal with jurisdiction. With regard to rights it would not be retroactive, but on the question of jurisdiction of the courts it would be retroactive.

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

On section 1,

Mr. J. HAGGART. This preserves all the old procedure and remedies, and at the same time enacts this new remedy?

Mr. OLIVER. I take it that this would allow an action for trespass or a minor action to be taken before the local courts, but a more important case would come before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The intention of the section should be more clearly stated.

On section 2,

Mr. J. HAGGART. This certainly is ex post facto. It must certainly apply to some agreements made in the past.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend thinks that is so, and it can be guarded against by words added, I would be quite willing to guard against it.

Mr. BARNARD. While the minister is amending the Indian Act, has he considered the advisability of amending section 89 of the Act? That section provides for the control of money arising from the sale of an Indian reserve, and provides in effect that not more than fifty per cent of these proceeds can be given to the Indians. It seems to me that there might be cases in which it would be advantageous for the government to have a discretion as to giving a larger proportion to the Indians directly, instead of funding it for their benefit. For instance the question of the Songhees reserve in Victoria is a burning one and great difficulty has been found in making a settlement with the Indians to get them off the reserve. As a matter of fact, although there have been many efforts there has been no result. It has been my opinion that one of the sticking points is that the Indians cannot see where they are going to get a sufficient inducement in cash at the present time. If one of the contentions put forward by these Indians for their desire to remain on that land is correct it seems to me there is no reason why they should not get a larger proportion, if not the whole of the purchase money directly. They contend that a number of their young men and women are working in factories and other places in the town, and it is a convenient place for them to live, and they do not want to be disturbed. If they are sufficiently enlightened to work in the factories they are able to take care of their funds. If the section were amended by striking out the words 'not exceeding fifty per cent' and leaving it discretionary with the Governor in Council to deal with the funds either by funding them, or handing them over to the Indians, it might be a step towards a settlement of that very vexed question.

Mr. OLIVER. It would be contrary to the established policy of the government of Canada in dealing with Indians to treat

Indians generally in that way. It is generally considered that there should be a permanence of revenue from any property which the Indians have, and the Act as it stands, allowing 50 per cent to be paid directly, is a big step in advance of the Act as it formerly was, and I doubt if it would be acceptable generally to allow a larger proportion to be paid. I quite appreciate the very difficult character of the conditions which my hon. friend has in mind. I would very much rather provide for that particular case, which is very exceptional, by a special Act, than to amend the general Act to meet a special case.

Mr. BARNARD: If one could have a positive assurance that a special Act would be brought down to deal with that case, there would possibly be no necessity for making this amendment. But I have no doubt that is not the only case. I know that there is a case within the limits of the city of Vancouver, and the people there are very anxious to get rid of that reserve. Not very long ago the Minister of the Interior made an effort to settle with the Indians in regard to this particular reserve. He was prepared to offer them a certain sum in cash, amounting to $2,000 per family for 40 families. The Indians were asking for more, but the minister said, I cannot go any further, because I can only give you 50 per cent of the value of the reserve. That being the case, if such an amendment as that proposed were made, it would materially assist the settlement of that question.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What business will be taken up on the first day after the vacation?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue on the Bills which have been discussed today, and which we have not been able to put through—the minor Bills. Almost anything except the Naval Bill will be taken up on the opening day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 p. m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1909-1910.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider, Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., Northwest Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ALLEN, Mr. H. E., *Shefford.*

Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1789 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7193, 7234 (iv).

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5643 (iii).

Blairmore Station Mail Service (Ques.) 7871 (v).

Budget, The (remarks) 2080 (ii).

Census of 1911, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2429 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 7295 (iv).

Combines Investigations Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7892 (v).

Conservation of Natural Resources (B. 84) 1° m., 1587 (i); on M. for 2°, 6332; in Com., 6338, 6360; on M. for 3°, 6619 (iv).

—— Consideration of Bill (remarks) 6140 (iv).

Conservation Com., Meetings, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

—— Names of Members (Ques.) 1196 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7006 (iv).

Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal, &c. (Ques.) 3293 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3918 (ii).

Electrical Measure Units B. 7 (Mr. Fielding) on Order for 2°, 5673 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Farm and Dairy Produce, Quantity exported for 1909 (Ques.) 1016 (i).

Free Mail Delivery, Closing of Post Office Distribution (Ques.) 1196 (i).
See 'Rural.'

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 183; on M. for 2°, 717 (i).

French Treaty, Similar Treatment to Germany (Ques.) 1196 (i).

German Surtax, Explanation *re* Negotiations (remarks) 3679 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreement *re* Dairy Products (remarks) 3832 (ii).

German Trade Relations, Par. in New York 'Herald' (remarks) 2635 (ii).

—— Similar Treatment *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 785 (i).

—— Value of Exports, &c. (Ques.) 261 (i).

Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1366 (i).

Hansard Debates, Omissions, &c. (remarks) 7880 (v).

Holstein and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms (Ques.) 4309 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5809 (iii).

Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 783 (i).

Insects, Pests and Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res. 211 (i); in Com., 5628 (iii).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmt., 2812 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Montreal Govt. Weigher, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1196 (i).

—— Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1546 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5901 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4423 (iii); in Com., 7452 (v.)

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5293 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Patronage *re* Advertisements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 8118 (v).

Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6507 (iv).

Port Colborne Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business (Ques.) 267 (i).

P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increase, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3167 (ii).

Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c. (Ques.) 5779 (iii).

Post Office Mail Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).

Printing outside of Govt. Printing Bureau, Payments *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

—— Inquiry for, 2713 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 886 (i); on M. for Com., 6492 (iv).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 6008 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 4812, 5625 (iii).

R. M. College Buildings, Total Cost *re* Maintenance (M. for ret.*) 3169 (ii).

Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver (Ques.) 784 (i).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, Change in Design of Boxes (Ques.) 1783 (i).

—— Locks furnished, &c. (Ques.) 784 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 259 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 1380 (i).

See 'Free.'

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5332, 5345 (iii), 6234, 6346, 6736 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7090 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2638 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7376; (cold storage) 7383 (iv); (experimental farms) 227 (i), 5726; (exhibitions) 5728 (iii); (Patent Record) 7371 (iv).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3107; (Newmarket) 3109; Welland (elevators) 3120 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farms) 227; (salaries) 219; Indian Affairs (salaries) 345; Labour (salaries) 236; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 252; (printing) 252 (i); Post Office salaries) 6650, 6683 (iv); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 249 (i).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7838 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Post Office—Outside Service (rural delivery) 5753 (iii); (salaries) 7863 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 426; (Eastern Block) 572; (Museum) 570; (Royal Mint) 557 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Que. immigration sheds) 961; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (Roberval) 927; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4761 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6117 (iv.).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 982 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Lennox Island) 2694 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3836; (St. Lawrence River channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecœur) 3889; (Fort William) 3892; (Gaspé) 3893; (Grand Mechin) 3901; (Grand Rivière) 3903; (Grand Vallée) 3904; (Grosse Isle) 3906; (Lake Aylmer) 3907; (Matane) 3907; (Natashquan) 3909; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Piche Point) 3913 (ii); (Ste. Croix) 4238; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (board of commissioners) 3698; Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3129 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5714; (trade commissioners) 5714 (iii).

Swine Commission, Report of (Ques.) 2429 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5960, 5989 (iv).

'Toronto World,' Ownership by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Maclean) 5998 (iv).

Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of (remarks) 5278 (iii).

See 'German.'

Troy, Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7288 (iv).

U.S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens (remarks) 6942 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Zinc Ores Smelting, Investigation, B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5796 (iii).

ARTHURS, Mr. J., *Parry Sound.*

Budget, The, 1946 (i).

Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount for 1907-9 (Ques.) 7872 (v).

Grain shipped from and received at Lake Ports, Ont. (Ques.) 445 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, O.Cs. *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for Copies, 3526 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of (Ques.) 1194 (i).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c. (Ques.) 850 (i).

Magnatawan Wharfinger, Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 7289 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6214, 6970 (iv).

Parry Sound Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 920 (i).

Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

SUPPLY.

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 930 (i); Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 6122 (iv).

Trent Canal Water Powers, Control by Govt. (Ques.) 2185 (ii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution, Commutation, &c., on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2009 (ii).

——— (correction) *re* Action of Crown, 2712 (ii).

B.C. Judicial Appointments, Delays, &c. (reply) to Mr. Borden, 11 (i).

Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice and National Trust Co. (Ans.) 6800 (iv).

Capital Cases and Action of the Crown, Correction (remarks) 2712 (ii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5226 (iii).

——— Instruction, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 6391 (iv).

Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public (Ans.) 5105 (iii).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 147 (i).

Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 2°. 2163; in Com., 2166 (ii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Customs and Fisheries Protection Act Amt. (B. 138) 1° m., 3290 (ii); 2° m., 6190 (iv).

Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Proceedings (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, on Inquiry for Rep., 7650 (v).

Dom. Police, Number sent to Thunder Bay, &c., *re* Dom. Election, 1907 (Ans.) 1007 (i).

Dubuc, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 1976 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2278 (ii).

Du Tremblay, Mr. Arthur, Instructions *re* Prosecution (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1268 (i).

Escheats to the Crown (B. 206) M. for Com. on Res., 6508; in Com. on Res., 6974 (iv); in Com., 8384 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. accidents) Amt. (B. 159) 1° m., 4996; in Com., 6182 (iv).

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies (remarks) 3207 (ii).

Franking Privilege *re* Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1207 (i).

Franking Privilege, Political Literature and Sol. Gen.'s Frank (remarks) 7792 (v).

Georgian Bay Canal, and U. S. Privileges, *re* Waterways Treaty (Ans.) 3160 (ii).

Horse Racing. *See* 'Race Track', &c.

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2043 (ii).

Judges, Defence of, 7163 (iv).

Judicial Business, Montreal District, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 1797 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S. Officers, Action of Can. Govt. *re* (remarks) 852 (i).

Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c. (Ans.) 4847 (iii).

——— Delay in Apptmt. (remarks) 5624 (iii).

Man. and Quebec Judges, Superior Court (prop. res.) 6607; in Com. on Res., 6976; in Com., 8383 (v).

National Battlefields Act Amt. (B. 188) 1° m., 5888; in Com., 6598 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7403 (v).

New York Canals, Use of by Canadian Vessels, Authority *re* (Ans.) 4128 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5206 (iii).

North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at the Hague, Counsel, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1552 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Obscene Literature, Sale of, Skill and King, release from Central Prison, Political Pull, &c. (remarks) 7069 (iv).

—— (further explanation) 7183 (iv).

—— Letter of Attorney General (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8348 (v).

Offences against the Person, B. 71 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2040 (ii).

Ottawa and Quebec Representation in the House of Commons, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1309 (i).

Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. (Ans.) 3490 (ii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt. (B. 217) 1° m., 7867; in Com., 8382 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Legal Work to Lawyers in Toronto, 8362 (v).

Quebec Superior Court at Montreal, Number of Cases standing (Ans.) 1370 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 901 (i); in Com., 6541; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6582 (iv).

—— on Ques of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 6717 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 457 (i).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. Graham) 6 m. h., 487 (i).

Railway Act (general) Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8416 (v).

Robinson, Mrs., Pets. *re* Release of (remarks) 924 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7163 (iv).

Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard (Ans.) 1375 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 253 (i).

Victoria Bridge Highway, Emigrants Burial Ground, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 5889 (iii).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3432 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2039 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6849; in Com., 6906 (iv).

De Mar., Edna Shibley Relief (B. 223) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5685 (iii).

Gaspereau River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).

Govt. Railways Pension B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1138; in Com., 1148 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Halifax Round-house Property, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2948 (ii).

House of Commons Corridors, Ejectment of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7183 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5802, 5865 (iii).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7951 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2827 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1121 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2914 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commission B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5905 (iii).

N.T. Ry., Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2406 (ii).

—— Lumsden Charges, Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4073 (iii).

—— change in rep., &c., on M. for Sup., 5570 (iii).

—— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6041 (iv).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 8305 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5676 (iii), 6963 (iv).

Nicholl, Emily Maud Relief (B. 222) 1°*, 8361 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1558 (i).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 1365 (i).

Post Office, Outside Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Salary to Leader of Opposition, 6612 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 609 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 892 (i); on M. for Com., 6476 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7102 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7347 (iv).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (tool grinder) 3105 (ii)
Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6675 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (creosoted timber) 3454; (Partridge Island) 3451; (Richibucto) 3442; (St. John tributaries) 3447; (St. John wharf property) 3452; (Shediac) 3450 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington) 3456; (Byng Inlet) 3460 (ii).
Railways (board of commissioners) 3092 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3068 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2934; (revenue) 3091; (Robinson's crossing) 2945; (Ste. Rosalie) 2946 (ii).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.. 5247 (iii).
Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3064 (ii).
Railways (Quebec bridge) 3071 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8092 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods, B. 101 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8012 (v).

Western Power Co's B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3434 (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B.C.*

B. C. Railway Subsidies, Particulars *re* (Ques.) 5929 (iv).

Budget, The, 1673 (i).

Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c., (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

Criminal Code (race-track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 886 (i).

Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector (Ques.) 1529 (i).

Dredging Inspection of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).

Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transportation of Guns, &c. (Ques.) 1017 (i).

——— Cor. *re* (M. for copy*) 3170 (ii).

Esquimalt Fortifications, Dismantling of, Conc. of Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 2292 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8032 (v).

Garrison Artillery Regiments, Number, Strength, &c. (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

——— Supply and Use of Field Guns, &c. (Ques.) 1790, 1799 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5926 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1259 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep of Com., 2920 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4182 (iii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6214 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5236 (iii).

Pender Island Canal, Cost, Length, Depth, &c. (Ques.) 2427 (ii).

Public Works, B. C., Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4279 (iii).

Public Works Engineers, Number of Resident, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

South African Scrip, Location in B. C. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Victoria and San Francisco) 5711 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Campbell) 4276; (Columbia river) 4277; (Nitinat Lake) 4715 (iii); (Victoria) 6123 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4775 (iii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (generally) 5614 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6117 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 6122 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste Croix) 4236-4237 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria & Eastern Ry. & Nav. co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4811 (iii).

Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1369 (i).

——— Number of Inmates, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

"William Joliffe," Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Banking Act, Expiration of, Issue of Currency, &c. (Ques.) 2950 (ii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6. (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 880 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1294 (i).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5680 (iii).

Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).

Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials (remarks) 6609 (iv).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1248 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2916 (ii).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4989 (iii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8204 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Martin's Island) 3474 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5797 (iii).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. A., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Civil Service Act (garnishee) Amt. (B. 175) 1°m., 5620 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv., 7066 (iv).

I.C.R., Prosecutions *re* Damages by Fire, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3683 (ii), 4568 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) 2946 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c. (Ques.) 642 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4108 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1392 (i).

BEST, Mr., *Dufferin.*

House of Commons, Sessional and Temporary Employees, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4392 (iii).

Peace River Country, Portions opened for Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 4313 (iii).

Retail Merchants Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8588 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2655 (ii).

Sessional Employees, H. of C., Number in January (Ques.) 4514, 5001 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5254 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Clean Currency, &c. (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 756 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5553, 5861 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6605 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8461 (v).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6291 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 216 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8051, 8423, 8596 (v).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 888 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 172) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5803 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5657 (iii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1108 (i).

I.C.R., Sale of to other Ry. Cos. (prop. res.) 2299 (ii).

——— Water on Passenger Trains, Filtering, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1303 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6293 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5407 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5749; (hatcheries) 5752 (iii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1393 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R. *Peel.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5646 (iii).

Bay St. Lawrence Light-keeper, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

Brownridge, James Thornton, Relief (B. 202) 1°*, 6802 (iv)

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).

Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported, &c. (Ques.) 631 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res. 6874; in Com., 6923 (iv); 7905 (v).

Conservation of Natural Resources Commission, B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res. 5885 (iii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty, B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6997 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6624 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3921 (ii); 5774 (iii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8694 (v).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Gaspereau Dredging, Demand for Papers read by Ministers (remarks) 2490 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Employees, Crown Residences, Inquiry for Ret., 3058 (ii).
See 'Senate.'

Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896 (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

House of Commons and Senate Officials, Estimated Cost of Occupancy of Living Rooms, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1023 (i).
See 'Senate.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5504; in Com., 5829 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6604 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (cigarettes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 3°, 523, 811 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5646 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7943 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3152 (ii).

Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4513 (iii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5764 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. King) to conc., 2425, 2887 (ii).

Lethbridge Post office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).

Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty (Ques.) 6391 (iv).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6279 (iv).

Milk Tests, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 5884 (iii).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7435 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5675 (iii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4821 (iii).

Newspapers, List *re* advertising Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).

Newspapers in Ontario, Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6141 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1569 (i).

Patronage List and Tory Whip, Par. in Toronto 'World,' (personal explanation) 7070 (iv).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).

Post Office Patronage List (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Post Office Regulations *re* Mails to Members, &c. (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6961 (iv).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 140 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (amt.) 612 (i).

Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture (remarks) 4532 (iii).

Race-track Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 455 (i).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8431 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7657 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5784 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5363 (iii), 6227, 6341 (iv).

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 121 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809 (i).

Senate and H. of C. Residents in Parliament Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).
See 'House.'

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 7763 (v); (census) 7374; (farm bulletins) 7380 (iv); (live stock industry) 7749 (v); (tobacco) 7382 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (Canton wharf) 3122; Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3103; Trent (damages) 3120; (Newmarket) 3119 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (clerks) 7764 (v); Finance (salaries) 335; Indian Affairs

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(salaries) 366, 414 (i); Interior (contingencies) 8195; (salaries) 8194 (v); Post Office (salaries) 6651 (iv); Public Works salaries) 333 (i).

Dom. Lands (printing, &c.) 8493 (v).

Excise (distilleries) 1333; Inspectors (salaries) 1331 (i).

Immigration (salaries) 8494 (v).

Militia (rifles, &c.) 8562 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8496 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 8518 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Strathcona) 8190 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Greenwood) 8191; (Williamshead) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Bathurst) 580; (Grand Falls) 582; (Lunenburg) 576; (Wolfville) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Fergus) 7178 (iv); (Goderich) 7496; (Guelph) 7498; (Harriston) 7503; (Kincardine) 7505; (Leamington) 7506; (Listowel) 7506; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 8170; (Uxbridge) 8178; (Wallaceburg) 8178; (Waterloo) 8178; (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 539 (i); (deptl., new) 7169 (iv); (military stores) 601; (museum) 569 (i); (National Art gallery) 6158 (iv); (parliament driveway) 8174; (Printing Bureau) 8170; (Senate redecorating) 8176 (v); (standardizing room) 572 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Summerside) 580 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine, heating) 667; (Megantic) 700; (Plessisville) 704; (Roberval) 944; (St. Roch) 830; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, repairs, &c..) 8193 (v).

Public Works—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4772 (iii); Man. (generally) 6138 (iv); Mar. Provs. (generally) 4782, 4805 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125 (iv); dredging (new plant) 4740, 4755; (vessel repairs) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (bridge work) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1167, 1174; (Saw Pit) 1176; (South Cove) 1177; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur, &c.) 6101; (Victoria) 6123 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3909; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3914 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monument) 6158; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6163; (engineering branch) 6163; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.B. (Courtenay Bay) 6151; Ont. and Que. (Chapeau) 6150; (Hawkesbury) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines, Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6154; Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 2873; P.E.I. (construction) 3102; Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3096, 3128; (Quebec bridge) 3073 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 1355 (i).

Yukon Govt. (administration salaries) 8487 (v).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1396 (i).

Uxbridge Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8187 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6378 (iv); in Com., 8399 (v).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5796 (iii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

French Canadian Party in Parlt., Ques. of Priv., 8115 (v).

Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment of Indemnity *re* Damages on Chambly Canal, &c. (Ques.) 2486 (ii).

Grand Mere Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

N.T. Ry. Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2598 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4453 (iii).

St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c. (Ques.) 5931 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 932; (Shawinigan Falls) 951 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia), *Kings, N.S.*

Airships, Devlopment of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 1369 (i).

——— Govt. Assistance to Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin (Ans.) 446 (i).

Armouries, Govt. Policy *re* Building (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Armouries and Drill Halls, on Inquiry for Ret., 5689 (iii).

Army Service Corps, Charges against two officers, &c (Ans.) 2288 (ii).

See 'DelaRonde.'

Artillery Horses *re* Petewawa Camp, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 786 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*

Artillery, Re-armament of, Reasons for (Ans.) 1372 (i).
See 'Garrison.'

Baby Farm Sale (B. 181) prop. Res., 2634 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5791 (iii); in Com., 5941, 6003 (iv).

Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).

Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt (Ans.) 2146 (ii).
See 'Garrison.'

Cartwright, Sir R., Lease of Lands: *See* 'Frontenac.'

Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation, Pension, &c. (Ans.) 636 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).

DelaRonde, Major and Capt., Charges *re* (Ans.) 135 (i).

——— Report of Justice Dept. (Ans.) 5500 (iii).
See 'Army Service,' 'Ottawa,' &c.

Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Strength, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 637 (i).

Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay Lists (Ans.) 6801 (iv), 8837 (v).
See 'Savard,' 'Scott,' &c.

Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transportation of Guns, &c. (Ans.) 1018 (i).

Esquimalt Fortifications, Dismantling of, Imp. Conc. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
See 'Garrison,' 'Halifax,' &c.

Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

——— Request *re* Indemnity (Ans.) 5560 (iii).

French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps (Ans.) 133 (i).

Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes (Ans.) 1371 (i).

——— Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, &c. (Ans.) 262 (i).

Garrison and Artillery Regiments, Supply of Guns, &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

——— on Question being put by another Member (remarks) 1791; (Ans.) 1800 (i).

——— Strength, &c. (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
See 'Esquimalt,' &c.

Halifax and Esquimalt Docks, Protection *re* Deterioration, &c. (Ans.) 1011 (i).

——— (remarks) 1802 (i).

——— Observations of Sir Wm. White, Stmnt. (read) 1961 (ii).

Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes 843 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 783 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*

Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payments *re* Services for Moving Pictures (Ans.) 1193 (i).

Lambton Barracks, Acquiring of Property (Ans.) 271 (i).
See 'Baby,' &c.

Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 275 (i).

Military Lands: *See* 'Baby,' &c.

Military Topographical Surveys, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 1375 (i).

Militia Active Service, Standards *re* Efficiency in Rifle Shooting (Ans.) 1596 (i).

Militia Clerks, Apptmt. without Examinations (Ans.) 1375 (i).

Militia Clothing, Life of, Purchase of New Material (Ans.) 1018 (i).

Militia, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 781 (i).

Militia Expenditures *re* Fortifications, Submission to Leader of Opposition (Ans.) 1779 (i).

Militia Field Allowance, Expenses of Staff Officers (Ans.) 1202 (i).

Militia Inspection, Pay, Rates of to Inspectors (Ans.) 1535 (i).

Militia Medical Attendance, Govt. Allowance for Married Officers (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. (B. 194) prop. Res., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6012, 6097, 1°*, 6098; 2° m. and in Com., 6190 (iv).

Militia Officers, Provisional School Allowance (Ans.) 1019 (i).

Militia Pay and Allowance Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 1378 (i).

Militia Provisions *re* Arms, &c. for active War Establishments, &c. (Ans.) 842 (i).

Militia Stores Building, Ottawa, Instructions to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling (Ans.) 838 (i).

——— Loss of Clothing by Fire, &c. (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— Value of Damage by Fire (Ans.) 386 (i).

Militia Tents, Average Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1780 (i).

Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).

Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System re (Ans.) 1200 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3296 (ii); in Com., 7440 (iv).

Naval Defence Documents, on Inquiry for, 2798 (ii).

Naval Service, Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Meaning of 'Upkeep,' &c. (Ans.) 3738 (ii).

Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate, &c. (Ans.) 1203 (i).

Ordnance Stores, Kingston, Repairs and Lease, &c., (Ans.) 5782 (iii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*

Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority *re* Emplymt. of Horses, &c., (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
See 'DelaRonde.'

Pay Lists of 18th Regiment, Personators (Ans.) 8837 (v).
See 'Eighteenth.'

Permanent Force, Average Cost per man, annually (Ans.) 1013 (i).

——— Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c. (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

——— Cost of Maintenance (Ans.) 1781 (i).

——— Increase in Establishments, &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

——— Number of Re-enlistments, &c. (Ans.) 3735 (ii).

——— Officers Entertaining Allowance (Ans.) 1531 (i).

——— Requirements *re* Instructions, &c., (Ans.) 1011 (i).

——— Scale of Payments, &c., (Ans.) 1012 (i).

——— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c. (Ans.) 1531 (i).

——— Total Strength and Expenditure (Ans.) 266 (i).

Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French (remarks) 5279 (iii).

Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1790 (i).

Queen's Own Rifles at Aldershot, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Patterns, &c. (Ans.) 265 (i).

Rifle Practices, Facilities *re* (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Ross Rifle Mark II**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 134, 273 (i).

——— on ques of priv. (Mr. Staples) 339 (i).

Ross Rifles, Mark I and Mark II**, Defects, Issue of, Contracts *re* &c., (Ans.) 1533; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Answer to Mr. Worthington (withdrawal) 1597 (i).

——— Number received, contracted for, &c. (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

——— Submission to N. R. Association *re* Bisley Meet (Ans.) 4082 (iii).

——— Weight of (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que. (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

R. M. College Act Amt. (B. 180) Prop. Res., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii); 2° m., 6098 (iv).

R. M. C. Cadets, Visit to Ottawa (remarks) 8584 (v).

R. M. College, Servants' Cottages, Removal of (Ans.) 5781 (iii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*

St. Johns, Que. Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c. (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 3738 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5492 (iii).

Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1780 (i).

Savard, Lt.-Col., Retention of Money from Capt. Talbot, &c. (Ans.) 8659 (v).

——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment (Ans.) 6800 (iv).
See 'Eighteenth.'

Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment (Ans.) 8109 (v).

S. A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1204 (i).

S. A. Patriotic Fund, Control of, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2952 (ii).

South African Scrip, Location in B. C. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

S. A. Volunteer Scrip, Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8581 (v).

S. A. War, Reinstatement of Aud. Gen.'s Messenger (remarks) in Com of Sup., 8568 (v).

Stanley Barracks, Sale of Baby Farm, &c. (Ans.) 2952 (ii).
See 'Baby.'

Subtarget Rifle Machines, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 1779 (i).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5532 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armoury grants) 8570; (armoury to 65th Reg.) 8570; (arms, rifles, &c.) 8556; (civil employees) 8574; (engineers) 8569; (gratuities) 8571; (monuments) 8575; (pay, &c.) 8559; (topographical survey) 8574 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec barracks) 975; (citadel drill shed) 967; (Quebec, ordnance stores) 967 (i).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted and delivered, &c. (Ans.) 1536 (i).

Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment of Allowances for 1907 (Ans.) 6800 (iv).

'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 1778 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 33 (i).

Address to Earl Grey, on Closing of Term of Office (seconded) 8740 (v).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7194 (iv).

Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Alien Labour Law, Violation, &c. (remarks) 4813 (iii).
Aud. Gen. Messenger, Re-instatement *re* S. A. War (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (vol. II) Inquiry for, 1445 (i).
Bank Act Amt., Inquiry for, 2061 (ii).
Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 201 (i).
Bread: *See* 'Inspection.'
B. C. Judicial Apptmts., Delays, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 5 (i).
See 'Judicial.'
B. C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 531 (i).
Budget, The, Date of Delivery (remarks) 1002 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 2081; Ques. of Order, 2085 (ii).
Canadian Associated Press Subsidy B. 228 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8685 (v).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).
Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N. S. (remarks) 8585 (v).
Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res. 6806 (iv); in Com., 7890; on M. for 3°, 7995 (v).
—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. King) 7188 (iv).
Conservation of Natural Resources B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6359; on M. for 3°, 6619 (iv).
Criminal Code (motors) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) in Com., 8730 (v).
Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2167 (ii).
Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6188; in Com., 6632 (iv).
Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3056 (ii).
—— Translators, Apptmt. of, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 3914 (ii).
Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv), 7650 (v).
Dog-Fish Reduction Plant, Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c. (M. for ret*) 109 (i).
Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3916 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8689 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 3987 (iii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8034 (v).
Fisheries Commission *re* Man., on Inquiry for Report, 1963 (ii).
—— Signing of Report (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7823 (v).
French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3059 (ii).
French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 189; on M. for 2°, 707, 715; on M. for 3°, 822 (i).
French Treaty, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).
French Treaty (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).
German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 4712 (iii).
—— Explanation *re* Negotiations (remarks) 3681 (ii).
German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 3829 (ii).
Govt. Railways Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4403 (iii).
Government's Railway Pension Amendment B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i); on M. for 3°, 2637 (ii).
G. T. P. *See* 'Natl. Transcl.' &c.
Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Condition of, Observations of Sir Wm. White (remarks) 1802 (i).
Halifax Harbour and Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen (remarks) 4714 (iii).
'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps., Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance of Old Proprietor Ledge Buoy, on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Papers, 315, 323 (i).
Horse Racing. *See* 'Race Track.'
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5523 (iii).
Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia, Papers (remarks), 207 (i).
Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Irregularity of Discussion, 119 (i).
Inland Revenue Act (warehouses) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 152
Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. B. on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).
Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7943 (v).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2827 (ii).
—— Board of Management, Rep. to Hse. (remarks) 2791 (ii).
—— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1106, 1803 (i); on M. for 3°. 2214 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8402 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

I. C. R. and N. T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

——— and P. E. I. Ry. Employees Fund B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i); on Order for 3°, 2637 (ii).

——— Low Rates, Inquiry for Information (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill 8481 (v).

——— Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service (remarks) 332, 343 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6201 (iv).

Judges Act (Man. and Que.) Amt. (B. 207) in Com., 8383 (v).

Judicial Apptmts. in N.S. (remarks) 623 (i).

See 'B.C.'

Labour Hours on Public Works, on 1st Rep. of Com., 1586 (i); on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2903 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1269 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8105, 8233 (v).

See 'Marine.'

Lumsden, Mr., Resignation, Letter to Prime Minister, Inquiry for, 622 (i).

See 'Nat. Transcl.,' &c.

Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6507 (iv.)

Manitoba Boundaries, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) to Com. of Sup., 8160 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520; in Com. on Res., 657 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Committee, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).

See 'Lobster.'

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6191 (iv).

Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6099 (iv).

Motions to Adjn., Ruling of Mr. Speaker, on Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 127 (i).

Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts., &c. (remarks) 1600 (i).

National Battlefields of Quebec B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6599 (iv).

N.T.R. Commissioners' Rep., Printing of (remarks) 97 (i).

Nat. Transcl. Ry., Lumsden, Mr., Resignation as Chief Engineer (remarks) 97 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).

——— Resignation, Reps. Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 258 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Additional letter to Prime Minister, (remarks) 448 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Printing Papers, 377, 1302 (i).

N.T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2367, 2601 (ii).

——— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report, 6055 (iv).

——— 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).

——— Errors in Rep. of Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5196, 5277 (iii).

——— on M. for Sup., 5589 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 5597 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. debate, 5599 (iii).

N.T. Ry., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, 8326 (v).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 8310 (v).

N.T. Ry., Counsel, &c. (remarks) 4516 (iii).

——— Payments to Counsel (remarks) 8841 (v).

Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt. (remarks) 7291 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1738 (i); on M. for 2°, 2979, Amt., 2991 (ii); Neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101 (iii); in Com., 7396; on M. for 3°, 7528 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* withdrawing stmnt., 4940 (iii).

Naval Defence Bill, Inquiry for, 520, 1100, 1600 (i).

Naval Defence Conference (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).

——— Further Documents, Inquiry for, 2797 (ii).

Naval Service, of Canada, Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Upkeep, &c. (Ques.) 3738 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6208 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B, 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4836, 5289 (iii).

New York Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5208 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 1560 (i).

N.S. Judges: *See* 'Judicial,' &c.

Ontario Legislation, Disallowance, Inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8702 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1314 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Permanent Force, Number of re-enlistments, &c. (question) 3735 (ii).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) on Ques. of Order, 3744 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 6603; in Com., 7316 (iv).

P.E.I. Rys., Royal Junction, Surveys, Reps. &c., (M. for copies*) 3170 (ii).

Prison and Reformatories Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8382 (v).

Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Miller) to suspend Rules, 8362 (v).

Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 140 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6564, 7262 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider Rep. of Special Com., 6399 (iv).

——— on Procedure in Com., 6558 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 462 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8477; in Com., 8480 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6170 (iv).

Returns, Careless Arrangement of (remarks) 522 (i).

Reynolds, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism (remarks) 3209 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7741 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7630 (v).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6196 (iv).

R.M.C. Servants' Quarters, Occupation, &c., (Ans.) 263 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res., (Mr. Lewis) 1538 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1441 (i).

——— in Com. on Rep., 8374 (v).

St. John Valley Railway, Legislation re Operation (remarks) 7292 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5366 (iii), 6169, 6246, 6721 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7524 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 811 (i), on M. for 2°, 2637 (ii).

Select Standing Committees, Organization of (remarks) 343 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

S.A. War, Reinstatement of Messenger in Aud. Gen.'s Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).

See 'Volunteer.'

SUPPLY—

Canals—Cornwall (lock 19, entrance) 3123 Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3105; Trent (Newmarket) 3108 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 243; Indian Affairs (salaries) 359; Labour (contingencies) 241; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248; (salaries) 247 (i).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8803 (v).

Fisheries (oyster culture) 8545 (v).

Geological Survey (surveys) 8555 (v).

Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 8567 (v).

Mines (ore deposits) 8553 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8498 (v).

N.W.M. Police (rifle ranges) 8802; (salaries) 8802 (v).

Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 8512; (steamers) 8510; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 597 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6133 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Kouchibouguac) 3392 (ii); (St. John) 6112 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3881; (Carleton) 3885; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Father Point) 3891; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3893; (Godfroy) 3898; (Grand Mechin) 3900 (ii); (Laprairie) 4224; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (St. André de Kamouraska) 4228; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (St. Charles de Caplan) 4235; (Ste. Croix) 4236 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3127; (Quebec bridge) 3071 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., Stmnt. re (remarks) 5278 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Stmnt., 6100 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1076 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2663 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).

Trade Relations with U. S. on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8742 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8399 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 258 (i); in Com., 8004 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8722 (v).

Waterways Treaty with the U. S., Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copy) 109 (i).

——— on Order for Cor. (remarks) 1536 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6100 (iv).

Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c. (remarks) 2713 (ii), 4403 (iii).

——— Information *re*, 3481 (ii).

——— Progress *re* (remarks) 1802 (i).

——— Printing of Papers (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Ways and Means, on M. *re* Procedure (Mr. Fielding) 6397 (iv).

——— U.S. Trade Relations, &c., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 8742 (v).

Wharfs, Policy of Building, &c., by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4238 (iii).

Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii), 4428 (iii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Algoma Rural Mail Delivery, Application *re* (Ques.) 1020 (i).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewal (Ques.) 3735 (ii).

Budget, The, 2093, 2102 (ii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Floods, &c. (remarks) 5219 (iii).

Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application, &c. *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 104 (i).

——— Sault Ste Marie, Application *re* Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 105 (i).

See 'Port Arthur,' 'Sault Ste Marie.'

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8693, 8695 (v).

Fielding, Mr., Gift to: *See* 'Gifts.'

Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Roads, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 635 (i).

Gifts to Ministers of the Crown (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).

Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation (M. for cor.*) 171 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8055; in Com., 8631 (v).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale, Terms and Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 635 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2677; in Com., 3152 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re* (remarks) 4083 (iii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Kensington Wharf, Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 1783, 1970 (i).

——— Expenditure (remarks) on the Budget, 2106 (ii).

——— Repairs, &c., Recommendation (Ques.) 3736 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2921 (ii).

McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office (Ques.) 4081 (iii).

Maxwell, Jessie Maud Mary Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 3829 (ii).

Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 783 (i).

Ministers of the Crown, Public Gifts, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7437 (v).

Naval Policy, Support of (remarks) 1649 (i).

Naval Service, Names of Cruisers purchased, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3931 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6205, 6972 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5296 (iii).

Obscene Literature, Skill and King, Release of from Central Prison, Par. in 'Can. Municipal Journal' *re* Political Pull (remarks) 7068 (iv).

——— Detention of Books, &c., (Ques.) 7517 (v).

——— Letter of Attorney General (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8345 (v).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).

Port Arthur Dry Dock, Applications *re* Subsidy (M. for pets.*) 171 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3136 (ii).

——— (remarks) 5003 (iii).

See "Dry Docks."

Pulp and Pulp Wood Exports from Sault Ste Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 836 (i).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6982 (iv).

Race Track Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3939 (ii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5765 (iii).

Rush-Bagot Treaty, Violation of *re* War Ships on Great Lakes (remarks) 5762 (iii), 7520 (v).

Reid, Ada Ann Relief B. 158 (Mr. Nesbitt) on M. for 2°, 5490 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8427, 8594 (iv).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5476 (iii); (amt.) 6735 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, &c., Applications *re* Subsidy, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 171 (i).

——— (remarks) 3833, 3945 (ii); 5278 (iii).

Sault Ste Marie Locks, Investigation *re* Accident, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 837 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 4315 (iii).

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 106 (i).

SUPPLY—

Excise (distilleries) 1331 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 537; Que. (Quebec ordnance stores) 968 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4763 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3406 (ii); (St. John) 6116 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3463; (Kensington) 3470; (Michipicoten) 3471; (Rainy River) 3472; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3474 (ii), 5608 (iii); (Sibley) 3475 (ii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2666 (ii).

Trade Negotiations with U. S., Par. in New York 'Sun' (remarks) 6393 (iv).

U. S. Claims: *See* 'Adjudication.'

U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes: *See* 'Rush-Bagot.'

Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c. (Ques.) 629 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 77) 1° m., 1441 (i).

Census, Decennial, Date of Taking (Ques.) 1371 (i).

Sauve, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign (M. for cor.) 2032 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4490 (iii).

Quebec Fisheries, and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c. (Ques.) 6940 (iv).

Savings Bank Act Amt (B. 76) 1° m., 1440 (i).

Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*

C. P. R. Teulon Branch, Extension, Govt. Approval, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

Cement Merger, Protection *re* Combine (Ques.) 106 (i).
See 'Combines Bill.'

Civil Service Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7311 (iv).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7979 (v).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8033, 8059 (v).

Fish Hatcheries at Berens River and Snake Island, Total Cost (Ques.) 632 (i).

Fish Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).
See 'Manitoba.'

Garden Fruits and Vegetable Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duty, &c., on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).

Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

Half-Breed Scrip, Location since Jan., 1910 (Ques.) 6937 (iv).

Hecla Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5552 (iii).

Lac du Bonnet Fisheries, Letter from Mr. Wold (read) 6720 (iv).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2667, 2683 (ii).

——— Report, &c. (remarks) 3391 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 1963, 3480 (ii). 5894 (iii).

Manitoba Fisheries Regulations, Amts. *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6292 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4833, 5236, 5279 (iii).

Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 850 (i).

Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost., &c. (Ques.) 7871, 8237 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7661 (v).

St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4263 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Claims *re* Speculators, &c. (Ques.) 129 (iv).

——— Instructions sent to Agent *re* Surrender (M. for copies*) 643 (i).

——— Instruction to Chief Justice Howell (remarks) 1963, 2279, 2636 (ii).

——— Instruction to J. O. Lewis *re* Patents (M. for papers*) 1380 (i).

——— Investigation by Dept. *re* Surrender, &c. (Ques.) 2296 (ii).

——— Letter from Rainway missing from Ret., Inquiry for, 1802 (i).

——— Moneys paid *re* Surrender (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).

——— Negotiations with Mr. Wm. Frank (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

——— Payments to E. Raynor, Ques. of Priv., 7520 (v).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7012 (iv).

——— Reps. and Accounts of Geo. Tracey (M. for copies*) 1976 (ii).

——— Rep. of A. S. Williams, &c. (M. for copy*) 3494 (ii).

——— inquiry for, 5689, 5762 (iii).

——— Report *re* Investigation, on M. for Sup. (amt.) 7009, neg. (Y. 57; N. 107) 7165 (iv).

——— Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).

——— Treatment *re* Surrender of Lands (M. for cor.*) 414 (i).

Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

Stone Industry Protection, on M. for Sup., 7330 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7349 (iv), 7759 (v); (experimental farms) 7765 (v).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 348 (i).

Fisheries—(Marine fishways) 8534; salaries) 8537 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 592 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 540; (museum) 569; (military stores) 601 (i).

Public Works — Dredging — Man. (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Gimli) 4262; (Red River) 4266; (St. Laurent) 4259; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Victoria) 6124 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3864; (Gaspé) 3895 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8073 (v).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8435 (v).

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Contract *re* (Ques.) 7289 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).

Winnipeg Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6849; in Com., 6905 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1281 (i).

Lumsden Charges, Changes in Report, &c., on M. to adjn. debate, 5600 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, 7567 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6967 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8175 (v).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8755 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A. *Dundas.*

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5511 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2813 (ii).

Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Inland Rev. Dept., Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 3935 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works on M. (Mr. King, to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6398 (iv).

Morrisburg Ferry Dock Co.'s incorp. (B. 177) 1°*, 5759 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3822 (ii).

New York Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5207 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5335, 5342 (iii), 6268 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5560 (iii).

Swine Industry in Ireland, Inquiry for Rep., 5689 (iii).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8754 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

Arcand T., Dismissal as Light Keeper at Carousel (Ans.) 2288 (ii).

'Arctic,' Str., Rep. of Capt. Bernier *re* Cruise (Ans.) 1014 (i).

Bait Freezers, Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Bait, Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1965 (ii).

Canadian Shipping Act (inspection) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for 2°, 513 (i).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of (Ans.) 1201 (i).

Cold Storage Plant at Barrington, N.S. Govt. Assistance, Application *re* (Ans.) 1973 (ii).

Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector (Ans.) 1529 (i).

Deep Water Weirs, Number of Licenses issued, &c. (Ans.) 1782 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance (Ans.) 633 (i).

——— Negotiations *re* Transfer (Ans.) 266 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Completion of Rep. and Evidence (Ans.) 276 (i).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell) 1302 (i).

Fisheries Commissions since 1896, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Fisheries, Revenue in Alberta and Sask. (Ans.) 1021 (i).

Fish Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 384 (i).

Fish Hatcheries at Berens River, &c., Total Cost (Ans.) 633 (i).

Fishermen's Bait Associations, Amounts paid per ton (Ans.) 1015 (i).

Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign (Ans.) 133 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building, &c. (Ans.) 1004 (i).

Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 2430 (ii).

Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity packed, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1782 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy (Ans.) 107, 108, 130 (i).

——— Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Copies, 302 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 207 (i).

——— (presented) 1297 (i).

——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 640 (i).

'Leebro,' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 788 (i).

Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia' (Ans.) 107 (i).

Light-house Keepers, Increase in Salaries (Ans.) 1589 (i).

Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns (Ans.) 259 (i).

——— Licenses, Number issued (Ans.) 1970 (Ans.) 1970 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Naval Cadets, Instruction *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ans.) 1971 (ii).

Naval Service, Number of Applicants, Policy of Appointments, &c. (Ans.) 1970 (ii).

Naval Ships, Purchase by Govt., Cost &c., (Ans.) 1972 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c., (Ans.) 108 (i).
See 'Hestia.'

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1323 (i).

Public Wharfs leased under Act of 1909 (Ans.) 260 (i).

Quebec Water Lots, Sale to Private Individuals (remarks) on Ques. (Mr. Monk) 431 (i).

St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners (Ans.) 129 (i.)

——— Sale of to Private Individuals (Ans.) 625 (i).

Seal Cove Life Boat, Inspection *re* Condition, &c. (Ans.) 2147 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensation, &c. (Ans.) 2294 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c. (Ans.) 445 (i).
See 'Can. Shipping.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 252; (salaries) 250 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1034 (i).

Tonnage Tax imposed by U.S. on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes (Ans.) 1530 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 25) 1° m., 258; 2° m., 1299; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 1302 (i); in Com., 8004 (v).

'William Joliffe,' Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals, on M. (Mr. Macdonell) to adjn. House, 1599 (i).

——— Stmnt. (read) 1684 (i).

Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 444 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Cor., 644 (i).

BUREAU, Hon. JACQUES (Solicitor General)
Three Rivers and St. Maurice.

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7812 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries vote, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) 8168 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4546 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7266 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Justice—Administration of N.W. Ters. (stipendiary magistrate) 8799; Supreme Court (law books) 8798 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. JACQUES—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings, Que. (Shawinigan Falls) 949 (i); Harbours and Rivers Que., (Becancour) 3870; (Doucet's Landing) 3890 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. 8004 (v).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Agriculture Dept., Adminstration of, on M. for Sup., 7242 (iv).

Apples grown in B.C. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5651 (iii).

Bank Deposits in 1909 (Ques.) 5001 (iii).

B.C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts., on M. to adjn., 16 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 533 (i).

B.C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 529 (i).

Budget, The (remarks) 2067 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6157 (iv).

Chinamen, Number paying Capitation Tax (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instruction to Capt. Jemmett (Ques.) 5499 (iii).

——— Surveys, &c., (M. for field notes*) 4315 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7899 (v).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6623 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1285 (i).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 812 (i).

Garden Fruits and Vegetable Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5846 (iii).

Insurance Act B. 16 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).

Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 380 (i).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1360 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2900 (ii).

National Anthem, Singing *re* Naval Debate (remarks) 3208 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3245 (ii); in Com., 7472; on M. for 3°, 7540 (v).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Nechaco and Stewart Rivers, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s (B. 32) 1°*, 380 (i).

Okanagan Lake Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop, Res. (Mr. Foster) 2484 (ii).

Pests to Vegetation Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 211 (i); in Com., 5630 (iii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7322 (iv).

Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 6941 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6584 (iv).

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Rep. *re* to Can. Govt., &c. (remarks) 1444 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5726 (iii), 7765 (v).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6681 (iv).

Ocean and River Service—B.C. (wrecking plant) 8519 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 425 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Fort George canyon) 4727; (new plant) 4775; (Queen Charlotte) 4718 (iii).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (generally) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops-Fenelon) 6156 (iv).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1878 (i); 2° m., 2101 (iii); in Com., 4841 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6380 (iv).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8438, 8721 (v).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2488 (ii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L., *Dauphin.*

Agriculture, Criticisms of Deptl. Methods, Ques. of Priv.. 1364 (i).

Agriculture Dept.. Administration of. on M. for Sup.. 7204 (iv).

Arts. Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7286 (iv).

Budget, The. 2259 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2091 (ii).

Buttonshaw, George Robert Relief (B. 117) 1°*. 2710 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 123) on Senate Amts.. 8657 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7309 (iv).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*

Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 5000, 5560 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6914 (iv).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 870 (i); in Com., 7264 (iv).

Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening (remarks) 3136 (ii).

Doukhobours, Comparison to hon. Member for Dauphin, Explanation *re*, 5532 (iii).

Dual Representation in H. of C. (remarks) *re* Bill, 6802 (iv).

Elevators at Terminal Points, Building, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Evidence and Rep., Completion of (Ques.) 276 (i).

Fisheries Investigation *re* Man. and N. W. Ter, Inquiry for Rep., 1302, 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).

See 'Manitoba.'

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 744 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7821 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3060 (ii).

G. T. P. Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 1783 (i).

Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c. (Ques.) 1784 (i).

Horses exported from Ont. to N. W. Ters. disinfecting Stockyards (remarks) 4812 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Supply, 4209 (iii).

House of Commons (B. 60) 1°*, 1102 (i).

See "Dual."

House of Commons Members, Names of (M. for ret.*) 1547 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5504; in Com., 5532; on Ques. of Order, 5540 (iii).

Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications &c. (M. for copies*) 277 (i).

Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission, Ques. of Privilege *re* 'up to date,' 2151 (ii).

See "Fisheries."

Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6360 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5175 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4835 (iii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1573 (i).

Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8582 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1324 (i).

——— Prime Minister's Resignation (remarks) 1446 (i).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. to Vacancy *re* Decease of Mr. Greenway (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1542 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115, Plans *re* (remarks) 5560 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7086 (iv).

Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts, &c. *re* Spawn (M. for copies*) 277 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7286; (experimental farms) 7346 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) conc. (M.) to reduce vote, neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).

Fisheries (fish breeding) 8540; (legal expenses) 8544; (salaries) 8536 (v).

Geological Survey (surveys) 8555 (v).

Marine (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8522; (Sorel yard property) 8523 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558 (v).

Mines (peat bogs) 8554 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 686; (St. Lambert) 956; Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Sydney Mines) 1178 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver on M. for 2°, 6381 (iv); in Com., 8072 (v).

CARRIER, Mr. L. A., *Lév*

Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 6390 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*

Buctouche Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 215) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Criminal Code Act (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8732 (v).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 896 (i); in Com., 6546 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5878 (iii).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3137 (ii).

I. C. R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2323 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 510 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2047; in Com., 2154 (ii).

Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S., Action of Can. Govt. *re* (remarks) 851 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3143 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2520 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5241, 5282 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 607 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s. B. 150 (Mr. J. Reid) 2° m., 4842 (iii); in Com., 6169 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7650 (v).

——— Ques. of Order, *re* stmnt. of Judgeship, 7676 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Discussion, 3847 (ii).

St. John River Valley Ry., Construction by Govt. (remarks) 123 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5319 (iii).

Scott, Elmer Walker, Relief (B. 165) 1°*, 5557 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5701 (iii).

Militia (armouries) 8570 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 663 (i).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5251 (iii).

Trent Canals, Damages by Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry (remarks) 5216 (iii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1192 (i); in Com., 3150 (ii).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 515 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 63) 1°*, 1192 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *East Huron.*

Airships, development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 446, 1369 (i).

Budget, The, 1858 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186; on M. for 2°, 725; on M. for 3°, 822 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5807, 5839 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6306 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3697 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5240 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2660 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5727 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8396 (v).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907, 5911 (iii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7327 (iv).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3202 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7352 (iv).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4922 (iii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com on Res., 7005 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3915 (ii), 5772 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 3296 (ii).

Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 203) 1°*, 6802 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8062 (v).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 164) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 218) 1°*, 7975; 2° m., 8055, 8380; in Com., 8618 (v).

Lillie, Clifford Buell Relief (B. 224) 1°*, 8361 (v).

N.T. Ry. Co., Classification of Material, Lumsden Charges, 2nd Rep. of Com., (M.) to conc., 3985 (iii).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4073 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to conc in 4th Report of Com., 6037 (iv).

——— Changes in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5595 (iii).

St. Clair River Sand, Lease by Ont. Govt. to Detroit Co. (remarks) 5820 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2651 (ii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8006 (v).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*

Budget, The, 1880 (i).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6862 (iv.)

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8847 (v).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8629 (v).

Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 6611 (iv.)

Labour, Hours on Public Works on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2912 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3269 (ii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8426, 8598 (v).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7147 (iv).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T., *Yukon Territory.*

Budget, The, 1903 (i).

Criminal Code (race track gambling) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6587 (iv).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7829 (v).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1122, in Com., (amt.) 1131 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3720, 3748 (ii); in Com. 7417 (iv).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8444, 8710 (v).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com. 6912 (iv), 7939 (v).

Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2166 (ii).

Criminal Code Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7267 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act (ry. employees) Amt. (B. 109) 1° m., 2184 (ii).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5918 (iii); in Com., 8065 (v).

International Waterways, Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1°*, 2329; 2° m., 2672; in Com., 3151 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8769 (v).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3141 (ii).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6368 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6964 (v).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5296 (iii).

Nickel Mines in Canada, Control by Americans, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson (remarks) 2191 (ii).

——— Control by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 2490 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 108) 1°* 2184 (ii); in Com., 5765 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5326 (iii), 6269 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5749 (iii).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7840 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6105 (iv); Ont. (Christian Island) 3467; (Sibley) 3475 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Pintsch gas) 2944 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8097 (v).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3435 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver City.*

B.C. Expenditure by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 118) 1°*, 2329, 2° m., 2671 (ii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 879 (i); in Com., 7266 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1256 (i).

Kitsilano Reserve Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).

'Leebro,' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re* (Ques) 788 (i).

Milk Standards, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3962 (ii); on M. for 3°, 7513 (v).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5304 (iii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5394 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (inspectors, &c.) 1345; (prosecutions) 1349 (i).
Excise (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).
Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7858 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 599 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 4281; (Lockport) 4715; (new dredging plant) 4769, 4772; (Queen Charlotte) 4716; (Stewart) 4726 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria & Eastern Ry. & Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4842 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7221 (iv).

Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).
See 'Loggie,' 'Gaspereaux,' &c.

Dalhousie Dredging Contract, Charges *re* Inspectors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).

Dalhousie Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, N.B., Contract of A. & R. Loggie (Ques.) 6508 (iv).
See 'Loggie.'

Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).

Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments by P. W. Dept. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant to, 3060 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 188 (i).

Gaspereau Dredging, Demand for Papers read by Minister (remarks) 2489 (ii).
—— Total Payment to Mar. Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2487 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3840 (ii).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i).

G.T.P. Construction Contracts, N.B., Provisions *re* sub-letting, &c. (Ques.) 383 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 643 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps. *re* Investigation, &c., on M. for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 318 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1104; in Com., 1131 (i).

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2915 (ii).

Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5622 (iii).
—— Total Payments to (Ques.) 2488 (ii).
See 'Bathurst,' 'Dredging,' 'Gaspereaux.'

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. (remarks) 8581 (v).

Mar. Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux (Ques.) 2928 (ii).
See 'Loggie.'

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B .N. A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2761 (ii).

Mayes Contracts, Charges *re* Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 589 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6192 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4873 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2462 (ii).

Pink Rock Wharf, Par. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3740 (ii).
—— Ques. of Priv, *re* 'Globe's' criticism, 3476 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i).

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, Sale of, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7592, neg. (Y. 63 N. 111) 7746 (v).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3840 (ii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8370 (v).

St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c. (M. for copies*) 154 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv); 8118, 8580 (v).

St. John River Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction (remarks) 122 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7376 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 254; Labour (salaries) 236; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 253; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247 (i).
Militia (arms, &c.) 8557 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 596 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Fredericton) 581; (Grand Falls) 582; (Hartland) 587; (Hillsborough) 587 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 575; (Parrsboro) 577; (Shelburne) 579 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 542 (i);

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(deptl. buildings, new) 549 (i), 7169 (iv); (Museum) 566; (Royal Mint) 559 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que.—(Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (Roberval) 927 (i); (St. Roch) 831 (i).

Public Works—Dredging, Generally (plant) 4780; Mar. Provs. (generally) 4780 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2697; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (Chance Harbour) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (Dipper) 3391; (Kouchibouguac) 3392; (Lameque) 3393; (Lorneville) 3394; (Moncton) 3394; (Neguac) 3395; (New Mills) 3395; (Petit Rocher) 3396; (Pink Rock) 3396 (Pointe du Chene) 3427; (Quaco) 3428; (Richibucto) 3428, 3439; (St. John tributaries) 3447; (Tracadie) 3452; (Traynor's Cove) 3452 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 1163; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1164; (Shelburne) 1176; (South Ingonish) 1177; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (The Wharfs) 1179; (West Advocate) 1179; (West Dublin) 1180 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3069 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Chatham diversion) 2947; (Halifax) 2884; (Indiantown) 2884; Loggieville) 2885; (Moncton-cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2934; (Riviere du Loup) 2945 (ii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5260 (iii).

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3064 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3070 (ii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*

Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax (remarks) 3057, 3209 (ii).

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5650 (iii).

Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice, and National Trust Co., &c. (Ques.) 6799 (iv.)

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6954 (iv.)

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7893 (v).

Cotton's Weekly, Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Criminal Code (race track gambling) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6560 (iv).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8690 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1289 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman, in Com., 8033, 8058 (v).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1145 (i).

Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re* (Ques.) 3672 (ii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2430 (ii).

Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction, &c., (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1249 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2793 (ii).

House of Commons Corridors, Ejecting of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7182 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5804, 5538; Ques. of Order, 5538 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5650 (iii).

I.C.R. Cunard Property, Halifax, Acquisition by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8236 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6310 (iv).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6366 (iv).

Negro Clergymen: *See* 'House of Commons.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8698 (v).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2473 (ii).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 4082 (iii).

Post Office Clerks Salaries (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).

Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 2429, 3292 (ii).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8126 (v).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5531 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3103; Soulanges (leakages) 3106 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 7768; Militia (salaries) 7767 (v).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 8544, (cold storage) 8545; (customs bureau) 8551; (dog fish) 8545 (v); (protection service) 5752 (iii); (provincial jurisdiction) 8547 (v).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7778 (v).

Immigration (agents) 8206 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5692; (Rivere du Loup) 5712; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Militia (pay, &c.) 8560 (v).

Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7866 (v).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5756 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8173 (v).

Public Works — Dredging — Mar. Provs. (generally) 5612, 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Black Point) 977; (Burk's Head) 979; (Dover) 989; (Eastern passage) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 993; (Pictou Island) 1000; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1172; (West Dublin) 1190 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que.—(Yamaska and Richelieu) 5721 (iii).

Quarantine (steamers) 7766 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (new machinery) 2943; (revenue) 3091; (St. John) 2946 (ii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3070 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5713 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1059 (i).

——— Postponement of Debate, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade (remark) 3208 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6380 (iv); in Com., 8100 (v).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *West Elgin*

Allard & Provost, Govt. Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2488 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2635 (ii).

Budget, The, 1894 (i).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 7293 (iv.)

Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, on M. for Sup., 5574 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6060 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2587 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4583 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) *re* Speech of Minister of Militia, 4711 (iii.)

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1327 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. Bill 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2644 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Indian Affairs (salaries) 367; Labour (salaries) 238 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6796 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*

Trent Canal Damage Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry (remarks) 5211 (iii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *North Simcoe.*

Apples grown in Provs., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5640 (iii).

Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for (Ques.) 1371 (i).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5942 (iv).

Bread: *See* 'Inspection.'

Budget, The, 1701 (i).

——— (remarks) 1806 (i), 2076 (ii).

Canadian Navy Shipbuilding, Tenders *re* Great Lakes Shipyards, and Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ques.) 844 (i).

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7295 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6880; in Com., 6911 (iv), 7882; on M. for 3°, 7985 (v).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 913 (i); in Com., 7265 (iv).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6989 (iv).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6637 (iv).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8852 (v).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to introduce, 1688 (i).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8690 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5915 (iii); in Com., 8068 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186 (i).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Ret. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5681 (iii).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8773 (v).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building (Ques.) 1004 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8621 (v).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139, 6753 (iv).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
House of Commons Classification, Discussion *re* (remarks) 7071 (iv), 7520 (v).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5802, 5849 (iii).
Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5640 (iii).
Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 516 (i).
Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7945, 8473 (v).
I.C.R., Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1121 (i).
—— Low Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidy Bill, 8482 (v).
I.C.R. and N.T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8705; in Com., 8766 (v).
Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada (Ques.) 7519 (v).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2903 (ii).
Liquor Compounding, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on prop. Res., 520 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 88) 1° m., 1689 (i).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6284 (iv).
Military Lands: *See* 'Baby.'
N.T. Ry., Tenders *re* Shops at St. Boniface (Ques.) 8835 (v).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5042 (iii); in Com., 7400 (v). *See* 'Can. Navy.'
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6212 (iv).
Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8771 (v).
Petroleum: *See* 'Crude.'
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7318 (iv).
Pure Food Act (B. 131) 1° m., 2792 (ii).
Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6984 (iv).
Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt. (Ques.) 2926 (ii).
—— (remarks) 4533 (iii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8408 (v).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. (B. 174) 1° m., 5621 (iii).
Ry. Code of Train Rules, Approval of Ry. Commission (Ques.) 8834 (v).
—— (remarks) 8585 (v).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8480 (v).
Ross Rifles, Regulations *re* National Rifle Association, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4526 (iii).
Rules of the House, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7527 (v).
—— in Com. on Rep., 8371 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6737; on M. for 3° (amt. 6 m. h.) 7256 (iv).
—— Plans, &c. (remarks) 5560 (iii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7525 (v).
SUPPLY—
Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1318 (i).
Canals, Ont.-Quebec (macadamizing roads) 3122; Sault Ste. Marie (iron mooring posts) 3124; Trent (improvements) 3126 (ii).
Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8807 (v).
Excise (distilleries) 1331; (extra hours) 1336 (i).
Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5748 (iii); (protection service) 8509 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5697; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5712 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 8566; (gratuities) 8571; (monuments) 8575; (rifle ranges) 8561 (v).
Naval Service (maintenance) 8499 (v).
Ocean and River Service (steamers) 8511; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 561; Que. (Quebec ordnance stores) 969 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5736; (Victoria) 5747 (iii).
Railways—G. T. P. (director's remuneration) 3131 (ii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130; (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5945, 5982 (iv).
Telegraph Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).
Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S. (Ques.) 1530 (i).
Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6768 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4998 (iii); in Com., 8091 (v).
War Vessels on Great Lakes, Rep. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i). *See* 'Can. Navy.'
Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C. B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8458, 8706 (v).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Zinc Ores Bounty B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5936 (iv).

CURRIE, Mr. M., *Prince Edward.*
Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c. (Ques.) 3934 (ii).
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6897 (iv).
Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease to R. J. Dunlop (Ques.) 3934 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4221 (iii).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1079 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (tobacco) 7380 (iv).
Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4801 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7303 (iv).
Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders, &c., *re* Dredging (Ques.) 3156 (ii).
Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6621 (iv).
Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8693 (v).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8036 (v).
Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1146 (i).
'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps., Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance of Old Proprietor Ledge Buoy (M. for copy) 290, 326 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 1880 (i).
See 'Life,' &c.
'Hudson,' Str., Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 4518 (iii).
Imperial Export Co., Application *re* Service between Canada and Australia (Ques.) 1100 (i).
Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7942 (v).
I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1129 (i).
I. C. R. Employees Passes, Number issued for Sept., Oct. and Nov. (Ques.) 2716 (ii).
—— Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods (remarks) 1208 (i).
Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia' (Ques.) 107 (i).
See 'Hestia,' 'Old Proprietor.'
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3141 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re* (Ques.) 2149 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8106 (v).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2746 (ii).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6192 (iv).
Milledgevile, Holderville, N.B., Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4518 (iii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4367 (iii); in Com., 7434 (v).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6968 (iv).
Old Proprietor Light Buoy, Defective Condition, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).
See 'Hestia.'
Pink Rock Wharf Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4737 (iii).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7318 (iv).
Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8479 (v).
Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6169 (iv).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8431 (v).
Returns, Inquiry for, 924 (i).
St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8120 (v).
See 'Courtenay.'
St. John River Survey, Inquiry for Ret., 8737 (v).
Sailing Directions to Capt. of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Seal Cove Life Boat, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c. (Ques.) 2146 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7373, 7376; (Dom. exhibitions) 7388; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).
Civil Govt—Justice (salaries) 254; Labour (salaries) 237; Fisheries (contingencies) 253; (salaries) 251 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i); R.N.W.M. Police (salaries) 415 (i).
Fisheries (protection service) 8509 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation), 8525; (pensions) 8528; (salaries) 8523; (signal service) 8527 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811 (v).
Marine (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8522 (v).
Militia (arms, &c.) 8557 (v).
Naval Service (maintenance) 8504 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers, saving life) 8515; (patrol vessels) 8521 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 580; (Fredericton) 581; (Hartland) 587; (Moncton) 591; (Partridge Island) 595; (St. John) 591 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 574; (Lawlor's Island) 576; (Parrsboro') 577 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto) 8178 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 542; (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (Museum) 566, 572; (standarizing room) 573 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 666; (Quebec ordnance stores) 967 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4776; Generally (new plant) 4738, 4760; (vessel repairs) 4737 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6136 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2698; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (creosoted timber) 3453; (Cumming's Cove) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (New Mills) 3395; (Partridge Island) 3451; (Petit Rocher) 3396; (Richibucto) 3445 (ii); (St. John) 6106 (iv); (St. John tributaries) 3447; (St. John wharf property) 3451; (Seal Cove) 3449 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3836; (St. Lawrence River channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697; (Tignish) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3880 (ii); (Shigawake) 4227; (Three Rivers) 4248 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 2941; (Pintsch gas) 2943; (St. John) 2945 (ii).

Veteran Land Grants, Number taken up, Assignments, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. 8019 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Pilots' Association Fund, receipts and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7517 (v).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*

Bank Act Amt. (B. 56) 1° m., 922 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4396 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, &c., 3536 (ii)

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1258 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2914 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4197, 4316 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Quebec and Ungava Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 190) 1°*, 5929 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5463 (iii).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal, St. Anne.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6952 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6931 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1276 (i).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8387 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8461 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6297 (iv).

Merchants Bank of Canada Pension Fund incorp. (B. 13) 1°*, 3133 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4124, 4129 (iii); in Com., 7419 (v).

——— on Order for Com. (remarks) 6948 (iv).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6981 (iv).

Trust and Loan Co. of Canada (B. 98) 1°*, 1878 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6385 (iv); in Com., 8086, 8399 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 101 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8009, (amt.) 8025 (v).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8437 (v).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *South Bruce.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 731 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4618 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 569 (i).

Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 380 (i).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. (B. 89) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 2671 (ii).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1528 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8095 (v).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4611 (iii).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 22 (i).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*

Armouries and Drill Halls, Erection of, Cost of Site, Places for Construction, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1546 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 5689 (iii), 8742 (v).

Budget, The, 2227 (ii).

—— Remarks, 1817 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 74) 1° m., 1262 (i); 2° m., 2158 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land *re* Timber, &c. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).
See 'Frontenac.'

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6806 (iv).

Elliott Bros. & R. Carson, Amounts paid to (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

—— Payments to *re* Supplies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

Fish Fry Application Forms (remarks) 3058 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 752 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7806 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3062 (ii).

Frontenac County Mail Contracts, Routes, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 5105 (iii).

—— Pets. *re* (Ques.) 7066 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'

Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 1371 (i).

—— Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 262 (i), 2717 (ii).

Green, John, Relief (B. 201) 1°*, 6802 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5528; in Com., 5536, 5831, 5879 (iii).

Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures (Ques.) 1193 (i).

Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 263 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1217 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2910 (ii).

Mail Contract with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 1379 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4064, 4083, 4937 (iii); in Com., 7481 (v).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Naval Defence Bill, Report of Speech in Toronto 'Globe' (personal explanation) 4533 (iii).

Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

Post Offices in Frontenac County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
See 'Frontenac.'

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5788 (iii).

R. M. C. Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 381 (i).

R. M. College, Servants' Cottages, Removal of (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

—— Completion, Total Cost, Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 263 (i).

Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid to for Public Works, Kingston (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7757 (v); (census) 7374; (cold storage) 7363; (exhibitions) 7389; (seeds) 7390 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3118 (ii); Welland (surveys) 8821 (v).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6654 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5696; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Elora) 7176; (Fergus) 7180 (iv); (Kingston) 7505; (Listowel) 7507; Ottawa (deplt., new) 7170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 663; (Maisonneuve) 673; (Marieville) 697; (Megantic) 700; (Montreal P. O.) 703; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6111 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1171; (Shelburne) 1176; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (West Dublin) 1180 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3461 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5735 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Dale, Mr. Sydney) 6168; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (telephone memorial) 6161 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6154; B.C. (Kamloops-Okanagan) 6156 (iv).

Quarantine (Tracadie) 7391 (iv).

U. S. Training Ships, Passage through Canals, Deptl. Consultations, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

—— (M. or O.C.'s) 135 (i).

'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. *re* Printing (Ques.) 1778 (i), 2428 (ii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 3494 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Williamsville Post Office Revenue, Pets. *re* Removal, &c. (Ques.) 7287 (iv).

Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 3461 (ii), 6164 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Banking Act, Consideration of (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Gaspereau Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4781 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8635 (v).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3138 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on Order for 2°, 1803 (i); on M. for 3°, 2191 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8403 (v).

I.C.R., Repairs to Car 37, &c. (Ques.) 2286 (ii).

—— Sleeping Cars, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4847 (iii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5763 (iii).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. (remarks) 8581 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5003 (iii).

—— Vote *re* Amt. (Mr. Northrup) Ques. of Priv., 5195 (iii).

Naval Service, Appointments, &c. (remarks) 8838 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6971 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4824, 5288 (iii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8735 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6171 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8587 (v).

Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re* (Ques.) 630 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5337 (iii), 6255 (iv).

—— Original Report, Inquiry for, 5559 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3109 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4781; Generally (new plant) 4744, 4759 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Moncton) 3394; (Pink Rock) 3397 (ii); (St. John) 6108 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Three Rivers) 4250 (iii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5255 (iii).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3434 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3055 (ii).

Montreal Central Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 515 (i).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 1192 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queens, N.S.*

Alien Labour Law Violation, &c. (remarks) 4813 (ii).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols. I and III (presented) 7 (i).

—— on Inquiry for, 1445 (i).

—— Vol. II. (presented) 1730 (i).

Bank Act Amt., Consideration of (remarks) 3479 (ii), 6947 (iv).

—— Expiration of, Issue of Currency (Ans.) 2950 (ii).

—— Inquiry for, 2061 (ii), 4307 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 56 (Mr. Demers) on M. for 2°, 2038 (ii).

Bank Deposits in 1909 (Ans.) 5001 (iii).

Bank Shareholders List, &c. (Ans.) 4846 (iii).

Barriefield Camp, Objections *re* Site, Removal of Ranges, &c. (Ans.) 3934 (ii).

B. C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 532 (i).

B. C. Public Works—Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4285 (iii).

Budget, The (annual statement) 1446 (i).

—— (remarks) 1002 (i).

Canadian Associated Press Subsidy (B. 228), prop. Res., 8239; in Com. on Res., 8680 (v).

Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c. (Ans.) 1967 (ii).
See 'Currency.'

Cement Merger, Protection *re* Combine, &c. (Ans.) 107 (i).

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 123) on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).

Chief Justice, Apptmt. of by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Civil Govt., Increased Expenditures (remarks) on M. for Sup., 216 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 205) on Senate Amts., 8772 (v).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6889 (iv); on M. for 3°, 7992 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Combines Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Customs Laws, 8002 (v).

Compensation to Alta. and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c. (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

Congregational Union of Canada incorp. B. 142 (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com., 4754 (iii).

Conservation of National Resources Commission, Names of Members (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Criminal Code B. 41 (Mr. Lennox) on Order for Com. (remarks) 1209 (i).

Currency Act Amt. (B. 195) in Com. on Res., 6188; in Com., 6620 (iv).

Currency, Govt. Assistance to Clean Circulation (Ans.) 8238 (v).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. (B. 233) 1° m., 8763; 2° m., 8841, 8849 (v).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3053, 3914 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3875 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies (B. 229) in Com. on Res., 8687; in Com., 8763 (v).

——— (M.) To discharge Order, 8003 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1286 (i).

Estimates, The (1909-10)—(presented) 154 (i).

——— Suppl. (1910)—(presented) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).

——— Suppl. (1911)—(presented) 7519, 8577 (v).

——— Suppl. (remarks) 3987 (iii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 1446 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Report (remarks) 2061 (ii).

Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease, &c. (Ans.) 3934 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3059 (ii).

——— Tel. from Sir Francis Bertie (read) 3295 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12, in Com. on Res., 172; 1°*, 200; 2° m., 705; agreed to (Y. 107; N. 33) 780; 3° m., 812, 816, 822 (i).

——— (clerical error) Amt. (B. 126) 1° m., 2486 (ii); 2° m., 6620 (iv).

French Treaty, on Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 6 (i).

——— Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 8665 (v).

——— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France (remarks) 1690 (i).

——— Provision *re* Termination (Ans.) 276 (i).

——— Ratification of (announcement) 2797 (ii).

——— Similar Treatment to Germany (Ans.) 1196 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3944 (ii).

See 'Race Track.'

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, 3573 (ii).

German Surtax, Error in Memorandum (remarks) 4712 (iii).

——— Explanation *re* Negotiations, &c., (remarks) 3679 (ii).

See 'French Treaty.'

German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 3830 (ii).

——— Similar Treatment as France (Ans.) 785 (i).

Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve (Ans.) 3295 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. (B. 155) 1°*, 4922 (iii); 2° m., 6329; in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 7512 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 926 (i).

——— Precedence on Monday (M.) 3829 (ii).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Inquiry *re* Ret. (remarks) 3945 (ii).

Grain Trade from West, Tel. *re* Terminal Elevator Co. (remarks) 8240 (v).

G.T.P. Bonds guaranteed to 31st March, 1910 (Ans.) 8237 (v).

See 'Natl. Transcl.'

Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

House of Commons Staff, Increases, &c. (M.) 8830 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 5617 (iii); 2° m., 7940; in Com., 7943, 8459 (v).

Insurance Bill, Consideration of (remarks) 5893 (iii).

——— Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt. (Ans.) 787 (i).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1111 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 511 (i).

——— Laying Letters on Table (remarks) 502 (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties (B. 231) in Com. on Res., 8705; in Com., 8764 (v.)

Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re* (remarks) 4083 (iii).

Japan Trade Commission, Cor., &c., with Mr. W. T. R. Preston, on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 331 (i).

Johnson, Mr. Arthur, Engineer on 'Reliever,' Certificate, &c. (Ans.) 3734 (ii).

Judicial Apptmts. in N.S. (remarks) 623 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Loans, Temporary, since June 1, 1909 (Ans.) 169 (i).

——— since beginning of present Session, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).

——— Outstanding on March 1st, 1910 (Ans.) 8237 (v).

Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty (Ans.) 6391 (iv.)

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8230 (v).

Lumsden Charges: *See* 'N.T. Ry.,' &c.

Mail Delivery, Free, Closing of Distribution Offices (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Militia Stores, Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).

Montreal Govt. Weigher, Apptmt of (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission, Subsidy (B. 191) Prop. Res., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5898; 1° m., 5904 (iii); in Com., 6601 (iv).

National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec (Ans.) 3671 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 787 (i).

N.T.Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com. 3985 (iii).

——— on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) Ques. of Order, 8309 (v).

——— Payments to Counsel (remarks) 8841 (v).

——— Payment of Fees, &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).

Natural Resources: *See* 'Conservation.'

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7467; on M. for 3°, 7535 (v).

Naval Defence Documents, on Inquiry for, 2797 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5303 (iii).

Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada B. 33 (Mr. A. Haggart) on M. for 3°, 2279 (ii).

Old Age Pensions: *See* 'Govt. Annuities.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission (B. 230) (prop. res.) 6801; in Com. on Res., 8697; in Com., 8770 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 8663 (v).

Pensions: *See* 'Govt. Annuities.'

Pilots' Association, Receipts and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 7517 (v).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 3744 (ii).

Port Arthur Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Dock.'

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Preston, W. T. R., Claims *re* Libel Suits, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor. 656 (i).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 289 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen's Rep., 604 (i).

Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 3292 (ii).

Quarantine Frontier Inspectors, Duties, Reps. &c, (Ans.) 1208 (i).

Quebec Bridge Ry. Co., Payments to by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 628 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6500, 6569 (iv).

——— Reintroduction of Bill 6 (remarks) 7258, 7263 (iv).

See 'Gambling.'

Railway Men, Rules *re* Employment (remarks) 8587 (iv).

Railway Subsidies (prop. res.) 8239 (v).

Representation in H. of C. of Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for copy, 654 (i).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Royal Mint, Total Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c. (Ans.) 784 (i).

See 'Currency.'

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1539 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5394 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7148 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7522 (v).

Saskatchewan Provl. Subsidies, Aggregate Payments (Ans.) 3167 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Dock Subsidies (remarks) 3945 (ii).

See 'Dry Dock Bill.'

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded (Ans.) 630 (i).

Senate Bills, Numbering, &c. (remarks) 6177 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. B. 87 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 2056 (ii).

S.A. War, Reinstatement of Messenger *re* Aud. Gen.'s Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).

Supply (M.) for Com., 93 (i).

Supply B. 173 (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5529; in Com., 5606; 1° m., 5626 (iii).

——— (B. 196) 1°*, 6398 (iv).

——— (B. 235) in Com., 8856 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Miscellaneous (Mrs. J. Gordon, allowance) 5616 (iii).

Charges of Management (foreign coin) 5607 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 7768 (v); Finance (salaries) 335 (i); Interior (salaries) 7768; Militia (salaries) 7767; Secretary of State (salaries) 7767; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 8808 (v).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8805 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 1358 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 1335 (i).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769 (v).

House of Commons (library) 8802; (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811; (Canada and Australia) 8808 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 5692 (iii), 8810; (Can. and G. B.) 8809 (v); (Canada and Mexico) 5690 (iii), 8809; (Halifax and Liverpool) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte) 8809; (Rivière du Loup) 8810 (v).

Militia (monuments) 8576 (v).

Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7806; (Naturalization Act) 7865; (royal mint) 7866; (royal society grant) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 574; (Shelburne) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 7508 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (eastern block) 572; (museum) 567; (royal mint) 558 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 688; (Quebec customs) 827 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4783, 4805 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Coquitlam) 4293 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 982; (Diligent) 989; (Piper's Cove) 1160; (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1170 (i).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3085 (ii).

Senate (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810; (Chinese Immigration Act) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S. (Ans.) 1021 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1089 (i).

Temporary Loans: *See* 'Loans.'

Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of (remarks) 5278 (iii).

See 'Cus. Tariff Bill,' 'German,' &c.

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2100 (ii).

U.S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada (remarks) 4713, 5278, 5690, 5762, 5891 (iii).

——— (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5942; Resolution laid on Table, 5967 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

U. S. Tariff, Importations, &c., on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6100 (iv).

——— Maximum Tariff, Decision *re* Canadian Exports (remarks) 3058 (ii).

——— Minimum Tariff, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— Par. in New York 'Sun' (remarks) 6393 (iv).

——— on Ques of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5760 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 93 (i).

——— The Budget, 1446 (i).

——— Supply Bill (M.) *re* Procedure, 6397 (iv).

Ways and Means, Tariff Negotiations with U. S. (M.) for Com., 5942 (iv), 8705; in Com., 8762 (v).

FISHER, Hon. S. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*

Agricultural Bulletins, Number distributed, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7191 (iv).

Agricultural and Experimental Farms, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Agricultural Machinery Imported into Canada. 1909 (Ans.) 383 (i).

Alfalfa: *See* 'Seed Control Bill.'

Animal Feeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons (remarks) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).

Apples grown in Quebec Prov., (remarks) in Com., on Bill, 5635 (iii).

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c. (Ans.) 642 (i).

Census for 1911, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1371 (i), 2429 (ii).

Civil Servants in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 205) Prop. Res., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6948; in Com., 7295 (iv).

Conservation Commission, Committee, Names, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 4845 (iii).

Conservation of Natural Resources (B. 185) Prop. Res., 5687; in Com. on Res., 5885; 1°*, 5885 (iii); 2° m., 6332; in Com., 6338, 6359; 3° m., 6619 (iv).

Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c. (Ans.) 1379 (i).

Criminal Code (copyright) Amt. B. 41 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 1°, 430, 806 (i).

Currency Act Amt. (Prop. Res.) 2632 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

Diseases to Vegetation: *See* 'Pests,' &c.

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 5773 (iii).

Experimental Farm at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2295 (ii).

——— Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c. (Ans.) 5002 (iii).
See 'Poultry.'

Farm and Dairy Produce, Quantity exported for 1909 (Ans.) 1017 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c (Ans.) 1965 (ii).

Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c. (Ans.) 631 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 735 (i).
See 'Milk.'

Historical Manuscripts Commission, Meetings, Results, &c. (Ans.) 790 (i).

Holstein and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms (Ans.) 4309 (iii).

Horses imported into N.W. from Ont., Examination of (remarks) 4210, 4813 (iii).

Insects Bill: *See* 'Pests,' &c.

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (cargoes, &c.) Amt. (B. 40) 1° m., 429 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (B. 51) in Com. on Res., 808 (i).
See 'Milk Glass.'

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can. (Ans.) 1374 (i).

McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2691 (ii).

Man. Grain Act Amt. (B. 49) prop. Res., 520 (i); in Com. on Res., 657; 1°*, 661 (i); on Order for 2°, 5674 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 5929 (iii); 2° m., 6279; in Com., 6279; 3° m., 6618 (iv).

Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, &c. (Ans.) 639 (i).

Milk Glass Inspection (B. 184) prop. Res. 5623; in Com. on Res., 5884 (iii); in Com., 6005-6 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification, on M. (Mr. Foster) that Hse. adjourn, 2562 (ii).

Natural Resources: *See* "Conservation."

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Pests to Vegetation, Prevention (B. 20) Prop. Res., 200 (i); in Com. on Res., 209; 1°* of B., 212 (i); in Com., 5627 (iii).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

Population, Method of Estimating, &c. (Ans.) 4846 (iii).

Pork Industry, Commission *re* Investigation Report *re* (Ans.) 5782 (iii).

Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 4519 (iii).
See "Supply."

Quarantine Boat Service at Halifax, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2429 (ii).

Quarantine Inspectors for Frontier, Cor. *re* Apptmts. (Ans.) 5561 (iii).

Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt. (Ans.) 2926 (ii).

——— Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture (remarks) 4532 (iii).

Restigouche Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. J. Reid) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, on Inquiry for Tracing (remarks) 171 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5444 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7525 (v).

Seed Control Act (alfalfa) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 204; M. to discharge order for 2°, 656 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt. (B. 55), in Com. on Res., 808, 1°*, 811 (i); 2° m., 2637; in Com., 2638 (ii).

S. A. War, Expenditure by Canada for Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 632 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c., (animals' health) 7755 (v); (archives) 7284; (Can. exhibit, London) 7380; (census) 7373 (iv), 7763 (v); (Charlottetown exhibition) 7766 (v); (cold storage) 7362, 7383; (dairying and fruit) 7362; (Dom. exhibitions) 7385 (iv); (exhibitions) 5728 (iii), 7389; (experimental branch stations) 7392 (iv); (experimental farms) 5725 (iii), 7333 (iv), 7764 (v); (farm bulletins) 7377; (fumigating stations) 7380 (iv); (live stock industry) 7748 (v); (Patent Record) 7371; (seeds) 7390; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 226; (experimental farms) 227 (i); (extra clerks) 7764 (v); (salaries) 219 (i).

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (usn transportation) 5748 (iii).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Can. Handicrafts guild) 7863 (v); (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6160 (iv).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 665; (immigration sheds) 960; (Rock Island) 948 (i).

Quarantine (Public Health Act) 7392; (steamers) 7392 (iv); 7766 (v); (Tracadie 7391 (iv).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3129 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board 5714; (trade commissioners) 5714 (iii).

Swine Commission, Report of (Ans.) 2429 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Rep., 5689 (iii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup. 2665 (ii).

Thornton, Dr., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 626 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop, Res. (Mr. Perley) 1432 (i).

Veterinary Service, B.C., Vacancies, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).

Ways and Means Com. (M.) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).

FORGET, Mr. R. *Charlevoix.*

Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

FORTIER, Mr. E., *Lotbiniere.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4237 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *North Toronto.*

Address, The, 60 (i).

Alcoholism, International Congress, Canadian Representation (remarks) 521 (i).

Analytical Index to Hansard (Ques.) 2138 (ii).

Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Adminstration, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 2142 (ii).

Bank Act Amt., Consideration of (remarks) 3479 (ii), 4307 (iii).

Budget, The (reply) 1474 (i).

—— Remarks, 1002 (i).

Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c. (Ques.) 1967 (ii).

—— Amount of U.S. Silver, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

Canadian Navy, Number of Applications *re* Positions, &c. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).

See 'Naval,' &c.

Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3170 (ii).

Civil Government Expenditures, Increase of, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 212 (i).

Civil Service Employees, Number in 1909, Total Cost (M. for ret.*) 4315 (iii).

Coal Oil Lands, Areas sold, leased, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 277 (i).

Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditures *re* (M. for ret.) 1977 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to introduce, 1689 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Exhibitions, Foreign, Canadian Participation *re* Expenditure by Canada (M. for ret.*) 1977 (ii).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditures *re* Preparation, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 1965 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund, Grant to (remarks) 3059 (ii).

French Treaty, B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).

French Treaty, Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 8664 (v).

—— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France, 1690 (i).

Garrison Artillery Guns, Question put by another member, Ques, of Order, 1791 (i).

Govt. Business (remarks) 926 (i).

Govt. Business, and Unopposed Motions (remarks) 4308 (iii).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1137 (i).

See 'Annuities.'

Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2184 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry.. Lands Sale along the Lines (Ques.) 1966 (ii).

—— Opening of Winnipeg to Lake Superior Division, ref. to in Speech from the Throne (Ques.) 3677 (ii).

—— Terminals, Expenditure by Govt. *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).

—— Winnipeg to Edmonton, Cost per mile, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 129, 623 (i).

See 'Nat. Transcl,' &c.

Hansard Analytical Index, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2138 (ii).

Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 270 (i).

See 'Dom. Lands Act.'

Hudson Bay Ry., Number of Acres of Land sold (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number (Ques.) 128 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 206 (i).

—— Instruction to Canada's Representatives (remarks) 923 (i).

—— Secretariat, Cor. *re* Formation, &c. (M. for copy of cor.) 388 (i).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3138 (ii).

'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work (Ques.) 1967 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).

I.C.R., Account-Keeping, Capital and Income (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2936 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2799 (ii).
——— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1113; in Com., 1131 (i).
——— Passes, Sale and Distribution, Padded Pay-Lists on Windsor Branch, &c. (M. for papers*) 801 (i).
——— inquiry for ret., 2634 (ii).
Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S. Officers (remarks) 853 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2424, 2891 (ii).
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).
Loans, Temporary, since June 1st, 1909 (Ques.) 169 (i).
——— Loans since beginning of present Session, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).
Lumsden Charges: '*See* 'Nat. Transcl. Ry.'
McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. by Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto (Ques.) 3678 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Accidents *re* Pintsch and Acetylene Gas (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).
Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2281 (ii).
N.T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2617 (ii).
——— (M.) to adjourn Hse., 2561 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1734 (i); on M. for 2°, 3344 (ii).
Naval Defence Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 855 (i).
Naval Service, Further Cor., Inquiry for, 2931 (ii).
——— Information from New Zealand (remarks) 623 (i).
——— 'Niobe,' Purchase of without Parliamentary Authority (remarks) 3481 (ii).
———War Vessels purchased from British Admiralty, O.C's. *re* (Ques.) 2144 (ii).
N. B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit (Ques.) 168 (i).
North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2712 (ii).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'Annuities.'
Ottawa Buildings, Allotted Space, Number of Occupants, &c., Information *re*, 623 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 8662 (v).
Party Patronage System (prop. res.) 2432 (ii).
——— Patronage Distribution, Inquiry for Ret., 3134 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion, 1792 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Party Patronage System, on Order being called (remarks) 2151 (ii).
Pensions: *See* 'Annuities.'
Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Expenditure *re* Ry. (Ques.) 3295 (ii).
——— Right of Way, &c. (Ques.) 8661 (v).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ques.) 1967 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 618 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29th, 1907 (Ques.) 1969 (ii).
——— Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1205 (i).
Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure re (Ques.) 3678 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8580 (v).
Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, Inquiry for Tracing (remarks) 170 (i).
Royal Mint, Loss in Operation (remarks) re Answer to Question, 784 (i).
——— Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).
Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1442 (i).
Rush-Bagot Treaty: *See* 'U.S.'
Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2644 (ii).
S. A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. and Can. (Ques.) 1204 (i).
S. A. Veterans, Scrip, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 219; Indian Affairs (salaries) 345, 415; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 231; (salaries) 229; Labour (salaries) 235; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 416 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 539; (deptl. buildings, new) 549 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lévis) 668; (Maisonneuve) 675 (i); (Marieville) 679; (Quebec customs) 824; (Quebec hospital 823; (Que. immigration sheds) 926; (Que. observatory) 823; (Quebec P.O.) 824; (Rock Island) 947; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 953; (St. Lambert) 955; (St. Roch) 828; (Shawinigan Falls) 950 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Pink Rock) 3423; (Quaco) 3427; (Richibucto) 3428 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3067 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (draw bars) 2882; (Indiantown 2884; (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2935; (original construction) 2943 (ii).
Miscellaneous—Railways (Quebec bridge) 3070 (ii).
Railways—N. T. R. (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1030 (i).

Temporary Loans: *See* "Loans."

Toronto sub-Post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3677 (ii).

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadians entering U.S. (remarks) 1101 (i).

U. S. Minimum Tariff (remarks) 2153 (ii).

——— Decision *re* Canadian Exports (remarks) 3058 (ii).

——— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— Trade Relations with U. S. (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com., 8754 (v).

U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes (M. for cor., &c.) 791 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 8737 (v).

War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (remarks) 2713 (ii).

See 'Naval.'

Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 1968 (ii).

Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909 (Ques.) 260 (i).

FOWKE, Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*

Budget, The, 1613 (i).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 379 (i).

Foreign Capital invested in Canadian Enterprises, Location, &c. (Ques.) 631 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3236 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1053 (i).

Toronto and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 116) 1°*, 2221 (ii); in Com., 6768 (iv).

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *Kings, P.E.I.*

Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6798 (iv).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2777 (ii).

P. E. I. Mail Service, Increased Facilities, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).

P. E. I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch Survey (Ques.) 7518 (v).

P. E. I. Tunnel, Reps. *re* Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for copy, 288 (i).

P. E. I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3197 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res., 2005 (ii).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*

Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. *re* P. E. I. (Ques.) 1376 (i).

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6506 (iv).

Souris Life-Saving Station, Ownership of Site (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5728 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6714 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subvention (Canada and Cuba) 5705 (iii).

Post Office—Outside Service (rural delivery) 5754 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Summerside) 580 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5735 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

I.C.R., Rivière du Loup Coal Shed, Erection of (Ques.) 4128 (iii).

——— Workshops at Rivière du Loup, Electrical Development, &c. (Ques.) 6182 (iv).

Lighthouse-keepers Salaries, Increase in, &c. (Ques.) 1589 (i).

'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge (Ques.) 8238 (v).

Rivière du Loup, I. C. Ry. Crossing, Protection *re* (Ques.) 1778 (i).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

British North American Mining Co. (B. 27) 1°*, 379 (i).

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 169) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4070 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6056 (iv).

——— 6th Rep. of Com. (M.) 8737 (v).

——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5196 (iii).

——— Changes *re* Report, on M. for Sup., 5575 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4444 (iii).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Botterill, Roland James Relief (B. 225) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 1878 (i); in Com., 3150 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6910 (iv).

Criminal Code (race track) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6550 (iv).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re* (remarks) 3944 (ii).

Port Credit Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6128 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

Pulpwood Exportation, Notice of Motion (remarks) 3986 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6667 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125; Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6110 (iv).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*

'Canada Gazette,' French Edition (remarks) 8585 (v).

Chambly River Dam and Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6949 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6933 (iv).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. (presented) 514 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 2424; (M.) to conc., 3052 (ii).

——— Translator, Apptmt. of (M.) 3914 (ii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Res., 6508 (iv).

House of Commons, Officials' Increases, Mr. Laplante (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8827 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller)on M. for 2°, 507 (i).

Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4951 (iii).

Retail Merchants Association incorp. (B. 210) 1°*, 7286; 2° m., 7287; in Com., 7868 (iv), 8043, 8422, 8587 (v).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (salaries) 8538 (v).
Labour (technical education) 8800 (v).
Mines (peat bogs) 8554 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (polytechnic school) 8822 (v).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel (Ques.) 2288 (ii).

Boivin, Elzear, Payment *re* Telegraph Construction (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecution (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Delisle Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal of, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).

GIRARD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Du Tremblay, Mr. Arthur, Instructions *re* Proceedings (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay Lists (Ques.) 6800 (iv), 8837 (v).

See 'Savard,' &c.

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 128) 1°*, 2792 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5763 (iii).

Lemieux, Ed., Payments to for Wood (Ques.) 8837 (v).

McLean, A., Payments for Purchase of Wood, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Oyamel Company, Payments *re* Tamarac Wood (Ques.) 7870, 8834 (v).

Pay Lists of 18th Regiment, Personators, &c. (Ques.) 8837 (v).

Pointe Bleue Indian Agent, W. Donohue, Removal of, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Potvin, P. A., Payments to (Ques.) 8837 (v).

Pulp Co., Chicoutimi, Tolls paid *re* Booms (Ques.) 7871 (v).

Savard, Lt.-Col., 18th Reg., Retention of Money from Capt. Talbot (Ques.) 8658 (v).

——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment, &c. (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment, &c. (Ques.) 8109 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chicoutimi) 3887; (Natashquan) 3910 (ii).

Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment of Allowance for 1907 (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Tremblay, J., Payments *re* Wood (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Veilleue, Charles, Payments to (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Wurtele, Col., 18th Regiment, Resignation, Refund of Moneys, &c. (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

GLADU, Mr. J. E. O., *Yamaska.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4953 (iii).

Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5647 (iii).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*

Camborne Postmaster, B.C., Pet. *re* Apptmt. (Ques.) 1016 (i).

Camborne Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (remarks) 2713 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7306 (iv).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 379 (i).

Columbia River Banks, Repairs, &c. (repairs) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6998 (iv).

Currency Acts Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6623 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5808 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5647 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7946 (v).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2904 (ii).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6368 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3659 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4828, 5297 (iii).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5443 (iii), 6348, 6727 (iv).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2005 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7349 (iv).

Excise (tobacco stamps) 1342 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 8190; Ont. (Kincardine) 7504 (v); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 422, 548 (i); (grounds) 8192 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C (Spallumcheen river) 4718; (Arrow lakes) 5614 (iii).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6373 (iv), 8715 (v).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5800 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 123) 1°*, 2426 (ii).

Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 124) 1°*, 2426 (ii).

Fighting Island Channel Improvement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3860 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. G., *Nipissing.*

Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming incorp. (B. 170) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

Criminal Code (silver ore thefts) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 1588 (i); 2° m., 2162 (ii).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1293 (i).

Gowganda Junction Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

Lake Nipissing Flooded Lands, Compensation *re* Names, &c. (Ques.) 2295 (ii).

Montreal River Improvements, Name of Contractor (Ques.) 1014 (i).

Nickel Mines in Canada, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson, Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 2189 (ii).

North Bay Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7863 (v).

Robinson, Mrs., Imprisonment of, Pets. *re* Release (remarks) 924 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3108 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (printing) 253 (i).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa mint) 7866 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 7863 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval 940 (i).

Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3081 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*

Address, The, Ques. of Order, Denial *re* reported speech, 81 (i).

Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1194 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Bridges, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2299 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre & Roberts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2142 (ii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Operation by G. T. Ry Co., Remedy *re* (Ans.) 102 (i).

Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal by N. T. Ry. (Ans.) 3166, 3676 (ii).

Bout de L'Ile Bridge Repairs, &c. (remarks) 6396 (iv).

B.C. Railway Subsidies, Particulars re (Ans.) 5929 (iv).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Application re Removal (Ans.) 3735 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 89 (Mr. Douglas) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 227) prop. Res., 8110; in Com. on Res., 8483 (v).

Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3150 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Canadian Northern Ry., Claims *re* Right of Way (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8784 (v).

——— Control of other Ry. Co.'s, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1208 (i).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. German) in Com., 3150 (ii).

C.P.R., Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval, &c, (Ans.) 1974 (ii).

Canal Statistics, Report (presented) 5759 (iii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Damages (remarks) 5214 (iii).

——— Total Amount of Account with Dept. (Ans.) 5781 (iii),7516 (v).

See 'Trent.'

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 913 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty (B. 208) in Com. on Res., 6985 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

See 'Petroleum.'

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonnell) on M. for 2°, 1271, 1290 (i).

Evers, T., Emplymt. as Electrician on Lachine Canal (Ans.) 2428 (ii).

——— Total Payments to *re* Lachine Canal Expenses (Ans.) 2928 (ii).

See 'Lachine.'

Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of (Ans.) 1207 (i).

Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment *re* Indemnity for Damages on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

Govt. Railways (claims) B. 151, 1° m., 4402 (iii).

See 'Rys.'

Govt. Railways Act (damages) Amt. (B. 232) in Com. 8772 (v).

See 'I.C.R'.

Govt. Rys. Provident Fund Amt. (B. 19) 1° m., 206, 2° m., 1136; in Com., 1139 (i); on Order for, 3°, 2637 (ii).

Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6799 (iv).

G.T.P., Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance by Govt. (Ans.) 2137 (ii).

——— Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Locations, &c. (Ans.) 1366 (i).

G.T.P. and N.T. Ry. Commissions, Investigation *re* Classification (Ans.) 260 (i).

G.T.P. Classifications, Letters from Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 387 (i).

——— Memorandum of Chairman to Prime Minister (Ans.) 2139 (ii).

—— submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909 (Ans) 262 (i).

See 'Natl. Transcl.'

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Construction Contracts, Provisions *re* Forfeits (Ans.) 388 (i).

——— N.B., Provisions *re* sub-letting (Ans.) 383 (i).

G.T.P., Cost of Winnipeg and Edmonton Sections, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Engineers' Complaints *re* Arbitrators (Ans.) 2141 (ii).

——— Entrance into Brandon, Res. re (Ans.) 3159 (ii).

——— Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost of (Ans.) 1784 (i).

——— Progress Estimates, Amount claimed in District 'A' (Ans.) 2140 (ii).

——— Terminals, Expenditure by Govt. *re* (Ans.) 1205 (i).

———Winnipeg to Edmonton, Cost per Mile, &c. (Ans.) 624 (i).

Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer (Ans.) 6799 (iv).

Gulliver's Cove, Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 1206 (i).

Halifax Roundhouse Property, Valuation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

Hodgins Investigation *re* N.T. Ry., Payments *re* Legal Services (Ans.) 7064 (iv.)

Holland River, Channel from Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 170, 626 (i).

———Corrected Answer, 1099 (i).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal.'

Hudson Bay Ry. Estimates, Stmnt. (read) 3206 (ii).

——— Survey, Obstructions, &c. (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Hungary Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Road (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

I.C.R., Account-keeping, Charges to Capital and Income (stmnt. read) in Com. of Sup., 2937 (ii).

——— Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 2798 (ii).

——— Board of Management, Additional Powers (Ans.) 627 (i).

——— Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 99 (i).

——— French Representation (Ans.) 7519 (v).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease (B. 17) 1° m., 205; 2° m., 1102; in Com., 1130 (i); 3° m. 2191, 2206 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8402

——— Agreement *re* Senate Amendments, 8828, 8854 (v).

I.C.R., Coal Shed at Rivière du Loup, Erection of (Ans.) 4128 (iii).

——— Cunard Property, Halifax, Acquisition by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Dismissals by Commission, &c. (Ans.) 128, 164 (i).

—— Dismissals for each month from Oct. 1908, to March, 1909 (Ans.) 1776 (i).

—— Employees, Number in 1907-8-9 (Ans.) 835 (i).

—— Employees' Passes, Number issued for Oct., Sept. and Nov. (Ans.) 2716 (ii).

—— Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipts, &c. (Ans.) 1367 (i).

—— Facilities, Prosecutions *re* Fire, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

—— Instructions *re* Sleeping Car Conductors' Residence (Ans.) 4512 (iii).

—— Low Rates, on Inquiry (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8481 (v).

—— Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods (remarks) 1208 (i).

I. C. R. and N. T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

I. C. R. Passes alleged to be stolen, Prevention re (Ans.) 3292 (ii).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 2635 (ii); 4812 (iii).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Ry. Employees Benefit Fund (B. 19) on Order for 3°, 2637 (ii).
See ' Govt. Rys."

I. C. R., Purchasing Agency, Names, &c. (Ans.) 272 (i).

—— Repairs to Car No. 37 (Ans.) 2286 (ii).

—— Riviere du Loup Workshops, Electrical Development (Ans.) 6182 (iv).
See " River du Loup."

—— Safety of Travel, (remarks) 2279 (ii).

—— Sleeping Cars, Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co. (Ans.) 4847, 5105 (iii).

—— Standard Pay for Machinists, (Ans.) 259 (i).

—— Water Supply on Passenger Trains (remarks) 1304 (i).

—— Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service (remarks) on M. for Sup., 344 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3155 (ii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5763 (iii).

Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 263 (i).

Krick, Mr. W. W., Date of Apptmt. as Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland (Ans.) 836 (i).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work done *re* Repairs, &c. under Denis O'Brien (Ans.) 1964 (ii).

—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Cost, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 627, 1006 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Lachine Canal, Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 1368 (i).

—— Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c. (Ans.) 1368 (i).

—— Electrical Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damage to (Ans.) 5104 (iii).
See " Evers.'

—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100, &c. (Ans.) 2428 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of (Ans.) 1194 (i).

Level Crossing Protection, Rep. of Mr. J. Murphy (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Little Nation River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8479 (v).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii).

Long Sault Rapids Dam, Application *re* (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Lumsden Charges: *See* ' N. T. Ry.'

McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absences, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2258 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging coming Season (Ans.) 1194 (i).

N. T. Ry., Accidents, Explosives, Circular *re* Caution, &c. (Ans.) 4512 (iii).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, 8263 (v).

—— Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2358 (ii).

—— Classification, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) that Hse adjourn, 2563 (ii).

—— Commission, Board of Arbitrators, Contractor's Claims *re* Over-Classification (Ans.) 836 (i).

—— Commission, Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Payments to (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

N. T. R., Commissioners, Number of Members, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 630 (i).

—— Profits re Supplies (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Commissioners' Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 622 (i).

—— (M.) to print, 97 (i).

N. T. Ry., Construction Contracts, Provision *re* Forfeits, corrected answer, 447 (i).

—— Contract to O'Brien and Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantity, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2715 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Payments *re* Excavations, &c. (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

——— Estimate of Work, &c. (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Date of Contract for Winnipeg to Superior Junction, &c., Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 165 (i).

——— Estimated Cost of Excavations on District 'F' (Ans.) 2285 (ii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Name of Asst. Engineer in Aug., 1907 (Ans.) 2284 (ii).

——— Letter of Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion (Ans.) 840 (i).

——— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

——— McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c. (Ans.) 839 (i).

N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 6393 (iv).

N. T. Ry., Surveys by G. T. P., Change in Location, &c. (Ans.) 2283 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* Shops at St. Boniface (Ans.) 8835 (v).

——— Tunnel East of Winnipeg, Length, &c. (Ans.) 2284 (ii).

——— Wheat Shipments, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).

——— Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction, Completion of (Ans.) 2285 (ii).

——— Winnipeg to Superior Junction, Opening for Traffic, &c. (Ans.) 165 (i).

See 'G. T. P.'

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4816, 5235 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

See 'Trent.'

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8612 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com. on Amt., 1364 (i).

Patronage Distribution, on Inquiry for Ret., 3134 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Bill, prop. Res., 6608 (iv).

See 'Crude.'

Port Colborne Elevator, Expenditure *re* Railway (Ans.) 3295 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

——— Right of Way, &c. (Ans.) 8661 (v).

Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ans.) 1968 (ii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4840 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch Survey (Ans.) 7518 (v).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Board of Engineers, Additions, Names, &c. (Ans.) 104 (i).

——— Consideration *re* Quebec Bridge Franchise (Ans.) 261 (i).

——— Criticism in 'Scientific American' *re* Plans (remarks) 3390 (ii).

——— Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29, 1907 (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

——— Payments to Company at time of Collapse (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

——— Tenders for New Piers, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

——— Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1205 (i).

Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 451; (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 451 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 462; (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 1°, 95; on M. for 2°, 474 (amt.), 478; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 53) 478 (i).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, 480, (amt.) 6 m. h. agreed to (Y. 107; N. 60) 494 (i).

Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Papineau) on M. for 2°, 2034 (ii).

Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2° (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 2156 (ii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5766 (iii).

Ry. Act (board of ry. commissioners) Amt. (B. 145) 1° m., 3914 (ii); 2° m., 8405; in Com., 8406 (v).

Railways, Govt., Adjudication of Claims (B. 151) in Com., 6600 (iv).

See 'Govt. Rys.'

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 232) 1° m., 8733 (v).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

——— Dep. Min., Apptmt., Duties, &c. (Ans.) 2718 (ii).

Ry. Code of Train Rules, Approval of Ry. Commission (Ans.) 8834 (v).

Ry. Commission Board, Vacancy *re* Mr. Greenway's Death (Ans.) 131 (i).

Railway Statistics Rep. (presented) 1729 (i).

Railway Subsidies (B. 266) in Com. on Res., 8477; in Com., 8480 (v).

Rivière du Loup, I. C. Ry. Crossing, Protection *re* (Ans.) 1778 (i).

St. Laurent, Man., Wharf Piers, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1195 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 842 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6233, 6354, 6666, 6724; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8655 (v).

Sault Ste. Marie Lock, Investigation *re* Accident, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 837 (i).

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 5777 (iii).

Sunday Traffic: *See* 'London,' &c.

Supplies purchased for Ry. Commission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4519 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Canals—Chambly (Canton wharf) 3122 (ii).

Canals—Cornwall (concrete wall) 3123; (levelling) 3123; (lock 17, entrance) 3123; (lock 19, entrance) 3123; (repairs) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Galops (concrete piers) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 3103; (wharfs and basins) 3103 (ii).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 3127 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (macadamizing roads) 3122; (protection walls) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 3106; (iron mooring posts) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Soulanges (leakage) 3105; (tool grinder) 3105 (ii).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3106; (damages) 3120; (improvements) 3126; (Newmarket) 3107 (ii).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121; (lock 2, channel) 3122 (ii); (Port Colborne) 8821; (surveys) 8822 (v).

Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247; (salaries) 246 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsborough) 578 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8820 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air-brakes) 2881; (Beresford subway) 2872; (board of commission) 3094; (bridge strengthening) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874, 2947; (Chaudiere junction) 2873; (draw bars) 2882; (facilities) 2946; (Halifax) 2883; (highways) 2882; (Indiantown) 2884; (Lac au Saumon) 2884; (Loggieville) 2885; (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2933; (new machinery) 2942; (original construction) 2943; (Pintsch gas) 2943; (revenue) 3091; (Riviere du Loup) 2945; (Robinson's crossing) 2945; (St. John) 2945; (Ste. Rosalie) 2946; (side ladders on cars) 2945; (Sydney Mines) 2946 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s cars) 3127; (litigation expenses) 3131; (ry. commission) 3127; (remunerations) 3131; (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v); (Quebec bridge construction) 3070 (ii), 8821 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (construction) 3102; (Georgetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke)in Com., 6768 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Survey, &c. (Ans.) 384 (i).

Trent Canal, Clarry, Mr. L. F., Charges *re* (remarks) 6097 (iv).

See 'Clarry.'

Trent Canal, Expenditures on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 (Ans.) 446 (i).

——— Floods in Township of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).

——— Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c. (Ans.) 170 (i).

——— Water Powers, Control of by Govt. (Ans.) 2185 (ii).

See Holland,' 'Newmarket.'

Vancouver, Victorian and Eastern Ry. & Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4841 (iii).

Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

——— Running through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 8660 (v).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3437 (ii).

Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Fall and Spring 1909 (Ans.) 5777 (iii).

Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, Running Rights of Dom. Atlantic Ry. (Ans.) 1370 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8055; in Com., 8621 (v); 3° m., 8652, agreed to (Y. 91; N. 26) 8652 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction incorp. (B. 110) M. to refund Fees, 7512 (v).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21, (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1218 (i).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6301 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4820 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2450 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8417 (v).

Railway Committee Report, Delay in presenting (remarks) 7190 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5324 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re* Investigation of Needs (prop. res.) 1023; Neg. (N. 78; Y. 56) 1098 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Technical Education, (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2362 (ii).
——— Replies from Provl. Premiers (Ques.) 3160 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8096 (v).
Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8439, 8706 (v).
Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3435 (ii).
HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*
Address, The, 67 (i).
Congregational Union of Canada incorp. (B. 142) 1°*, 3481 (ii); in Com., 4754 (iii).
Dubuc, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of Successor (remarks) 2277 (ii).
——— Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of a Successor (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 751 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5549 (iii).
Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 8468 (v).
Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).
Manitoba Bench Vacancy, Delays, &c. (remarks) 5624 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on M. for Sup., 8131; (amt.) 8141; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 102) 8166 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 661 (i).
Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4846 (iii).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Ruttan) in Com., 4817, 5240 (iii).
Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada (B. 33) 1°*, 380 (i); on order for 3°, 2279 (ii).
Post Offices opened on Sundays to Boxholders (M for cor.*) 4315 (iii).
Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. Bench (Ques.) 3489 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (construction) 3106 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 8185 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4261; (Lake Winnipeg wharfs) 4263; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of commissioners) 3099 (ii).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1039 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays, &c. (Ques.) 3672 (ii).
——— Representations *re* (M. for cor.*) 4315
——— (remarks) 4134 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).
Budget, The, 2067 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2230 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6951; in Com., 7313 (iv).
Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5217 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6869 (iv); in Com., 7904 (v).
Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6987 (iv).
Currency Act Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 6636 (iv).
Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com. 3920 (ii); 5772 (iii).
Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6975 (iv).
Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5906 (iii).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7833 (v).
Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8772 (v).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8619, 8636 (v).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6765 (iv).
Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5922, in Com., 5926 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act (warehouses) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on Prop. Res., 98; in Com. on Res., 152 (i).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt. (reply) 2840 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1103 (i).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5886 (iii); in Com., 6201 (iv).
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).
London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).
Lumsden Charges, Changes in Report, on M. for Sup., 5598 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5900; in Com. on B., 5904 (iii).
N.T. Ry., Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2582 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2417 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7454 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6202, 6970 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5236, 5284 (iii).

New York State Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5208 (iii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8617 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7321 (iv).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6977 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6571 (iv).

——— Procedure *re* Discussion, 6559 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8407 (v).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5768 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4843 (iii).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6197 (iv).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7100 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1999 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Justice, Administration of, Supreme Court (law books) 8798 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5692; (Canada and Mexico) 5690; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5711 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3406 (ii); (St. John) 6107 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5720 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3069 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2935 (ii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5231, 5249 (iii); 8359 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3070 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5714 (iii).

Water Power in B. C. Ry. Belt, B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5888 (iii).

HARRIS, Mr. L., *Brantford.*

Co-operation (B. 50) 1° m., 705 (i).

Criminal Code (automobiles) Amt (B. 75) 1° m., 1363 (i); in Com., 8731 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association (B. 111) 1°*, 2221; in Com., 3481, 3872, 3915 (ii); 5772 (iii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1529 (i); in Com., 6139; 6739 (iv).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 91) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 3929 (ii).

Toronto Central Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1360 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6783 (iv).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8468 (v).

Kingston, Smiths Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 4128 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4763 (iii); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851; Que. (Aylmer) 3864 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Agriculture, Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7224 (iv).

Agriculture, Machinery imported into Canada, 1909 (Ques.) 382 (i).

Bank Shareholders List, &c. (Ques.) 4846 (iii).

Budget, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2229 (ii).

Burlington Beach Protection Piers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 277 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8486 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7993 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6995 (iv).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6622 (iv).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8841 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5912 (iii), 8071 (v).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Fisheries, Regulations *re* International Fishing, Inquiry for Rep., 1880 (i).
See 'International.'

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°. 770 (i).

—— B. 126 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 6620 (iv).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3062 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreements, &c., *re* Rys. (remarks) 3832 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6762 (iv).

Horse Races and Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6593; on M. for 3°, 7270 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (cigarettes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 3°, 812 (i).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7947 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, asks for Names of Companies, 502 (i)

I. C. R. and N. T. R. Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1109; in Com., 1136 (i).

International Fisheries Regulation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 381 (i).

—— (remarks) 1880 (i), 2153 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3155 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2893 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair to conc., 8229 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6279 (iv).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3° 2280 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2258 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3985 (iii).

N. T. Ry. from Winnipeg to Superior Jct., Open for Traffic, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6205, 6966 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Newspapers in Ont., Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iv).

Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada B. 33 (Mr. A. Haggart) on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).

Oakville Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7313 (iv).

Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Miller) to suspend Rules, 8362 (v).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 466 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8480 (v).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8434 (v).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Rules of the House in Com. on Rep., 8367 (v).

St. Lawrence Power B. 115, on M. for 3°, 7256 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (farm bulletins) 7377 (iv); (live stock industry) 7751 (v); (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (cribwork) 3124; (repairs) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (macdamizing roads) 3122 (ii).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3112 (ii).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3120 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 7768 (v); Customs (salaries) 246; Indian Affairs, (salaries) 346; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 232 (i); Interior(salaries) 8194 (v); Justice (salaries) 253; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 253; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 250 (i); Militia (salaries) 7767 (v); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247 (i); Secretary of State (salaries) 7767 (v).

Excise (tobacco stamps) 1342 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7777 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8200 (v).

Indians—Man. (live stock) 7848 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (surveys) 7837; (medical attendance) 7836 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (relief, &c.) 7847 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 8565; (monuments) 8575 (v).

Mines (peat bogs) 8553 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally— (tobacco curing) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8183 ; (Winnipeg) 8184 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 584 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Lunenburg) 576 (i).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7174; (Fergus) 7179 (iv); (Guelph) 8169; (Waterloo) 8178, (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 422; (deptl. buildings, new) 553 (i); (grounds) 8191 (v); (Royal Mint) 558 (i); (ventilation) 8172 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 669; (Marieville) 688 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (generally) 4809 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 6103 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington) 3457 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3881; (Gaspe) 3892; (Godfroy) 3899 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Lake Nipissing floods) 6165; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6161 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3127 (ii).

Senate (sesional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6769 (iv).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2098 (ii).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8397 (v).

Ways and Means, on M. (Mr. Fisher) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).

Ways and Means—Tariff with U. S., in Com., 8757 (v).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7209 (iv).

Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7908 (v).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c. (Ques.) 4517 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5894 (iii).

Gervais, Mrs. C., Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ques.) 6934 (iv).

Immigrants from U. S., Remarks of Mr. Bruce Walker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5548, 5817, 5847 (iii).

Indian Lands in Alberta, Disposal by Govt. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 119 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8473 (v).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6321 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4888 (iii).

Peigan Indian Reserve, Disposal or Sale of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1801 (i).

——— Open for Homesteading Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).

Pincher Creek Sub-Land Agency (remarks) 8840 (v).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7326 (iv).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6200 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2641 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7363; (experimental farms) 7348 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Macleod) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (North Saskatchewan river channel) 4273; B.C. (Chilliwack) 4299 (iii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8202 (v).

Indians—Alberta (Peigan reserve) 7856 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5999, Res. *re* Farmers, 6000 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv); in Com., 8099, 8400 (v).

Whitford, Mr. James, Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ques.) 6935 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5801 (iii).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6825 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, &c., 3539 (ii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 1366 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5793 (iii); in Com., 6005 (iv).

Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re* (remarks) 3057 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 2069 (ii).

Can. Associated Press Subsidy B. 228 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8685 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Champlain, Samuel de, Monument, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).

Civil Service Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7304 (iv).

Civil Service Apptmts., Number Passing Examinations, &c. (Ques.) 2286 (ii).

—— Apptmts. under the C. S. Act, Temporarily, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3170 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7885, 7900; on Amt. (Mr. King) *re* Title, 8003 (v).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 150 (i).

Cotton's Weekly, Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) 5897 (iii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 897 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6993 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3053 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8688 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1276 (i).

Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of (Ques.) 1207 (i).

Franking Privilege, and Political Literature &c. (remarks) 7804 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3061 (ii).

French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps (Ques.) 133 (i).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1137; in Com., 1139 (i).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 2135 (ii); in Com., 5810, 5834 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8031 (v).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2810 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3152 (ii).

Japan-United States Treaty, Safeguarding Canada's Rights (remarks) 5761 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1236 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2893 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr Martin) in Com. 3140 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 660 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 105 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6014 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5902 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3760 (ii); in Com., 7399; on M. for 3°, 7562 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4206 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1572 (i).

North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2711 (ii).

Ochre River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8699 (v).

Petroleum Fields in N.W., Royalty Charges, &c. (Ques.) 133 (i).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 2137 (ii).

Railways and Canals, Dep. Min., Apptmt. of, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 2718 (ii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8598 (v).

Ross Rifle, Ques. of Privilege, 338 (i).

—— Regulations of National Rifle Association re (M.) to adjn. Hse., 4519 (iii).

R.M.C. Cadets, Visit to Ottawa (remarks) 8584 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Fredrick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5785 (iii).

Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1443 (i).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8122 (v).

St. Johns, Que., Govt. Land, Occupation by Militia (Ques.) 3494 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5336 (ii), 6226, 6343, 6663, 6724 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7084 (iv).

S.A. Veterans' Scrip, Amendment *re* Issue (Ques.) 133 (i).

—— Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8580 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (experimental farms) 7348; (farm bulletins) 7378 (iv).

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 337, Finance (salaries) 336; Indian Affairs (salaries) 356; Mines (salaries) 336; Public Works (salaries) 333 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7773 (iv).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armouries) 8570; (gratuities) 8571; (instructions) 8573; (pay, &c.) 8559; (rifles, &c.) 8563; (topographical survey) 8574 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 7497; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8178 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (ventilation) 8171 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 662; (Fraserville) 662; (Joliette) 663; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Levis) 669; (Maisonneuve) 674; (Marieville) 679; (Megantic) 700; (Montreal P. O.) 702; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (New Mills) 3395 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (South Cove) 1177; (Tusket Wedge) 1179 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Christian Island) 3467; (Collingwood) 3467; (Goderich) 3468; (Grand Bend) 3468; (Haileybury) 3469; (Juniper Island) 3469; (Latchford) 3471; (McGregor's creek) 3470; (Martin's Island) 3474; (Port Hope) 3472; (Port Stanley) 3472; (Rainy River) 3472; (Rondeau) 3474 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Charles) 6102 (iv).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3069; I. C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3074 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S. on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5944 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1090 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6768 (iv).

U.S. Training Vessels on Great Lakes, Number, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4996 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6379 (iv); in Com., 8096 (v).

Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying (Ques.) 130 (i).

Zinc Ores Bounty B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5937 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) 5655 (iii).

Arctic Expedition Tablet, Authority for placing in H. of C. (Ques.) 1526 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Rep. from Capt. Bernier *re* Cruise (Ques.) 1014 (i).

Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1976 (ii).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1965 (ii).

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of new Office (Ques.) 5778 (iii).

——— Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4313 (iii).

Canadian Fisheries Commissions, Number since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Centreville Wharf Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 1201 (i).

Cold Storage Plant, Barrington, N.S., Application *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 1972 (ii).

Conservation Committee, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 4845 (iii).

——— Regulation *re* Fisheries (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

See 'Natural.'

Customs Act Amt. (B. 200) 1° m., 6607 (iv).

Deep Water Weirs in Charlotte, Number of Licenses issued, &c. (Ques.) 1782 (i).

See 'Herring.'

Digby Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).

Digby Dredging (remarks) in Com of Sup., 4791 (iii).

Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 4811 (iii).

Fishing Vessels Licenses (B. 199) 1° m., 6607 (iv).

Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign (Ques.) 133 (i).

Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ques.) 1206 (i).

Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity packed, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1782 (i).

See 'Deep,' &c.

Herring Fisheries Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats (Ques.) 1777 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5513; in Com., 5805, 5821 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5655 (iii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1134 (i).

——— Employees, Payments to, Names, Apptmts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1021 (i).

———Safety of Travel (remarks) 2278 (ii).

International Fisheries Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 3059 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3149 (ii).

Lobster Canning Licenses, Number issued (Ques.) 1970 (ii).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Lobster Canning Plants, Names of Officers connected with, &c. (Ques.) 3936 (ii).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2779 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6363 (iv).

Naval Cadets, Instructions *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1971 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1762 (i); in Com., 7489 (v).

Naval Service in Can., Number of Applicants, Policy of such Appointments, &c. (Ques.) 1970 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6965 (iv).

Newspaper Postage to U. S., Classification, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1973 (ii).

N. S. Representation in H. of C., *re* Amt. in B. N. A. Act (Ques.) 1965 (ii).
See 'Mar. Provs.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8703 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Electoral Divisions, Decision of Prime Minister (remarks) 413 (i).

Provincial Boundaries Extensions, Notice to N. B. and N. S. (Ques.) 3166 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5341 (iii).

Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, Cor. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

—— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2798 (ii).

Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).

Salmon River Postmastership, Vacancy, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 2929 (ii).

Senate Vacancies in N. S., Names of Appointees, &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (tobacco) 7382 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v).

Fisheries (customs bureau) 8547 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 8525; (buoy steamers) 8528; (salaries) 8524; (signal service) 8527 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Militia (armouries) 8572 (v).

Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 8519 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 573; (Halifax) 575; (North Sydney) 577; (Parrsboro) 577; (Wolfville) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4788, 5717 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6134 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Arichat) 977; (Black Point) 977; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Brooklyn) 978 (i); (Centreville, &c.) 8817 (v); (David's Cove) 985; (Economy) 985; (Fox Island) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 992; (Habitant River) 992; (Little River) 996; (Meteghan) 996; (Nyanza) 1000; (Piper's Cove) 1158; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Hood) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1169; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P. E.I. (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810 (v).

Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S. (Ques.) 1020 (i).

Westport Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).

Weymouth Port Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, Ont.*

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2660 (ii).

KING, Hon. MACKENZIE (Minister of Labour), *North Waterloo.*

Aliens Labourers on Rys. (remarks) 8577 (v).

Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 272 (i).

—— Violations *re* (remarks) 4814 (iii).

Cement Merger, Complaints *re* Illegal Combination (Ans.) 2297 (ii).
See 'Combines Bill.'

Combines Investigation Act (M.) for Com. on Res., 2489 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act (B. 101) 1° m., 2056 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 6802; 2°, m. and in Com., 6904 (iv), 7881; 3° m., 7977, 7981; on Senate Amts., 8777 (v).

——(amt.) *re* Title, 8003 (v).

Combines Bill, Rep. of Speech (personal explanation) 7188 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1282 (i).

Extension B. C., Mining Disaster, Medals awarded, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 270 (i).

Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1297 (i).

—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8116 (v).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. (B. 198) Prop. Res., 4848 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6603 (iv); in Com., 8027 (v).

Industrial Disputes, Increase in Wages, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

Industrial Disputes Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1590 (i).

KING, Hon. MACKENZIE—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration from U. S., entering B. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1229 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 1586 (i).
—— Rep. of Com (M.) to conc., 2424, 2887; conc. in (Y. 114; N. 36) 2923 (ii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com (M.) to conc., 8830 (v).
Naval Defence Bill, Ques. of Priv., Res. read by Minister of Militia (explanation) 4710 (iii).
Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5446 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Labour (contingencies) 243; (salaries) 235 (i).
Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Queen Charlotte) 4717 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1061; (M.) to adjn. debate, 1076, agreed to (Y. 78; N. 56) 1097 (i).
—— Letters to Premiers, &c. (read) 2666 (ii).
—— Replies of Provl. Premiers (Ans.) 3160 (ii).
Technical Education, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade (remarks) 3208 (ii).
Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2662 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*

Fleming, Helena Mellor Relief (B. 179) 1°*, 5759 (iii).
Hudson Bay Insurance Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 515 (i).
Industrial Disputes Act, Legislation *re* Amt. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond, N. S.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 27 (i).
Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. re B.N.A. Act (prop. Res.) 2718 (iii)

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Malcolm) 1164 (i).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4848 (ii).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7993 (v).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6526 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. exhibitions) 7387; (experimental farms) 7359; (tobacco) 7381 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Brandon Agency, Number of Persons employed, Absence, &c. (Ques.) 2950 (ii).
Budget, The, 1828 (i).
Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c. (Ques.) 5001 (iii).
Compensation to Alta. and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c. (Ques.) 3291 (ii).
Dom. Land Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3290 (ii).
Fisheries Revenue in Alberta and Sask., &c. (Ques.) 1021 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re* (Ques.) 5931 (iv).
Homestead Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908 (Ques.) 847 (i).
Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908 (Ques.) 275 (i).
Homestead Pre-emptions, Alberta and Sask., Total Acreage, Moneys received, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).
Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 6390 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).
Mudie, Allen R., and Thos. G. Warwick, Claims *re* Section 24-38-10, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).
See 'Warwick.'
National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec (Ques.) 3671 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1737 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5158 (iii).
Paterson, Mr. T. and J. F. Sibbard, Claims *re* Section 16-30-9, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.*) 1686 (i).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c. (Ques.) 432 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Prime Minister Speech at Toronto, Rep. of 'Globe,' 2430 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Provl. Subsidies, Aggregate Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3167 (ii).
School Lands Sales, Conditions, Terms, &c. (Ques.) 5930 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price paid Additional Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1002 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution to Homestead Holders Quarter Sections 24 (Ques.) 1195 (i).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 251 (i).
Dom. Lands (salaries) 8490 (v).
Immigration (salaries) 8494 (v).
Naval Service (maintenance) 8497 (v).
Post Office (P. O. guide index) 5607 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain) 4272 (iii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8819 (v).

Suzerainty to England, Report of Prime Minister's Speech at Toronto (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8394 (v).
Warwick, Thos. G., Payment *re* Value of Improvements on Entry, &c. (Ques.) 275 (i).
See 'Mudie.'
Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel Purposes in Twp. 50 (Ques.) 4079 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Budget, The (remarks) 2079 (ii).
Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c. (Ques.) 633 (i).
Dunnville, Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ques.) 1009 (i).
Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 721 (i).
German Surtax, Explanation *re* Negotiations, [illegible] (remarks) 3680 (ii).
German Tariff and U. S. Rates, &c. (remarks) 3833 (ii).
Krick, Mr. W. W., Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland, Date of Apptmt. (Ques.) 835 (i).
Long Sault Rapids, Deputations *re* Building of a Dam (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5031 (iii).
Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7661 (v).

SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 540 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv); Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3837 (ii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2016 (ii).
Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6925 (iv).
Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8730 (v).
Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8731 (v).
Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8763 (v).
Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).
Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 172; on M. for 2°, 739 (i).
Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8772 (v).
Grimsby Post Office Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i), 8814 (v).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8618 (v).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6748 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5554, 5844 (iii).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6604 (iv).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2812 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on Senate Amts., 8404 (v).
James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5763 (iii).
Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4844 (iii).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 125 (Mr. Oliver) on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).
Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8235 (v).
Lumsden Charges, N.T. Ry. Classification, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6094 (iv).
Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6360 (iv).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5016 (iii); in Com., 7418 (v).
Oka River Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).
Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8600 (v).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6400; on M. for

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Com., 6407; in Com., 6503, 6548; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6582 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 93; 2° m., 413, 448 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 94; 2° m., 452, 462; on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 95; 2° m., 467; Neg. (Y. 87; N. 53) 479 (i).

Railway Act (appeals) Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8406 (v).

Railways, Adjudication of Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6601 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. Bills, Delay in Committees (remarks) 925 (i).

Ry. Committee (M.) to reduce Number, 8734 (v).

Rainy River Radial Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5767 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8596 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5784 (iii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8370.

St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8124 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5465 (iii), 6355, 6735 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8656 (v).

Senate, Abolition, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, Prop. Address to His Majesty, 1977, Neg. (Y. 23; N. 111) 2002 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 5777 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194 (v).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8806 (v).

Excise (distilleries) 1332; (translation) 1343 (i).

Fisheries (legal expenses) 8543; (provincial jurisdiction) 8546; (salaries) 8540 (v).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8206 (v).

Justice—Administration of—N. W. T. (stipendiary magistrate) 8799 (v).

Militia (monuments) 8576 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 593 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsboro') 578 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 426; (military stores) 597; (museum) 568 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Rigaud) 8814 (v); (Roberval) 928; (St. Roch) 830; (Shawenegan Falls) 949 (i).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 981 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5721 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8391 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8005, 8436, 8706 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. A., *Richelieu.*

Victoria Jubilee Bridge Highway, Emigrants Burial Ground, Repairs (Ques.) 5889 (iii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

I. C. Ry., Board of Control, French Representation (Ques.) 7519 (v).

——— Instructions *re* Sleeping Car Conductors' Residence (Ques.) 4512 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4547 (iii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID, G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*

Address, The, 40 (i).

——— (M.) *re* Precedence, 5 (i).

——— (M.) to present, 93 (i).

——— Reply from His Ex. (presented) 1586 (i).

Address to Earl Grey on Closing of Term of Office (M.) 8737 (v).

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 4618 (iii).

Alcoholism, International Congress, Canadian Representation (remarks) 522 (i).

Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'

Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1020 (i).

Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax (remarks) 3057, 3210 (ii).

Allard & Provost, Govt. Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2489 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2636 (ii).

All-Red Route, Rep. *re* Negotiations, Legislation, &c. (Ans.) 269 (i).

Annuities Act. Expenditure *re* Administration, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2142 (ii).

——— Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 385 (i).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 3057 (ii).

Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 201 (i).

Barrie and Allandale, Letter Rate, Res. *re* (Ans.) 169 (i).

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Maintenance, &c., Cost (Ans.) 2426 (ii).

Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts. (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2014 (ii).

Boundaries: *See* 'Manitoba,' 'Provincial.'

B. C. Judicial Apptmts., Delays, &c. (remarks) 6, 8 (i).

B. C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 527 (i).

—— Recommendations *re* from Political Organizations (Ans.) 382 (i).

Business of the House, Delay, &c. (remarks) 118 (i).

Camborne Postmaster, Pet., *re* Apptmt. (Ans.) 1016 (i).

Canadian Attache at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1583 (i).

—— Agent at Washington (remarks) 4710 (iii).

Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents (remarks) 1101 (i).

Canadian Navy, Number of Applications for Positions (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

—— Pet. to Govt. and Parliament *re* (Ans). 5782 (iii).

—— Purchase of Vessels by Govt. (Ans.) 2931 (ii).

See 'Naval.'

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 2°, 2161 (ii).

Canadian Shipbuilding, Tenders from Ship Yards on Great Lakes, Conflict with Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ans.) 844 (i).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts, 8657 (v).

Chartered Banks, Shareholders' Rep. (presented) 5759 (iii).

Chinamen, Paying Capitation Tax (Ans.) 7870 (v).

Christmas Adjournment (M.) 923, 1298 (i).

Claims Adjudication Treaty, Ratification, &c. (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Damages (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7937 (v).

—— (remarks) 1363 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 5, 22 (i).

—— Lists (presented) 155 (i).

—— (M.) to add Names, 1001 (i).

Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditures *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1977 (ii).

Conservation Commission, Meeting of Com. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada (remarks) 854 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 26 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 2156 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

—— Consideration of (remarks) 2711, 3206 (ii).

Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt .B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8730 (v).

Criminal Code (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8733 (v).

See "Motor."

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. to ref. to Special Com., 921 (i).

Currency, Distribution of Clean Bills (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in Report of Com., 3053 (ii).

Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, on Inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv).

Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3166 (ii).

Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 3159 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies (prop. res.) 6276 (iv), 8113 (v).

Dual Representation in H. of C. (remarks) 6802 (iv).

Dufferin Election, Date of (remarks) 623 (i).

Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 1009 (i).

'Earl Grey' Str., Names of Crew, Wages, (Ans.) 3467 (ii).

Easter Adjournment (M.) 5688 (iii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Com. on Res., 6508 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6186 (iv).

Fenian Veterans, Recognition of Services (remarks) 7068 (v).

Fielding, Mr., Gift to: *See* 'Ministers,' &c.

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5921 (iii).

Fisheries in Man. and N. W. Ter., on Inquiry (Mr. Campbell) for Rep., 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).

See 'Manitoba.'

Fish Fry, Applications for Forms (remarks) 3058 (ii).

Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 4812 (iii).

French, Sir John: *See* 'Petawawa.'

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 189; on M. for 2°, 765 (i).

German Trade Relations *re* Par. in New York 'Herald' (remarks) 2635 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 2221 (ii), 4315 (iii).

Govt. Business for Session, &c. (remarks) 5893 (iii), 6100 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Govt. Ry. Bills, Conference with Senate (M.) 8834 (v).
Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1138, 1142 (i).
Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896 (Ans.) 3484 (ii).
Governor General, Address to on Close of Term of Office (M.) 8737 (v).
Grain Mixing by Elevator Men (remarks) 5933 (iv).
Grain shipped and received at Lake Ports, Ont. (Ans.) 445 (i).
Grain Supervisors at Port Arthur and Fort William, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
G.T.P., Winnipeg to Lake Superior Div., Opening of, Ref to in Speech from Throne (Ans.) 3677 (ii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re* (Ans.) 2427 (ii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8380; in Com., 8623 (v).
Halifax Harbour and Big Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen (remarks) 4714 (iii).
Harland & Wolff, Rep. *re* Shipbuilding (remarks) 1363 (i).
Horse-Racing Regulations (remarks) 6617 (iv).
See 'Criminal,' 'Race Track.'
House of Commons, Reorganization of Staff (M.) 6389 (iv).
—— (remarks) 7071 (iv).
—— (M.) to disch. Order, 7872 (v).
See 'Sessional, &c.
House of Commons Corridors, Ejectment of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7182 (iv).
Imperial Conference, Conversion of Cost into Canadian Currency (remarks) 856 (i).
—— Distribution of French Edition (Ans.) 276 (i).
—— Instructions to Canada's Representative (remarks) 923 (i).
—— New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 207 (i).
—— Secretariat, Formation of, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 413 (i).
Imperial Export Co., Application *re* Service between Can. and Australia (Ans.) 1100 (i).
Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Irregularity of Discussion (remarks) 119 (i).
Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).
Inspection and Sales Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 807 (i).
I. C. R. Branch Lines B. 17, on Order for 2°, 1803 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission (presented) 96 (i).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 3490 (ii).
—— Report re (remarks) 2153, 3059 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Iron and Steel Bounties (prop. res.) 8362 (v).
Japan-United States Treaty, (Safe-guarding Canada's rights (remarks) 5762 (iii).
Jones, Hon. L. M., and Hon. F. T. Frost, Apptmts. to Senate (Ans.) 2189 (ii).
Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada (Ans.) 7519 (v).
Labelle Settlers Grievances, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 8782 (v).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2426, 2890 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Accommodation, on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3140 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re* (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104 (v).
Magdalen Island and Pictou SS Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7065 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) to Com. of Sup., 8142 (v).
—— Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. Roche) for Copies, 644 (i).
—— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 131 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries Report, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Campbell) 2152 (ii).
—— on Inquiry for, 3480 (ii).
See "Fisheries."
Manitoba Grain Act Amt B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520 (i).
Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2788 (ii).
Minister of the Crown, Gifts to, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8789 (v).
Morning Sittings (M.) 6099 (iv).
Motions to Adjn, Rulings of Mr. Speaker (personal explanation) 126 (i).
Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts. (remarks.) 1601 (i).
Motor Vehicles, Injuries B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2035 (ii).
See "Criminal Code.'
National Anthem, Singing of during Naval Debate (remarks) 3208 (ii).
National Battlefields of Quebec B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6600 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden (M.) for Special Com., 2330, 2609, 2949 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
N. T. Ry. Classification, on Order being called for Com. (remarks) 2198 (ii).
——— Letter to Prime Minister, on Inquiry for, 448, 622 (i).
——— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).
——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5197 (iii).
——— Changes *re* Report, on M. for Sup., 5584 (iii).
——— Changes in Rep., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5567 (iii).
——— Error in Res. of Com. (remarks) 5278 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. debate, 5597 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6017 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Printing, 377 (i).
Naturalization Laws, Reply to Imp Govt. *re* (remarks) 7292 (iv).
Naval Defence (B. 95) 1° m., 1732 (i); 2° m., 2952 (ii); Agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5193 (prop. res.) 5195 (iii); in Com., 7393 (v); 3° m., 7528, agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7591 (v).
Naval B. 95, Notice for prop. Res., Naval Dept., 6509 (iv).
——— in Com. on Res., 7294 (iv).
Naval Defence, Information from New Zealand (remarks) 623 (i).
Naval Defence Bill, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 521, 1100, 1600 (i).
——— On Order for Com. (remarks) 6948 (iv).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 855 (i).
Naval Defence, Further Cor., on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2931 (ii).
Naval Pensions, prop. Res. (M.) to discharge from Order Paper, 8742 (v).
Naval Service Appointments, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8839 (v).
See 'Can. Navy,' 'Warships.'
N. B. Coal and Ry., Disputed Accounts, Settlements of (remarks) 169 (i).
New York State Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5207 (iii).
'Niobe,' Purchase of without Parliamentary Authority (remarks) 3481 (ii).
North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2712 (ii).
N.S. Representation in H. of C., *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act (Ans.) 1965 (ii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, *pro forma*, 3 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
——— (remarks) 521, 1446 (i).
Ottawa and Quebec Representation in H. of C. (remarks) 521, 1446 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1315 (i).
——— Resignation, 1689 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers (Ans.) 167 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 4129 (iii).
Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., Number of Persons accommodated (Ans.) 447 (i).
Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business (Ans.) 268 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Post Offices opened in Can., 1909, Weekly Mail Service in N.S., &c. (Ans.) 626 (i).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 8364, 8380 (v).
——— (M.) to extend time, 1597 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lake) *re* 'Globe's Rep. of Speech, 2431 (ii).
Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 138 (i).
——— (M.) for Com., 429 (i).
Provincial Boundaries, Extension Res. Notice to N.B. and N.S. (Ans.) 3167 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen's Rep., 614 (i).
Quebec Fisheries, Special Regulations, Licences granted, &c. (Ans.) 6940 (iv).
Questions standing as Notices of Motions (remarks) 6941 (iv).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) (M.) to consider Rept. of Special Com., 6398; on Order for Com,, 6510; in Com., 6567 (iv).
Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 452 (i).
Railway Act Amt. Bills, Delay in Committees (remarks) 925 (i).
Railway Committee, Rules re (remarks) 8833 (v).
Railway Subsidies (prop. res.) 7873 (v).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8598 (v).
Representation: *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Proportional.'
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 8580 (v).
Reynolds, Conductor, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism (remarks) 3209 (ii).
Ross Rifles, Regulations *re* National Rifle Ass'cn, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4529 (iii).
R.N.W.M. Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Sask., Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 843 (i).
——— Report (presented) 1730 (i).
Rules of the House, Report, laid on Table, 7867 (v).
——— (M.) *re* Special Com., 1299, 1441 (i).
——— Progress *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii), 5894 (iv), 7528 (v).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Rules of the House, (M.) for Com. *re* consideration of Rep., 8365 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1537 (i).
Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, &c. (Ans.) 630 (i).
——— Locks furnished (Ans.) 784 (i).
Rural Free Mail Deliveries, Number in Operation, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 259 (i).
——— East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 265 (i).
Rush-Bagot Treaty, Abrogation of, &c. (remarks) 5762 (iii).
——— Violation of *re* War Ships on Great Lakes (remarks) 7520 (v).
See 'U.S.'
St. John Valley Ry., Legislation *re* Operation (remarks) 7292 (iv).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6138, 6227, 6722 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8655 (v).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 3169 (ii).
Saturday Sittings of House (M.) 8110 (v).
Senate, Abolition of, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster) 1993 (ii).
Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2006 (ii).
Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. *re* P.E.I. (Ans.) 1376 (i).
——— Names of Appointees (Ans.) 386 (i).
Sessional Employees, H. of C. under Pay in January (Ans.) 4514, 5001 (iii).
Souris Life-Saving Station, Ownership of Site (Ans.) 7065 (iv).
Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3293 (ii).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'
Stenographers for Committees of H. of C., Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8677 (v).
SUPPLY.
Civil Govt.—Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v); R.N.W.M. Police (salaries) 415; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 415 (i).
Fisheries (protection service) 8509 (v).
Naval Service (maintenance, &c.) 8495 (v).
Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 8511; (steamers) 8510; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).
R. N.W.M.P. (rifle ranges) 8802; (salaries) 8802 (v).
Suzerainty to King of England, Report of Minister's Speech at Toronto (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
Sydney Free Mail Delivery, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 1014 (i).
Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5993 (iv).
——— (remarks) 5932 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Tourists Post Office, Number temporarily established (Ans.) 170 (i).
Trade and Commerce Deptl. Rep. (presented) 621 (i).
U.S. Claims: *See* 'Claims.'
U.S. Minimum Tariff (remarks) 2153 (ii).
U.S. Training Ships, Number on Great Lakes, &c. (Ans.) 133 (i).
——— Passage through Canals, Consultation of Depts., &c. (Ans.) 108 (i).
——— Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ans.) 103 (i).
U.S. Warships passing through Can. Canals, on M. (Mr. Edwards) for O. C.'s (amt.) 135 (i).
———on Great Lakes, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 800 (i).
See 'Rush-Bagot.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to (Ans.) 2188 (ii).
War Ships on Great Lakes, Reps. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building (Ans.) 1367 (i).
See 'U.S.'
War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (remarks) 2714 (ii).
War Vessels purchased from British Admiralty, O.C.'s *re* &c., (Ans.) 2144 (ii).
See 'Naval.'
Waterways Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 3390 (ii).
——— Rep. (presented) 209 (i).
Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c. (remarks) 2713 (ii).
——— Cor., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copy, 109 (i).
——— Progress *re* (remarks) 1802 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 5932 (iv).
Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes (remarks) 3136 (ii).
See 'Supply.'
Year-Book, Expenditure *re* French Distribution (Ans.) 1020 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Arthabaska 'Gazette,' Declarations, &c., *re* Franking Privileges (M. for copies*) 2149 (ii).
Eastern Townships Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 379 (i).
Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51, on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1095 (i).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 981; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé.*

'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Blairmore Station Mail Service (Ans.) 7871 (v).

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office, &c. (Ans.) 5779 (iii).

——— Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4313 (iii).

Cable Rates Bills: *See* 'Ry. Act Amt. B. 104,' 'Ocean.'

Camborne Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (remarks) 2713 (ii).

Central Park, B. C., Post Office, Pet. *re* Closing, &c. (Ans.) 2188 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).

——— Discontinuance of Mail Service (Ans.) 2293 (ii).

Civil Service Act (P. O. inspectors) Amt. (B. 197) prop. Res., 6100 (iv).
See 'P. O. Inspectors.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6955; in Com., 7310 (iv).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Answers of P.M.G. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8819 (v).

——— Discrimination *re* Postage, &c. (Ans.) 4517 (iii).

——— Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756, 5895 (iii).

Dauphin Post Office Date of Opening (remarks) 3136 (ii).

Delisle, Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 3293 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re* (Ans.) 4312 (iii).

Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Office Revenues per month, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

Franking Privilege, Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7800 (v).

Frontenac Mail Contracts, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 7066 (iv).

——— Routes, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 5105 (iii).

Frontenac County Post Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iv).

Gowganda Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Great Northwestern Tel. Co. and Night Letter *re* French Language (remarks) 8241 (v).

Grenville and Grenville Village Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).

Hansard Debates, Omissions from (remarks) 7880 (v).

Holland Post Office Boxes (remarks) 7881 (v).

Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

Kilmant and Shackleton Post Office, Application *re* Opening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Lachute Post Office, Opening of (remarks) 5690 (iii).

Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract (Ans.) 7290 (iv).

Lethbridge Post Office Facilities, on Inquiry for Ret., 3683 (ii).

——— on M. for Sup., 7782 (v).

——— Total Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Mails addressed to Streets, Free Delivery, &c. (remarks) 8119 (v).

——— (Ans.) 7869 (v).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs. (remarks) 8582 (v).

Mail Contracts with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration *re* (Ans.) 1379 (i).

Mail Delivery at Sydney (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Mail Privileges of Members *re* Postal Regulations (Ans.) 2146 (ii).

Markham Post Office, Completion and Opening (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Metabetchouan Postmaster, Jean Gauthier, Removal of, &c. (Ans.) 4515 (iii).

Milledgeville-Holderville, N. B., Mail Route, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4518 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3023 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4978 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4206 (iii).

Newspaper Postage to U. S., Classification, Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 1973 (ii).

New Westminster, B.C., Post Office, Application *re* (Ans.) 2952 (ii).

North Bay P. O. Inspector(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill.'

Ocean Cables Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 8388 (v).
See 'Cables.'

Parry Sound Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Postal Regulations during Parliamentary Recess (Ans.) 2486 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Violations, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks inspectors) Amt. (B. 197) in Com. on Res., 6601; 1° m., 6389; in Com., 7313 (iv).

Post Office Act Amt. Bill (remarks) in Com. on Civil Service B., 6955 (iv).

Post Offices, Closing on Sundays, Statmt. *re* (Ans.) 2932, 3673 (ii).

See 'Winnipeg.'

P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increases, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3168 (ii).

Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c. (Ans.) 5780 (iii).

Post Office Parcel Delivery, Signing for (remarks) 3682 (ii).

Post Office Promotional Examination, 1908, Accepted answer to question 4 (Ans.) 2290 (ii).

Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c. (Ans.) 109 (i).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6979 (iv).

Quebec-Levis Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 6390 (iv).

Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 6941 (iv).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2136 (ii); 2° m., 6007; in Com., 6010 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 8388 (v).

Ry. Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6390 (iv).

——— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars (Ans.) 5106 (iii).

——— Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).

Retail Merchants Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 7868 (v).

River Herbert and Minudie Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 1380 (i).

St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Salmon River Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 2930 (ii).

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 2290 (ii).

Skill and King, Sale of Obscene Literature, &c. (Ans.) 7517 (v).

Sunday Postal Office, Winnipeg, Closing of (remarks) 2932 (ii).

See 'Post Office.'

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5711 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (contingencies) 5607 (iii); Outside Service (contingencies) 8818 (v); (R. G. Mercer) 5755; (rural delivery) 5753 (iii); (salaries) 5752 (iii), 7863 (v);

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Becancour) 3865; (Bic) 3872; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3882; (Gaspe) 3893; (Godfroy) 3899; (Grand Mechin) 3901; (Grand Riviere) 3903 (ii); (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Malbaie) 3907 (ii); (Riviere Ouelle) 4212; (St. Andre de Kamouraska) 4230; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (Ste. Croix) 4241 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159 (iv).

Telegraphs Act Amt. (B. 105) 1° m., 2138 (ii); in Com., 6011 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8389 (v).

——— (B. 234) 1° m., 8776; in Com., 8777 (v).

See 'Ocean.'

Toronto Sub-Post Offices, Owner of Buildings, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

Troy, Inverness, N. S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 7288 (iv).

Williamsville Post Office Revenue, Pet. *re* Removal, &c. (Ans.) 7288 (iv).

Windygate Post Office, Pet. *re* Change (Ans). 2930 (ii).

——— Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 3168 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 8118 (v).

——— (remarks) 8364 (v).

Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays (remarks) 3135, 3673 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Answer, 3484 (ii).

See 'Sunday,' &c.

LENNOX, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7202 (iv).

Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re* (Ques.) 169 (i).

Barrie Post Office Square (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).

Bills from Senate, Numbering, &c. (remarks) 6177 (iv).

Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal from N. T. Ry., &c. (Ques.) 3166, 3676 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7301 (iv).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Flood Damages, on M. for Sup., 5209 (iii).

——— Instructions, Payments, &c., as Agent *re* Trent Canal Lands (Ques.) 6391 (iv).

——— Payments to *re* Trent Canal Damages (Ques.) 7516 (v).

——— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6806 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Conservation of Natural Resources B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 5885 (iii).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Criminal Code (copyright) Amt. (B. 41) 1° m., 430; 2° m., 805; on Order for Com., 1209 (i).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6632 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3482, 3872 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8696 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth)in Com., 6184 (iv).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 176 (i).

Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve (Ques.) 3294 (ii).

G. T. P., Construction Contracts, Provisions *re* Forfeits, &c. (Ques.) 387 (i).

——— Eastern Div., Survey, Location, &c., Names of Engineers, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1687 (i).

——— Engineers' Complaint against Arbitrators (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

——— and N. T. Ry. Commission, Investigations *re* Classification, &c. (Ques.) 260 (i).

See 'Natl. Transcl..'

——— Progress Estimates, Amounts claimed in District 'A' Contract (Ques.) 2140 (ii).

Hodgins Investigation *re* N. T. Ry., Payments *re* Legal Services, &c. (Ques.) 7064 (iv).

Holland River, Channel from Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 170, 626 (i).

See 'Trent.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5534, 5819, 5840 (iii).

Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 7865 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 808 (i).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2799 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1112 (i).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5723, 5763 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2889 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8107 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Marieville Post Office, Que. of Order in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Adjustment of disputed Item in Letter of Aud. Gen., O.C.'s, &c. (M. for copies*) 3495 (ii).

——— Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance of, &c. (Ques.) 2137 (ii).

——— Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2335; Amt. Neg. (Y. 65; N. 109) 2629 (ii).

——— Changes in Rep. of Com., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

——— Changes in Rep., on M. for Sup., 5585 (iii).

——— Classification submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909 (Ques.) 261 (i).

——— Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 643 (i).

——— Letters of Aud. Gen., &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

——— Letter of Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion, &c. (Ques.) 839 (i).

——— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— Memorandum from Chairman to Prime Minister (Ques.) 2139 (ii).

——— Objections *re* Classification, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3169 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2297 (ii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to consider, 5820 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6015 (iv).

N.T.Ry., Lumsden Charges, Appmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. (amt.) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).

——— Royal Commission (prop. res.) on M. for Sup., 8242 (amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).

N. T. Ry. Commission, McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c., Certificates, Cor. (M. for copies*) 1686 (i).

——— Promotion of, (Ques.) 839 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

——— Names of Contracts, Estimated Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2297 (ii).

N.T.Ry., Contract to O'Brien & Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2715 (ii).

——— Estimate of Work, &c. (Ques.) 3490 (ii).

——— Payments *re* Excavations, &c. (Ques.) 3291 (ii).

N.T.Ry., Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F' (Ques.) 2285 (ii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Name of Ass't Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907 (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

——— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 622 (i).

——— Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location, &c. (Ques.) 2283 (ii).

——— and Quebec Bridge, Expenditures *re* Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 6392 (iv).

——— Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c. (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

——— Winnipeg and Lake Superior Division, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4752, 4814, 4819, 5235, 5281 (iii).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5723 (iii).

Ottawa Improvement Commisison B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) on Amt., in Com., 1365 (i).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753, 4840 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602 (i).

Quebec Bridge Co., Payments to Directors at time of Collapse (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

——— Payments by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 628 (i).

——— Tenders for New Piers, &c. (Ques.) 840 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 472 (i).

Railway Crossings, Application to Board *re* Protection, &c. (M. for ret.*), 277 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6171 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 7868 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5785 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s B. 115, in Com., 5841 (iii), 6138, 6672, 6721; (amt.) 6725; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv).

SS. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of by Officials (remarks) 7976 (iv).

——— Treatment of at Halifax (remarks) 8477 (v).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5531 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1348 (i).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl., new) 7169 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 929; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 954 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4755 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Lawrence River Channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879; (Cap de Chatte) 3889; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3887; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3893; (Grand Mechin) 3900; (Grand Vallée) 3904; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Matane) 3907; (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3911 (ii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3068 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 2881; (Beresford subway) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (drawbars) 2882; (Halifax) 2884; (highways) 2882; (Lac au Saumon) 2884; (side ladders) 2945 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5232 (iii), 5249 (iv), 8360 (v).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3078 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Ques. of Priv., 5759 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Intermediate Tariff, &c.(remarks) 5892 (iii).

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Survey, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).

——— Damages by Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry, &c., on M. for Sup., 5209 (iii).

Trent Canal, Clarry, Mr. L. F., Charges *re* (remarks) 4714 (iii), 6096 (iv).

See 'Clarry.'

——— Floods in Twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3733 (ii).

——— Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c. (Ques.) 169 (i).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5797 (iii).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*

Address, The, 82 (i).

Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 380 (i).

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2013 (ii).

Capital Offences and Offensive Weapons (B. 14) 1°*, 204 (i).

Canadian Attache at Washington (prop. res.) 1582 (i).

Canadian Business Agent at Washington (remarks) 4708 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6861 (iv).

Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public (Ques.) 5104 (iii).

Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada (remarks) 853 (i).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (assaults, &c.) Amt. (B. 71) 1°*, 1360 (i).
Criminal Code (automobiles) Amt. (B. 13) 1° m., 201 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii); in Com., 8729 (v).
Currency, Govt. Assistance to Clean Circulation (Ques.) 8238 (v).
—— Distribution of Clean Bills (remarks) 7188 (iv).
Daylight Saving (B. 72) 1°*, 1361 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 3133 (ii).
Immigrants from Europe, Number for 1908, 1910 (Ques.) 7872 (v).
Inspection of Vessels (B. 47) 1° m., 515 (i).
Load Lines on Ships (B. 10) 1° m., 162 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 2nd Rep. 3133 (ii).
Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6302 (iv).
Motor Vehicles Injuries (B. 13) 2° m., 2035 (ii).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4403 (iii).
Oaths, Administration of (B. 100) 1° m., 1878 (i).
Offences against the Person (B. 71) 2° m., 2040 (ii).
Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy to (remarks) 4712-3 (iii).
Ry. Act (sanitary conditions) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1297 (i).
Rules of the House, Amt. to (prop. res.) 1536, 1545 (i).
—— Progress of Committee (remarks) 4307, 5893 (iii).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 5891 (iii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes (remarks) 3135 (ii).
—— on Ships (B. 11) 1° m., 163 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).

LOGGIE ,W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The, 2178, 2215, 2222 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6972 (iv).
Selkirk Dock, Collections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Dredging (new plant) 4767 (iii).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5069 (iii).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *South Renfrew.*

Budget, The, 1864 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O. Cs., &c., 3531 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 2792 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6917 (iv), 7882 (v).
Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2854 (ii).
—— Board of Management, Additional Powers (Ques.) 627 (i).
—— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1117 (i); on M. for 3°, 2209 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8769 (v).
N. T. Ry., Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2414 (ii).
—— Lumsden Charges, Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse (remarks) 5197 (iii); Ques. of Order, 5199 (iii).
—— on Ques of Priv. (remarks) 5570 (iii).
—— Changes in Report, on M. for Sup., 5572 (iii).
—— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6070 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Prop. Res. *re* Royal Commission (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 8302 (v).
—— Lumsden Charges, Payment of Counsel Fees (M.) 8832 (v).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3386, 3575 (ii); in Com., 7474 (v).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., *re* Change of Route, on M. (Mr. Warburton for Copies, 3191 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7357 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6384 (iv); in Com., 8084 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8011 (v).
Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8718 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*

Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 271 (i).
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5941, 6004 (iv).
'Bessemer No. 2,' Wreck on Lake Erie, Negligence re Signals (M.) to adjn House, 1597 (i).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Dominion Bank (B. 171) 1°*, 5617 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 22) 1° m., 256 (i).
Dom. Lands in Man., Sask., &c., Total Area of Arable Lands (Ques.) 2925 (ii).
Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 22) 2° m., 1268, 1270 (i).
Extension, B. C. Mining Disaster, Medals awarded, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 270 (i).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6739 (iv).
Immigrants Treatment *re* Deportations, &c. (remarks) 6945 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 257; 2° m., 1296 (i).
——— Consideration of (remarks) 6941 (iv).
——— (personal explanation) 8116 (v).
Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1213 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2899 (ii).
Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 270 (i).
Land Titles Act, Moneys received, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6318 (iv).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6223 (iv).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at The Hague, Counsel, &c. (Ques.) 271 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1571 (i).
Ottawa Buildings Design, Competition, &c. (Ques.) 6180 (iv).
Peace River District, Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c. (Ques.) 2924 (ii).
Phœnix Assurance Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 515 (i).
Ry. Act (cheap rates) Amt. (B. 24) 1° m., 257 (i).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, Positions, &c. (Ques.) 6390 (iv).
Rescue Station in Coal Mining District, Establishment by Govt. (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5485 (iii).
School Slates and Lead Pencils, Quantity imported into Can., Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 6506 (iv).
S. A. Veterans Association, Military Reserve, (M. for cor.*) 2149 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4223 ; (Three Rivers) 4247 (iii).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1048 (i).
Toronto Barracks, Site on Humber River, Disposal of (Ques.) 3167 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6771 (iv).
Toronto Harbour Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
Treaties with U.S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4998 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*

Address, The, 52 (i).
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Fred. Borden) in Com., 5941, 6003 (iv).
Budget, The, 1626 (i).
Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7998 (v).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).
French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 173 (i).
Imperial Conference Secretariat, Formation of, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 403 (i).
Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8032 (v).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2810 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1102; in Com., 1133 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8766 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6283 (iv).
Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 5687 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6335 (iv).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5142 (iii); in Com., 7397 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Special Rep. of Com., 6399 (iv).
——— on M. for Com., 6468 (iv).
——— on order for Com., 6509; in Com., 6501, 6510 (iv).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8736 (v).
Railway Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c., Ques. of Priv., 378 (i).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8048 (v).
Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1442 (i).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5457 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5709 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5951, 5977 (iv), 8755 (v).

——— (remarks) 5690 (iii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).

'Toronto World', Ownership by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5998 (iv).

MACNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*

Hudson Bay Ry., Survey, Obstructions, &c. (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5091 (iii).

McALLISTER, Mr. D. H., *King's and Albert*

I.C.R. Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2308 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4879 (iii).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*

Budget, The, 1655 (i).

Port Dover Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5489 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (creosoted timber) 3453 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3461 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 6160; (Ottawa, water storage dams) 6162 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c., Revenue *re* Royalties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

Drinkle, Hope Eileen Moreland Relief (B. 134) 1°*, 3133 (ii).

Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Office Revenue per month, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

Grain Shipment from the West (M. for papers*) 1687 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2675 (ii).

Petroleum Locations on Athabaska River, Reports *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3493 (ii).

R.N.W. M. Police Barracks, Calgary, Applications *re* Transfer to Ry. Corporations (Ques.) 1206 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Southern Alberta Land Co., Description of Areas under Agreements with Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1686 (i).

Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of duty, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3492 (ii).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *West Kent.*

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6990 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6318 (iv).

Rondeau Park Forest, Removal of by Provl. Govt. (remarks) 6944 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1174 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 875 (i); on M. for Com., 6431; in Com., 6500, (amt.) 6501; in Com., 6524; 6578, (amt.) 6580, agreed to (Y. 78; N. 77) 6587; in Com., 7265 (iv).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal (B. 136) 1°*, 3296 (ii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*

Committee on Standing Orders, 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 6605 (iv).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B.N.A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2756 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power Transmission Co.'s Bill (M.) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6504 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7149 (iv).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Pardee) on M. for 2°, 7868 (v).

Mond Nickel Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 92) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 3090 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1099 (i); in Com., 2258 (ii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 380; in Com., 1364 (i).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 380 (i); in Com., 2098 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton, North.*

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8775 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1245 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5925 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2317 (ii).
Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2773 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M for 2°, 4343 (iii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5679 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R., Judgments, Reps. *re* Libel Suits (M. for copy) 656 (i).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 979; (Pictou Island) 1000 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury and Queens.*
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3798 (ii); in Com., 7443 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *South Huron.*
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6872 (iv); in Com., 7905 (v).
Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4413 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4928 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of *re* Interrupting Mr. Clare, *re* Speech on Naval Bill, 5200 (iii).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7269 (iv).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *South Cape Breton.*
Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 882 (i); in Com., 6495, 6573 (iv).
Fisherman's Bait Association, Amounts paid per ton, &c. (Ques.) 1015 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c., (Ques.) 6799 (iv).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer (Ques.) 6798 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5844 (iii).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2864 (ii).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1237 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2911 (ii).
Ottawa and Quebec East Representation in the House of Commons, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1314 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, &c., Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3193 (ii).
Sydney Free Mail Delivery, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 1014 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3137 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*
Alberta Coal Areas, Estimated Total Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 1010 (i).
Blackfoot Indian Reserve, Proposed Lease (M. for cor.*) 3170 (ii).
——— Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com of Sup., 7853 (v).
Budget, The, 1920 (i).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).
Dom. Lands Act (licenses) Amt. (B. 143) 1° m., 3670 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing (M. for copies*) 2150 (ii).
Homestead pre-emptions, Available for Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 6935 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 2135 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5516 (iii).
Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1226 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2908 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Representation re (Ques.) 641 (i).
Lethbridge Post Office Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
——— Cor. Reps, &c., with Depts. (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).
——— Improved Facilities (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7781 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) 8855 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 941 (i).
——— Total Revenue for ten months, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).
N.T. Ry., prop, Res., *re* Royal Commission (Mr. Lennox) on M. for Sup., 8285 (v).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurer) on M. for 2°, 4328 (iii).
Population, Method of estimating (Ques.) 4846 (iii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5443 (iii).
Section 29, Tp. 9, Range 22, Application *re* Right of Way (M. for reps.*) 643 (i).
SUPPLY—
Indians—Man. (general expenses) 7853 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 582 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Rock Island) 947; (St. Roch) 829 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Saskatchewan river channel) 4276 (iii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4245 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain lake) 4273 (iii).

Waterways Treaty and Georgian Bay Canal, Privs. of U. S. (Ques.) 3159 (ii).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

Labelle Settlers Grievances (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8778 (v).

Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputation *re* Claims of McLaren Co. (Ques.) 1777 (i).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*

Deptl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction (Ques.) 5106 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation (remarks) 1600 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4910 (iii).

Port Bruce Harbour, Total Expenditure from 1904-9 (Ques.) 264 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).

Port Stanley Life Saving Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).

SUPPLY.

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 8518 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 695 (i).

Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 444 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. A. M., *North Wellington.*

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3921 (ii).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2100 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8008 (v).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5661 (iii).

Ry Act (labourer's pay) Amt. (B. 39) in Com., 386 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5463 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina*

Barthelmes, Alexander Augustus Relief (B 162) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

Brockville, Ottawa and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 160) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

Budget, The, 1662 (i).

Edmonton, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 219) 1°*, 7975 (v).

Forster, James Alexander Hurst Relief (B. 221) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re* (Ques.) 2427 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. (B. 80) 1°*, 1529 (i); in Com., 3139 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95, Rep. in Toronto 'World' *re* 'Round Robin,' Ques. of Priv., 4305 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Advertising in (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6147 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 885 (i); in Com., 6460 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8432 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1543 (i).

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 2329 (ii); in Com., 4753 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6386 (iv).

MAYRAND, Mr. H., *Maskinonge.*

Saint Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s (B.59) 1°*, 1099 (i).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie*

Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent (Ques.) 7290 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1282 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7807 (v).

Homestead Patent for S.W. ¼ 18-19-20, 4th Meridian, Issue of (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

Immigration Official, Dr. Lavoie, Charges against (Ques.) 8109 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8465 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2049 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1231; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 1266 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Sel. Com., 2908 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2548 (ii).

——— Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep of Com., 6087 (iv).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5087 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6970 (iv).

Norris, T. C., Payments to for 1908-9 (Ques.) 2718 (ii).

Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation in the House of Commons (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Negatived (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).

——— Disposal of Protest, &c. (ques. of priv.) 802 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6552 (iv).

Ry. Act (liability) Amt. (B. 53) 1° m., 782 (i); 2° m., 2156 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8410 (v).

Railways, Adjudication of Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6600 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7722 (v).

——— Ques. asked Min. of Public Works, 7695 (v).

Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N. T. Ry. Commissioners (M. for ret.*) 643 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7369 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 362 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 427, 537 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Pink Rock) 3400 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5966 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 8081 (v.)

Western Grain Trade, Over-classification of Grades, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup. 8343 (iv).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1193 (i); 2° m., 2039 (ii); 3°*, 8731 (v).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *North Grey.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) 5352 (iii)

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

B. C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts., on M. to adjn., 19 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 535 (i).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c. (Ques.) 7514 (v).

Civil Service, Outside Service, Legislation *re* Reorganization (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7903 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7001 (iv).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7798 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 184; on M. for 2°, 733 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5652 (iii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1123 (i).

International Waterways Canal Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2679 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2495 (ii).

——— Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5593 (iii).

——— on M. to adjn. debate, 5597 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3210 (ii); on M. for 3°, 7545 (v).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5291 (iii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5333 (iii), 6138, 6242, 6351 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7107 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 574 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 543; (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (museum) 567 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging (new plant) 4769 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5954 (iv).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*

Budget, The, 1507 (i).

Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c. (Ques.) 1378 (i).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111, (M.) to ref. back to Committee of the Whole, 4025 (iii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7805 (v).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, Ques. of Priv., 3937 (ii).

See "Race Track."

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5883 (iii).

Insect Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5639 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8460 (v).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 126; 2° m., 499; (M.) to withdraw Bill, 1209 (i).

——— (B. 73) 1° m., 1362 (i); 2° m., 2040; in Com., 2153 (ii).

Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 51) in Com., 2279 (ii).

Militia Stores, Fire Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5285 (iii).

Private Bills, Suspension of Rules (M.) 8361 (v).

Race Track Gambling (B. 6) 1° m., 96; 2° m., 856, 914(i); on M. for Com., 6400, 6514, 6572, 7258; 3° m., 7270 (iv).

Race Track—Gambling Bill: Ques. of Priv. *re* Letter of Min. of Justice, 6715 (iv).

Senate, Abolition, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster) 1992 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 7755 (v).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7779 (v).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1416 (i).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Man. Govts., &c. (M. for copy*) 4315 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4913 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7126 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8094 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Address, The, (remarks) 47 (i).

All-Red Route, Rep. re Negotiations, Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 269 (i).

Artillery Horses to Petawawa Camp, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 786 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent (M. for copy) 2298 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3732 (ii).

——— Lease to Messrs McIntyre & Robert, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

Business of the Hse., Delay, &c. (remarks) 118 (i).

Canadian Navy. Pets. to Govt. and Parliament *re* (Ques.) 5782 (iii).

——— Purchase of Vessels by Govt. (Ques.) 2930 (ii).

Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation of, Pension, &c. (Ques.) 636 (i).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of (prop. res.) 142 (i).

Co-Operative Credit Societies Act (B. 26) 1° m., 340 (i); order for 2°, 2156 (ii).

——— Consideration of (remarks) 2710, 3205 (ii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 870 (i).

Dom. Lands (licenses) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Magrath) on M. for 1°, 3671 (ii).

Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c.(Ques.) 3159 (ii).

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies (remarks) 3207 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 173; on M. for 2°, 757 (i).

French Treaty, Provision *re* Termination, (Ques.) 276 (i).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3941 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.Cs., &c., 3555 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreement *re* Hay, &c. (remarks) 3832 (ii).

Gervais, Alphonse, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6178 (iv).

Harland and Wolff Shipbuilders, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 1363 (i).

'Hestia' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy (Ques.) 130 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5505 (iii).

Immigration Agents in France, Total Expenditure, Rep. of Mr. Paul Wiallard (Ques.) 790 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, Expenditure by Can. Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).

——— Statement of Cost, Conversion into Canadian Currency (remarks) 856 (i).

——— Total Expenditure (Ques.) 639, 783 (i).

Insurance Bill, Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt. (Ques.) 786 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 506 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Japan Trade Commission, Cor., Rep., &c., of Mr. W. T. R. Preston (M. for copies) 328 (i).

Judicial Business, Montreal District (M.) for Ret., 1792 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Additions to Board of Engineers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).

Quebec Water Lots, Sale to Private Individuals, &c. (Ques.) 430 (i).

LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 640 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3142 (ii).

Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 641 (i).

Mails between G.B| and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

Merchants and General Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1587 (i); in Com., 2714 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c. (Ques.) 5498 (iii).

Montreal Post Office, and Postal Stations, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 1581 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Stmt. of Expenditure, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for ret.) 1580 (i).

National Battlefields Commission, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 787 (i).

N.T.Ry., Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

—— Date of Contract for Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1769 (i); on M. for 2°, 2991, Amt., 3022 (ii); Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095 (iii).

Naval Defence Programme, List of Experts, Technical Adviser, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1546 (i).

Naval Defence Bill, on Inquiry for, 1100 (i).

Naval Ships, Purchase of by Govt., Details of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (ii).
See 'Can. Navy.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, Cor. &c. (M. for copies) 1547 (i).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Grant, &c. (Ques.) 1376 (i).

—— Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 1535 (i).

Proportional Representation in the House of Commons (M. for sel. com.) 136 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 605 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Public Works in the Prov. of Quebec, Uselessness, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).

River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets. Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 114 (i).

Ross Rifles, Marks I and Marks II**, Ques. of Order *re* Answer, 1534 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1541 (i).

St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).

—— Sale of to Private Individuals (Ques.) 625 (i).

St. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets. &c., *re* Repairs (M. for copy) 110 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c. (Ques.) 841 (i).

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded, &c. (Ques.) 629 (i).

Segregation: *See* 'Convicts.'

Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Speaker Blanchet (M. for copies*) 2298 (ii).

Superior Court, Additional Judges in Montreal (remarks) 332 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Roch) 832 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Becancour) 3865, 3875 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3085 (ii).

MURPHY, Hon. CHARLES (Secretary of State) *Russell.*

Analytical Index to Hansard, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2138 (ii).

Angus, Wm., Apptmt. *re* Naturalization Commissioner (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c. (Ans.) 7515 (v).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 209) 1° m., 7181 (iv); in Com., 8381 (v).

Civil Service (census) Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7302 (iv).

Civil Service Apptmts., Number passing Examinations, &c. (Ans.) 2287 (ii).

Civil Service List (presented) 1730 (i).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 887, 910 (i).

Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908 (Ans.) 2286 (ii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv).

Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re* (Ans.) 7289 (iv).

Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction (Ans.) 6938 (iv).

International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 381 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. CHARLES—*Con.*

Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State (Ans.) 849 (i).

Penitentiary at New Westminster, Contract *re* Fish Supply (Ans.) 7516 (v).

Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7287 (iv).,

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to (remarks) 3486 (ii).

Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Protection *re* Invasion, &c. (Ans.) 7514 (v).

Reynolds, Conductor, Tel. from Strathcona *re* Albert Medal Award (read) 4208 (iii).

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6506 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 337; Marine and Fisheries (printing) 252; Sec. of State (salaries) 337 (i).

Treaties with U.S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c. (Ans.) 269 (i).

Voters' Lists, Total Cost of Revision for Thunder Bay, &c. (Ans.) 629 (i).

Winding-up Act, Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 732 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4535 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1577 (i).

Quebec Superior Court, Montreal, Number of Cases standing, &c. (Ques.) 1369 (i).

Ste. Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of (Ques.) 787 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Que. (immigration sheds) 960; (Maisonneuve) 678; (Marieville) 679; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 953 (i).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*

Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) *re* Vote of Sol. Gen., 8168 (v).

National Park, Sask., Establishment of, Disposition of Buffalo Herd (Ques.) 790 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4931 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4821, 5292 (iii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1360 (i); in Com., 4753, 4840 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8047, 8427, 8588 (v).

St. Lawrence Power B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., Ques. of Order, 5412 (iii).

Sunday Postal Service at Winnipeg, Closing of P.O. (remarks) 2931 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *North Oxford.*

Budget, The, 2246 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts, 8657, (v).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6916 (iv), 7892 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3873, 3919 (ii).

Green, Ada Ann Relief (B. 158) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7946, 8465 (v).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1124 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2052 (ii).

Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to ref, back to Sel. Com., 5235 (iii).

Naval Defence Bill, Ques. of Order *re* quoting King's Speech, 5100 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4832, 5309 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7268 (iv).

Reid, Ada Ann Relief (B. 158) 2° m, 5490 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8053 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5355 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 35) 1°*, 380 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (contingent expenses) 8210 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—'Dredging (new plant) 4768 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6383 (iv); in Com., 8095 (v).

Western Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 380 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievance *re* Operation by G. T. Ry., Remedy *re* (Ques.) 102 (i).

See 'Ry. B. 5.'

Bow River Coal Lands, &c. (M. for cor.*), 3170 (ii).

Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer, &c. (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 180 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8625 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2916 (ii).

Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6055 (iv).

Ministers of the Crown and Public Gifts (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8792 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2° (amt.), 5107; Neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191 (iii); in Com., 7396 (v).

—— Notice of Amt., 5102 (iii).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 615 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6595 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 96; 2° m., 480; Neg. (Y. 107; N. 60) 494 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5447 (iii); 6236 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5963 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Alberta Coal Areas, Total Tonnage of, &c. (Ans.) 1010 (i).

Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).

Barge, W. R., Application *re* Licenses, Extension of Time, &c. (Ans.) 5002 (iii).

Becher, Chas. D. T., Homestead Patent, &c. (Ans.) 7290 (iv).

Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).

Brandon Agency, Number of Persons employed, Absence, &c. (Ans.) 2950 (ii).

Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c. (Ans.) 6182 (iv).

B. C. Ry. Belt, Govt. Title to Beds of Streams, &c. (Ans.) 2951 (ii).

See 'Water Power.'

Buffaloes: *See* 'National.'

Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents (remarks) 1101 (i).

Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instruction to Capt. Jemmett (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage (Ans.) 5000, 5561 (iii).

Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund of Money *re* Purchase of School Lands (Ans.) 4617 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Dom. Lands, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenue (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

Dom. Lands in Man., Sask., Total Area of Arable Lands (Ans.) 2925 (ii).

See 'Half Sections,' 'Homesteads,'

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3875, 3916 (ii).

Doukhobors, Comparison with h. m. for Dauphin (remarks) 5532 (iii).

Emigration to U. S. from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston (Ans.) 432 (i).

Emigration from Canada, System of Record-keeping (Ans.) 268 (i).

See Immigration, &c.

Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Construction of Roads (Ans.) 636 (i).

Gervais, Mrs. C. Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4617 (iii).

Grain Trade: *See* "Western."

G. T. R. Ry. and Land Sales along the Line (Ans.) 1966 (ii).

Half-Breed Scrip, Commission *re* (Ans.) 5931 (iv).

—— Location since Jan. 1910 (Ans.) 6937 (iv).

Half Sections in Man., N. ½, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 5890 (iii).

Hay and Wood Permits from Dom. Lands, Man., Amounts collected (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

See "Wood."

Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c. (Ans.) 1784 (i).

Homestead Fees, Amount collected in Alberta and Sask. (Ans.) 848 (i).

Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c. (Ans.) 270 (i).

Homestead Patent for S. W. ¼, 18-19-20 W. 4th Meridian, Issue of (Ans.) 6936 (iv).

Homestead Pre-emptions, available for Settlers, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

—— Total Acreage sold since 1908 (Ans.) 275 (i).

—— Total Acreage, Moneys received, &c. (Ans.) 2951 (ii).

Homesteading on Section 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties (Ans.) 4080 (iii).

Homesteads for Women (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8489 (v).

Hudson Bay Ry., Land Sales, Number of Acres (Ans.) 2144 (ii).

Hydrographic Survey, Irrigation Rep. (presented) 5103 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 2133 (ii); 2° m., 5502; in Com., 5532, 5802, 5822 (iii); on Senate Amts., 8400 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*
Immigration Act Amt.—*Con.*
—— in Com., on Ques. of Order, 5540 (iii).
Immigration Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 102 (i).
—— Rep. of Mr. Wiallard (Ans.) 790 (i).
Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number (Ans.) 128 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number of (Ans.) 1374 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, Number for 1908, 1910 (Ans.) 7872 (v).
Immigrants and S.S. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of (remarks) 7977, 8477 (v).
—— Letter from Supt. (read) 8579 (v).
Immigrants located on Bay of Quinté Ry., Number, &c. (Ans.) 7872 (v).
Immigrants, Treatment *re* Deportations (remarks) 6946 (iv).
—— Treatment of at Halifax (remarks) 7977, 8477 (v).
Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 638 (i).
Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
Immigration Official Dr. Lavoie, Charges *re* (Ans.) 8109 (v).
Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials (remarks) 6610 (iv).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 141) 1° m., 3390 (ii); 2° m., 5922; in Com., 5925 (iii); in Com., 5934 (iv).
Indian Industrial School, Regina, Closing of (Ans.) 6179 (iv).
See 'School,' &c.
Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, Disposal of by Govt., on M. (Mr. Herron) to adjn., 120 (i).
Indian Lands in Algoma, Terms, &c., of Sale (Ans.) 635 (i).
Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c. (Ans.) 784 (i).
Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy *re* (Ans.) 6390 (iv).
Interior and Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Irrigation Act Amt. (B. 186) 1° m., 5886 (iii); in Com., 6201 (iv).
Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
La Butte Indian School, Payments to (Ans.) 6179 (iv).
Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 125) 1° m., 2485 (ii); 2° m., 5921 (iii); on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).
Leech, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4081 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*
Lilly, Wm., Homestead Preemption of S.W. ¼, 32-7-5, &c. (Ans.) 6936 (iv).
McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).
McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon Trip (Ans.) 5890 (iii).
McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office, &c. (Ans.) 4081 (iii).
Manitoba Federal Subsidy *re* School Lands (Ans.) 4310 (iii).
Manitoba School Lands, Sale of (Ans.) 4309 (iii).
National Park, Sask., Disposition of Buffalo Herd (Ans.) 790 (i).
Naval Defence, Lands available for defraying Cost (Ans.) 1367 (i).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4835, 5294 (iii).
New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations (Ans.) 3169 (ii).
Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 851 (i), 2718 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims for Damages, Fiat, &c. (Ans.) 640 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1563 (i).
Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53, 54, Terms of Sale (Ans.) 1374 (i).
Oka Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).
Oka River Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8582 (v).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Land Grant (Ans.) 1376 (i).
—— Disposal of Lands by Govt. (Ans.) 1535 (i).
Peace River Country, Portions opened up for Settlement (Ans.) 4313 (iii).
—— Total Acreage of Arable Land, &c. (Ans.) 2925 (ii).
Peigan Indian Agency, Winding up Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).
Peigan Reserve, Sale of Lands (Ans.) 6936 (iv).
Petroleum Fields in N.W., Royalty Charges, &c. (Ans.) 134 (i).
Petroleum Locations on Athabasca River, Reports *re* (Ans.) 3493 (ii).
Pincher Creek sub-Land Agency (remarks) 8840 (v).
Pitt Meadows, Lease of Land on Special Terms, &c. (Ans.) 274 (i).
Pointe Bleue Indian Agent W. Donohue, Removal of (Ans.) 4515 (iii).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest (Ans.) 432 (i).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Removal of Squatters (Ans.) 1369 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations, prop. Res., 3057 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6194, 6372 (iv).

R.N.W.M. Police Barracks, Calgary, Application *re* Transfer to Ry. Corporations (Ans.) 1206 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5447 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation *re* Charges, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).

——— Claims *re* Speculators, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. Bradbury) 5762 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Surrender, &c. (Ans.) 2296 (ii).

——— Instruction to Chief Justice Howell, on Inquiry for Ret., 2636 (ii).

——— Letter of Mr. Ernest Raynor (explanation) 1963 (ii).

——— Negotiations with Mr. W. Frank (Ans.) 7065 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7527 (v).

——— Surrender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).

School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 433 (i).

School Lands, Sale of, Conditions, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 5930 (iii).

See 'Indians.'

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price paid, Additional Cost (Ans.) 1003 (i).

——— Distribution to Homestead Holders in Quarter Section 24 (Ans.) 1196 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. *re* Surgeons, &c. (Ans.) 3732 (ii).

——— Amt. *re* Issue of (Ans.) 133 (i).

——— Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8581 (v).

——— Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 107 (i), 2144 (ii).

See 'Volunteers.'

SS. Passengers: *See* 'Immigrants.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 344, 415 (i); Interior (contingencies) 8194; (salaries) 8194 (v).

Dom. Lands (printing, &c.) 8493; (salaries) 8489; (timber protection) 8492 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8195; (contingent expenses) 8207; (salaries) 8494 (v).

Indians—Alta. (Peigan reserve) 7856 (v).

Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7858 (v).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7837; (schools) 7861 (v).

Indians—Man. (annuities, &c.) 7848; (clothing, &c.) 7851; (general expenses) 7853; (grist mills) 7853; (live stock) 7848;

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(medical attendance) 7849; (Sioux) 7853; (supplies) 7849 (v).

Indians—N.B. (salaries) 7846 (v).

Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 7843; (surveys)) 7837 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (Lennox island wharf) 7847; (relief, &c.) 7847 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 427 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration sheds) 960 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii); (adminstration salaries) 8487 (v).

Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms, &c. (Ans.) 2291 (ii).

Surveys in Township Nine, Man., Alterations, &c. (Ans.) 272 (i).

Swan Lake Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).

Trachoma in Regina Schools (remarks) 3391 (ii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Tree Planting, Expenditure re (Ans.) 5932, 6181 (iv).

U.S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens (remarks) 6943 (iv).

Veteran Land Grants, Number taken up, Assignments, &c. (Ans.) 447 (i).

See 'S. A.'

Victoria Immigration Building, Number of Inmates, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. (B. 163) 1° m., 4996 (iii) 2°., 6376 (iv); in Com., 8072 8389 (v).

Wakefield, A. G., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 5890 (iii).

Walton, Geo., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3734 (ii).

Warwick, Thos. G., Value of Improvements on Entry (Ans.) 275 (i).

Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C. (B. 187) 1° m., 5887 (iii); in Com., 6373 (iv); 8435, 8706 (v).

Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber Lands, &s. (Ans.) 844 (i).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2188 (ii).

Western Grain Trade, Deputations *re* (remarks) 8584 (v).

Western Grain Trade, Over-classification of Grades (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8344 (v).

——— Over-classification of Grades (remarks) 8363 (v).

Westminster District, Land leased to B.C. Mill and Trading Co. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Whitford, James, Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel in Twp. 50, &c. (Ans.) 4079 (iii).

See 'Hay.'

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 888 (i).

I. C. R., Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1129 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2904 (ii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1571 (i).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

Budget, The (remarks) 2246 (ii).

Campbellford Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).

Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908 (Ques.) 2285 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6285 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5079 (iii).

Parcel Post Delivery, Signing for, &c. (remarks) 3682 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6588 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Discussion, in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 930 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3850 (ii).

Trent Canal, Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

U.S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada (remarks) 4712 (iii).

PAPINEAU, Mr. L. J., *Beauharnois.*

Fenian Raid Veterans, Request *re* Indemnity (Ques.) 5560 (iii).

Ry. Act (fires) Amt. (B. 48) 1° m., 621 (i); 2° m., 2032 (ii).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Agricultural Bulletins, Number distributed, &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7282 (iv).

Archives, Protection *re* Fire (Ques.) 1019 (i).

Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1193 (i).

Budget, The, 1929 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 742 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Historial Manuscripts Commission, Members, Results, &c. (Ques.) 790 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5823 (iii).

Immigration Agents in Belgium, Reps. *re* (M. for papers*) 1022 (i).

Immigration Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 101 (i).

Immigration Medical Inspection, Cor. since 1st Jan. 1908 (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).

Imperial Naval Conference, Distribution of French Edition (Ques.) 276 (i).

I. C. R. Board of Commissioners, Names, Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 99 (i).

—— Dismissals by Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 128, 164 (i).

—— Employees, Number in 1907-8-9 (Ques.) 835 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4678 (iii).

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4315 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6529 (iv).

St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3936 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1425 (i).

Year Book, Expenditure *re*, French Distribution (Ques.) 1020 (i).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) 2° m., 7868 (v).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6877 (iv); in Com., 7912 (v).

Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2167 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Amt. (Mr. Haggart) *re* Vote of Sol. Gen., 8168 (v).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7263 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s Limited incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 2221 (ii); in Com., 5317' 5334 (iii), 6138, 6169, 6226, 6341, 6663, 6721; 3° m., 6886, 7251; on Senate Amts., 8653 (v).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 8000 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm., (Minister of Custom) *Brant.*

Budget, The, 2061 (ii).

Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c. (Ans.) 261, 633 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6953 (iv).

Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909 (Ans.) 842 (i).

Customs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Customs and Excise Revenues for 1909-10 &c. (Ans.) 8109 (v).

Dunnville, Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 1009 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) 7828 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 190; on M. for 2°, 776 (i).

German Trade Relations, Value of Exports, &c. (Ans.) 261, 633 (i).

Grain Exports from Montreal for past Ten Years, &c. (Ans.) 782 (i).

Herring Fish transported to U.S., &c. (Ans.) 1777 (i.

Incubators, Total Number imported from U. S., 1909 (Ans.) 169 (i).

LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 641 (i).

Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 641 (i).

Machinery, Steel, Quantity imported for 1907-8 (Ans.) 1015 (i).

Mahone, Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 6507 (iv).

Pulp and Pulpwood Exports from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c., (Ans.) 836 (i).

School Slates and Lead Pencils imported into Canada, Quantity, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 6506 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 243; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8803 (v); (salaries) 1359 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs) 826 (i).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8753 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8100 (v).

Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909 (Ans.) 1378 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil*

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6643 (iv).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8695 (v).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Grenville Station to Grenville Village Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for (Ques.) 131 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 7959 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3151 (ii).

Lachute Public Building, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 3183 (ii); (remarks) 3137 (ii), 5689 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4863 (iii).

New York Canals, Use by Canadian Vessels, Authority for (Ques.) 4128 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).

——— Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens, &c. (read) 5625 (iii).

Ottawa, Govt. Buildings (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes and Rent, &c. (Ques.) 1009 (i).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. (B. 178) 1°*, 5759 (iii); in Com., 8599 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4842 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4233; Ste. Croix) 4237; (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, &c. (prop. res.) 1380 (i).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

I.C.R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2313 (ii).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 5773 (iii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8387 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5841 (iii).

Milk Testing, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4639 (iii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5771 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (cold storage) 7363, 7384 (iv).

PRICE, Mr. W., *Quebec West.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5651 (iii).

Pringle, Cecilia Marie, Relief (B. 157) 1°*, 4922 (iii).

PRICE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co's. incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5428 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1285 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5082 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6532 (iv).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Green, James Albert Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3195 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Public Works) St. John City and County, N.B.

Archives, Protection *re* Fire (Ans.) 1019 (i).

Arctic Expedition Tablet, re Authority for placing in H. of C. (Ans.) 1596 (i).

——(corrected answer) 1730 (i).

Armouries in Can., on Inquiry (Mr. Edwards) for Ret., 8742 (v).

Armouries and Drill Halls in Man., Purchase and Locations, &c. (Ans.) 788 (i).

Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).

Baie St. Paul, Title to Lot 73, &c. (Ans.) 1017 (i).

Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).

See 'Dredging.'

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N.S., Expenditure to Date (Ans.) 1179 (i), 3676 (ii).

Boivin, Elzéar, Payment re Telegraph Construction (Ans.) 7870 (iv).

Brandon Drill Hall, Completion of, &c. (Ans.) 1777 (i).

Budget, The, Ques. of Order re Kensington Wharf, 2109 (ii).

See 'Kensington.'

Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments re (Ans.) 7870 (iv).

Burlington Beach Protection Piers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co's. incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).

Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease *re* Lands and Timber, &c. (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1373 (i).

Columbia River Banks, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Couchiching and Simcoe Lakes, Lowering of Water, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

Dalhousie Port Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).

Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of (Ans.) 631 (i).

Digby Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).

Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 849 (i).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr Harris) in Com., 3873, 3925 (ii).

Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie (Ans.) 6508 (iv).

See 'Bathurst.'

Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

Dredging Inspection on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4253 (iii).

See 'Govt. Dredges.'

Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 105 (i).

Dry Dock at Sault Ste. Marie, Application *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 106 (i).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8695 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments by P. W. Dept. (Ans.) 2718 (ii).

Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Papers, 2029 (ii).

Fighting Island Channel Improvement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).

Forty-ninth Regiment, Appmt. of Commanding Officer, &c. (Ans.) 4311 (iii).

Fraser River Channel, Depth of Dredging, &c (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

—— Protection *re* Inundations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

Gasperaux River Dredging, Payments to Mar. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

—— Demand for Papers read by Minister (remarks) 2490 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, &c., 3569 (ii).

—— Papers laid on Table, 8734 (v).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, &c., Reply to Mr. Gefman, 3986 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1536 (i).

Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of struction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2185 (ii).

Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).

Great Lakes Dredging Co.'s Contracts *re* Kaministiquia River (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

Grimsby Post Office Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 929 (i), 8816 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3672 (ii).

Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction of (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Heating and Lighting Contracts *re* Public Buildings (Ans.) 1203 (i).

Hecla Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).

'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work (Ans.) 1967 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1132 (i); on M. for 3°, 2210 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2672; in Com., 3151 (ii).

Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 4514 (iii).

'J. G Witherbee,' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

Kensington Wharf, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (Ans.) 1783, 1970 (i).

——— Recommendations re (Ans.) 3469, 3737 (ii).

King, Mr., Astronomer's Residence: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works—Buildings—Ottawa.'

Labour Dept., Rent of Y.M.C.A. Building (Ans.) 627 (i).

See 'Ottawa.'

Lachute Public Building, Completion of, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3137 (ii), 5690 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3463 (ii).

Lake Nipissing flooded Lands, Compensation *re*, Names, &c. (Ans.) 2295 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c. (Ans.) 850 (i).

Lambton Barracks, Appropriations *re* (Ans.) 271 (i).

Latchford Dam, Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

Lemieux, Ed., Payments to for Wood (Ans.) 8838 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 641 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 583 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3148 (ii).

Loggie, Messrs. A. & R., Total Payments to (Ans.) 2488 (ii), 5622 (iii).

See 'Dredging.'

Long Sault Rapids, Deputation *re* Building of Dams (remarks) 2060 (ii).

McLean, A., Payments for Sale of Wood (Ans.) 8836 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2690 (ii).

Maritime Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux (Ans.) 2929 (ii).

——— Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 849 (i).

See 'Gaspereaux.'

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2768 (ii).

Markham Post Office Building Site, Cost of (Ans.) 99 (i).

Mayes Contract, Charges *re* Graft (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 589 (i).

Michipicoten Dock, Preparation of Plans, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 783 (i).

Militia Ordnance Stores, Damage by Fire, Value, &c. (Ans.) 386 (i).

——— Fire Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

Montreal River Improvements, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 1014 (i).

Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Mud Lake Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 3294 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, on M. for Sup., 1156 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 103) 1° m., 2135 (ii); in Com., 5674 (iii), 6202, 6963 (iv).

Nechaco River, &c., Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4753, 4820, 5279, 5291 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., &c., Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6141 (iv).

——— List *re* (read) in Com. of Sup., 8825 (v).

New Westminster Dom. Land, Expiration of Lease, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting (Ans.) 4078 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

—— Names of Employees, &c., Total Expenses (Ans.) 4079 (iii).

Oakville Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4810 (iii), 6149 (iv).

Okanagan Lake Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* speaking in Committee, 4798 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings, Design Competition (Ans.) 6180 (iv).

—— Canadian Stone *re* Construction (Ans.) 5107 (iii).

—— (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes and Rent, &c. (Ans.) 1010 (i).

See 'Labour,' 'Militia,' 'Rideau Hall.'

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8614 (iv).

Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

Oyamel Co., Payments to *re* Tamarac Wood (Ans.) 7871, 8834 (v).

Paul, Mr. William, Purchase by Govt. of Gasolene Boat (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

Pender Island Canal, Depth, Length, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2427 (ii).

Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 3489 (ii).

Pink Rock Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i), 3397 (ii), 4734 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3477 (ii).

—— Par. in 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 3739 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order, 3743 (ii).

Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6507 (iv).

Port Arthur Dry Dock, Subsidy Grant, &c. (remarks) 5003 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 3136 (ii).

See 'Dry Docks.'

Port Bruce Harbour, Total Expenditure from 1904-9 (Ans.) 264 (i).

Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ans.) 1968 (ii).

Port Credit Harbour, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6127 (iv).

Port Dover Wharf, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).

Port Dufferin Wharf, N.S., Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 4082 (iii).

Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4513 (iii).

Port Stanley Life Saving Station(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).

Potvin, P. A., Payments to (Ans.) 8837 (v).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Public Works Advertising, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 8118 (v).

See 'Newspapers.'

Public Works, Deptl. Rep (presented) 7 (i).

Public Works Employees, and Election Campaign (remarks) 2489 (ii).

Public Works Engineers, Number of Residents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2293 (ii).

Pulp Co., Payment of Tolls *re* passing through Booms (Ans.) 7871 (v).

See 'Oyamel.'

Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure (Ans.) 4309, 4846 (iii).

Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7872, 8238 (v).

Residents in H. of C and Senate., on Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).

Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt. of Committee (M.) 376 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6139, 6169 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8428, 8588 (v).

Return, on Inquiry for (Mr. G. V. White) 8585 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7692 (v).

See 'Pink Rock,' &c.

Rideau Hall Furniture, on Inquiry for Ret., 8742 (v).

Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputations *re* Claims of McLaren Co. (Ans.) 1777 (i).

River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cors., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 117 (i).

Rondeau Harbour, Removal of Forest by Provl. Govt. (remarks) 6945 (iv).

Ross Rifles Mark II**, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4311 (iii).

R.M.C. Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 381 (i).

—— Servants' Quarters, Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 263 (i).

Royal Mint, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 103 (i).

Rural Free Mail Delivery Boxes, Changes in Design (Ans.) 1783 (i).

St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4263 (iii).

St. Andrews Rapids Construction, Division of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 8239 (v).

St. Clair River Sand, Lease to Detroit Co. by Ont. Govt. (remarks) 5821 (iii).

Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 112 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

St. John Harbour, N.B., Wharfs and Buildings (B. 204) 1° m., 6934 (iv); in Com., 8120 (v).

—— Courtenay Bay and G. T. P. Terminals, Contract, &c. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 3156 (ii).

St. John River Channel Survey, on Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv); 8118, 8580, 8737 (v).

St. John Valley Ry., Construction by Govt. (remarks) 123 (i).

St. Johns, Que. Govt. Land occupied by Militia (Ans.) 3494 (ii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan (Ans.) 841 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5377 (iii); 6231, 6342, 6665; on M. for 3°, 7252 (iv).

—— Compliance with Act of Incorporation (Ans.) 7869, 8108, 8659 (v).

—— Rep. of Engineers laid on Table, 5557, 5617 (iii).

St. Maurice Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c. (Ans.) 5931 (iv).

Ste Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of Property, &c. (Ans.) 787 (i).

Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v).

Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, Decision *re* Subsidy (remarks) 3833 (ii), 5278 (iii). *See* "Dry Docks."

Sawdust Wharf: *See* 'Richibucto.'

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., &c. (Ans.) 106 (i).

Selkirk Wharf, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. Public Works (salaries) 333; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5698 (iii).

Public Works — Buildings — Alta. (Lethbridge) 8188; (Macleod) 8189; (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 8190; (Chilliwack) 8190; (Greenwood); 8191; (Vancouver) 8191; (Williamshead) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 8193; (tobacco stations) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182; (Winnipeg) 8184 (v).

Public Works—Buildings Mar. Provs. (renewals) 596 (i).

Public Works — Buildings — N.B. (Bathurst) 580; (Fairville) 580; (Fredericton) 581; (Grand Falls) 582; (Hartland) 583; (Hillsborough) 587; (Moncton) 591; (Partridge Island) 595; (Tracadie) 596 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 574; (Halifax) 574; (Lawlor's Island) 576; (Lunenburg) 576; (North Sydney) 577; (Parrsboro) 577; (Wolfville) 579 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Dresden) 7174; (Dundas) 7174; (Elora) 7174; (Fergus) 7178 (iv); (Gananoque) 7495; (Goderich) 7496; (Guelph) 7496; (Guelph armouries) 8169; (Harriston) 7500; (Kincardine) 7504; (Kingston) 7505; (Leamington) 7506; (Listowel) 7506; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 7511, 8169; (Parkhill) 8177; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8177; (Toronto) 8178; (Uxbridge) 8178, 8185 (Wallaceburg) 8178; (Waterloo) 8178; (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 536 (i); (deptl. buildings, new) 548 (i), 7166 (iv); (Eastern Block) 571 (i); (grounds) 8191; (Langevin Block) 8176 (v); (military stores) 597; (museum) 566 (i); (National Art Gallery) 6158 (iv); (Parliament Driveway) 8173; (peat testing) 8177; (Printing Bureau) 8170; (Rideau Hall grounds) 8193 (v); (Royal Mint) 557 (i); (Senate re-decorating) 8176 (v); (standardizing room) 572 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 580 (Summerside) 580 (i).

Public Works—Quebec— (Arthabaska) 661; (Aylmer) 661; (Chicoutimi) 662; (Fraserville) 662; (generally, repairs) 662; (Grosse Isle) 662, 665; (Joliette) 662; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Lachine, heating) 667; (Lévis) 668; (Maisonneuve) 670; (Marieville) 679; (Mégantic) 700; (Montreal P.O.) 700; (Montreal, postal station) 704; (Plessisville) 704; (Quebec customs) 824; (Quebec hospital) 823; (Quebec immigration sheds) 823, 926, 959; (Quebec observatory) 823; (Quebec, ordnance stores) 967; (Quebec P. O.) 823 (i); (Rigaud) 8814 (v); (Roberval) 927; (Rock Island) 946; (St. Henri) 952; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 952; (St. Lambert) 955; (St. Roch) 828; (Shawenegan Falls) 948; (Three Rivers) 959; (Westmount) 963 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, &c.) 8193 (v).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (generally) 6138 (iv); (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Generally (plant) 4777; (new plant) 4738, 4755; (vessel repairs) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Man. (generally) 6137 (iv); (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4780, 5608, 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (generally) 4809 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6124 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Sask. (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta — (Athabaska channel) 4272; (North Saskatchewan River channel) 4273 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Athalmer) 4276; (Bamfield) 4276; (Campbell) 4276; (Chilliwack) 4299; (Columbia river) 4277; (Coquitlam)

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

4291; (Fort George Canyon) 4727; (Fraser river) 4295; (Lillooet river) 4298; (Lockport) 4715; (Masset) 4715; (Nitinat lake) 4715; (Nootka) 4716; (Porcher island) 4716; (Port Moody) 4728; (Queen Charlotte) 4716; (Serpentine river) 4305; (Skeena river) 5608; (Spallumcheen river) 4718; (Stewart wharf) 4726 (iii); (Vancouver) 6122; (Victoria) 6123 (iv); (Yakoun river) 4728 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (bridge work) 4731; (surveys) 5719 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4254; (Gimli) 4263; (Lake Winnipeg wharfs) 4262; (Red River) 4266 (iii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 6103 (iv); (St. Andrew's Rapid Lock) 8819 (v); (St. Laurent) 5255; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5608 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 8817 (v); (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2697; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (Chance Harbour) 2706; (creosoted timber) 3452; (Cummings Cove) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (Dipper harbour) 3391; (Dorchester) 3391; (generally) 3392; (Kouchibouguac) 3392; (Lameque) 3393; (Leonardville) 3393; (Lorneville) 3393; (Mace's bay) 3394; (Moncton) 3394; (Neguac) 3395; (New Mills) 3395; (Partridge Island) 3450; (Petit Rocher) 3396; (Pink Rock) 3397; (Pointe du Chene) 3427; (Quaco) 3427; (Richibucto) 3428, 3438; (St. Andrews) 3450 (ii); (St. John) 6106 (iv); (St. John harbour) 3450; (St. John tributaries) 3446; (St. John wharf property) 3451; (Sackville) 3448; (Seal Cove) 3449; (Shediac) 3449; (Shippigan) 3450; (Sibley) 3475; (Tracadie) 3452; (Traynor's Cove) 3452 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W. Ters. (generally) 4276 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Arichat) 977; (Black Point) 977; (Blue Rocks Island) 977; (Bluff Head) 977; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Broad Cove) 995; (Brooklyn) 978; (Brule) 979; (Burk's Head) 979 (i); (Centreville) 8817 (v); (Chapel Cove) 985; (David's Cove) 985; (Deep Brook) 986; (Delap's Cove) 986; (Delorey's Beach) 986; (Devil's Island) 986; (Digby) 986; (Diligent) 986; (Dover) 989; (Dublin) 990; (Duncan Cove) 990; (Eastern passage) 990; (Economy) 985; (Fox Island) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 992; (Gulf shore) 991; (Habitant River) 992; (Hampton) 992; (Joggin's Mines) 995; (Judique) 995; (Kingsport) 995; (LaHave) 995; (Lake Ainslie) 995; (Leitche's Creek) 995; (Liscombe) 995; (Litchfield) 995; (Little Anse) 995; (Little River) 996; (Little Tancook) 996; (Lower Argyle) 996; (McNair's Cove) 996; (Meteghan) 996; (Middle Island) 999; (Mira River) 999; (New Harbour) 999; (Northport) 999; (Nyanza) 999; (Owl's Head) 1000; (Parker's Cove) 1000; (Pictou Island) 1000; (Pinckney)

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

1158 (i); (Pine Brook) 8816 (v); (Piper's Cove) 1158; (Port Dufferin) 1161; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Hood) 1161; (Port Joli) 1164; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1164; (Saw Pit) 1176; (Shelburne) 1176; (South Cove) 1177; (South Ingonish) 1177; (Spanish Bay) 1177; (Swim's Point) 1178; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (Tenecape) 1178; (The Wharfs) 1179; (Three-Fathom) 1179; (Toney River) 1179; (Tusket Wedge) 1179; (Upper Prospect) 1179; (Upper Washabuck) 1179; (West Advocate) 1179; (West Baccaro) 1180; (West Dublin) 1180; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont.—(Blanche river) 3458; (Brockville) 3455; (Burlington) 3456; (Byng inlet) 3459; (Christian island) 3467; (Collingwood) 3467; (Fiddler's Elbow) 3835; (Goderich) 3468; (Grand Bend) 3468; Gravenhurst) 3468; (Haileybury) 3468; (Juniper island) 3469; (Kensington wharf) 3469; (Latchford) 3471; (Lion's Head) 3470; (McGregor's creek) 3470; (Martin island) 3474; (Michipicoten) 3471; (Picnic islands) 3457 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5729 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 6101 (iv); (Port Burwel) 3471; (Port Hope) 3472; (Port Stanley) 3472; (Providence bay) 3457; (Rainy river dam) 3472; (Rondeau harbour 3474; (St. Lawrence river channel) 3833; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3474 (ii), 5608 (iii); (Thornbury) 3475 (ii); (Tiffin) 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv); (Toronto improvements) 3852 (ii); (Victoria) 5747 (iii); (Victoria) 6123 (iv); (Whitby) 8818 (v); (Wiarton) 3475 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Belfast pier) 2693; (Belle river) 2693; (Brudenell) 2693; (China Point) 2694; (Cove Head) 2694; (generally) 2694; (Haggerty's) 2694; (Lennox Island) 2694; (Miminegash) 2695; (Naufrage) 2695; (New London) 2695; (Port Selkirk) 2695; (Red Point) 2696; (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697; (Tignish) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3862; (Becancour) 3865, 3875; (Bic) 3871; (Cabano) 3879; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3881; (Cap de Chatte) 3889; (Carleton) 3885; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Father Point) 3891; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3892; (Godfroy) 3898; (Grand Mechin) 3900; (Grand Riviere) 3903; (Grand Vallee) 3904; Grosse Isle) 3905; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Isle Verte) 3906; (Kamouraska) 3907; (Lake Aylmer) 3907; (L'Ange Gardien) 3862 (ii); (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Le Petit Debarquement) 3907; (Les Eboulements) 3907 (ii); (Lévis) 6102 (iv); (Malbaie) 3907; (Matane) 3907; (Montebello) 3908; (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3909; (New Carllsle) 3912; (Norway Bay) 3912; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3913 (ii); (Pointe aux Trembles) 4210; (Richelieu river) 4212; (Rimouski) 4210; (Rivière du

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Loup) 4227; (Riviére Ouelle) 4211; (Rivière aux Vases) 4210; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (St. André de Kamouraska) 4228; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232 (iii); (St. Charles) 6102 (iv); (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234; (Ste. Croix) 4235; (St. Denis) 4235; (St. Joseph de Sorel) 4246; (Saguenay) 4221; (Shigawake) 4227; (Sorel wharf) 4246; (Tadousac) 4246; (Three Rivers) 4247; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211; (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5720, 5724 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain lake) 4272 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 4730 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monument) 6158; (Dale, Sydney J.) 6167; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6163; (engineering branch) 6163 (iv); (engineering branch, salaries) 5720 (iii); (International Commission, N.B.) 6163; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (Ottawa, water-storage dams) 6162; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6161 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—(Dom., generally) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N. B. (Courtenay Bay Marsh road) 6151; (St. John-St. Leonard) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ont. (Chapeau) 6150 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ont. and Que. (Hawkesbury) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (city bridges) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Que. (Restigouche) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 6149; (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Edmonton-Athabaska) 6154; (Limerick Gravelburg) 6154 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B. C. (Arrow Lakes) 5614 (iii); (Kamloops-Okanagan) 6156 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Sask. and Alberta (generally) 5614 (iii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Chatham diversion) 2881 (ii).

Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8836 (iv).

Toney River: *See* 'Boat,' &c.

Toronto Barracks, Site on Humber River, Disposal of (Ans.) 3167 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell (Ans.) 3735 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4251 (iii).

Toronto Harbour Extension, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 2929 (ii).

Tremblay, Payments *re* Purchase of Wood (Ans.) 8836 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Trent Canal: *See* 'Couchiching.' 'Lakefield.'

Veilleue, Charles, Payments to (Ans.) 8837 (v).

Victoria Immigration Building, Total Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1369 (i).

Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for (Ans.) 1373 (i).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8446 (v).

Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment *re* Purifying (Ans.) 131 (i).

Weymouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4789, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).

Wharfs transferred to P. W. Dept., Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).

Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).

Wharfs, Policy of Building, &c. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4239 (iii).

Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Contract *re* (Ans.) 7289 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).

Winnipeg Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).

Wolfe Island Wharf, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 3462 (ii), 6164 (iv).

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *North Perth.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5428 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 887 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, &c., 3542 (ii).

Grain Exports from Montreal, for ten years, &c. (Ques.) 782 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8641 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1257 (i).
See 'Labour.'

Immigration Act Amt. B 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5537, 5826 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 5541 (iii).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 209 (i).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).

——— (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 807 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).
——— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 205 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B, 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8765 (v).
James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5764 (iii).
Kemptville Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2897 (ii).
See 'Hours.'
Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 4517 (iii).
Long Sault Rapids Dam, Application *re* (Ques.) 1194 (i).
——— Deputation *re* Building a Dam (remarks) 2060 (ii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 5933 (iv).
See 'St. Lawrence B. 115.'
Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5589 (iii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6281 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint Com., 2950 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4947 (iii); in Com., 7442 (v).
Naval Defence Bill (remarks) 855 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 1577 (i).
Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7675 (iv).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5329 (iii); 6230, 6354 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8654 (v).
——— Incorporation, Rep. *re* Application (remarks) 1529, (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7373; (farm bulletins) 7377 (iv).
Customs—Outside Ports (Contingencies) 8804 (v).
Justice—Administration of (N.W. stipendiary magistrate) 8799 (v).
Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 7496 (v); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 428; Que. (Grosse Isle) 666; (Maisonneuve) 674 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provinces (dredging) 5608 (iii).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Sask. and Alta. (generally) 5614 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 2938 (ii).
R.N.W.M. Police (rifle ranges) 8802 (v).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5956, 6000 (iv).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1079 (i).
Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell (Ques.) 3735 (ii).
——— Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 2929 (ii).

REID, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*

Restigouche Boom Co. (B. 150) 1°*, 4402 (iii); in Com., 6139, 6169 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*

Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4310 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6929 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8732 (v).
Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6627 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co. and Cumberland Coal Co.'s Strike, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5501 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations, Violation of, Names of Persons, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).
Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8774 (v).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1125; in Com. (amt.) 1130 (i).
I.C. Ry., Dismissals by Board of Management, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).
——— Passes alleged to be Stolen, Prevention *re* (Ques.) 3292 (ii).
——— Train Service between Pictou and Oxford Junction, Date of leaving and arrival (M. for ret.*) 3171 (ii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2907 (ii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1223 (i).
Machinery Steel, Quantity imported for 1907-8 (Ques.) 1015 (i).
N. T. Ry., Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names and Payments, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Names of Employees, Total Expenses in operating, &c. (Ques.) 4078 (iii).
Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4513 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. and N.T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Counsel by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 226 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8478 (v).

River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1380 (i).

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2290 (ii).

Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3292 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Naval Service (maintenance) 8503 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3397 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Broad Cove) 995; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Burk's Head) 983; (Diligent) 986; (generally, repairs, &c.) 993; (Gulf shore) 991; (Northport) 999; (Nyanza) 1000 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 2877; (highways) 2882; (Moncton shops) 2936; (new machinery) 2942; (Pintsch gas) 2944; (Robinson's crossing) 2945 (ii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Expenditure *re* (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c. (Ques.) 1370 (i).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2767 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., West Shore, Memorials, &c., *re* Surveys (M. for copies*) 5501 (iii).

P.E.I. Tunnel Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 285 (i).

—— Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3199 (ii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Budget, The, 1842 (i).

Civil Servants in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 845 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.Cs., 3563 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4036 (iii).

Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 183) 1°*, 5886 (iii).

Royal Guardians Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 2329 (ii); in Com., 7256 (iv).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*

Explosives on Construction Works, Number of Accidents, Investigations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8465 (v).

N. T. Ry., Accidents *re* Explosives, Circular *re* Caution, &c. (Ques.) 4512 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5362 (iii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Angus, Wm., Apptmt. as Naturalization Commissioner (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Armouries and Drill Halls, Man., Location, Prices paid for Sites, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7297; 7308 (iv).

Clear Lake, Application to raise the Water Level (M. for cor.*) 3495 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3874 (ii).

Dunn, John A., Application for N. W. Lands (M. for cor.*) 3170 (ii).

Gardiner, Wm. Reid, Cancellation of Entry, &c. (M. for cor.) 5502 (iii).

G. T. P. Entrance into Brandon, Res. *re* (Ques.) 3159 (ii).

Homesteads for Women, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5548 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Man. Govt. (M. for copies) 644 (i).

—— Legislation *re* (Ques.) 131 (i).

Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3619 (ii).

Railway Commission Board, Vacancy *re* Mr. Greenway's Death, Filling of (Ques.) 131 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 226 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8478 (v).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 216 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8043; in Com., 8424 (v).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).

—— Reserve, Removal of Squatters (Ques.) 1368 (i).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6198 (iv).

Souris Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Number of Warrants issued, &c. (Ques.) 107 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Interior (salaries) 7767 (v).

Dom. Lands (salaries) 8488; (timber protection) 8491 (v).

Indians, Man., (annuities, &c.) 7848; (hospitals) 7850; (live stock) 7848; (supplies, &c.) 7849 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558; (properties) 8571 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3069 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry commission) 3128 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res (Mr. Perley) 1400 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6382 (iv); in Com., 8073 (v).

Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 5890 (iii).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3437 (ii).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny*

Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 51) 1°*, 782 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4570 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6580 (iv).

ROY, Mr. E., *Dorchester.*

Budget, The, 1678 (i).

Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Night Letter Rates, and French Language (remarks) 8240 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1260 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 507 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4667 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4237 (iii) .

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *East Toronto.*

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8419 (v).

Railway Mail Clerks, Increase of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6678 (iv).

—— (remarks) in Com. on Civil Service Bill, 6958 (iv).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (experimental farms) 7350 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6678 (iv).

Immigration (contingent expenses) 8207 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7177 (iv); (Guelph) 7500; (Mitchell) 7507 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8174 (v).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert*

Naval Defence B., Ques. of Priv., 5502 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 782 (i); in Com., 4752, 4824, 4818, 4834, 5235, 5279 (iii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

Alien Labourers on Rys. (remarks) 8577 (v).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6004 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Canadians entering U.S., Action of U.S. Immigration Agents, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 1101 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7299 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7917; on M. for 3°, 7980 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3917 (ii).

Fort William and Port Arthur Grain Supervisors, Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Grain Mixing by Elevator Men at Fort William and Port Arthur, Charges *re* (remarks) 5933 (iv).

Grain Trade, Terminal Elevator Co., Tel. (read) 8240 (v).

See 'Western.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5547, 5838 (iii).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5924; in Com., 5926 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5652 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7952, 8465 (v).

Jones, Hon. L. M. and Hon. F. T. Frost, Apptmts, *re* Senate (Ques.) 2189 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep .of Com., 2906 (ii).

Manitoba Subsidy *re* School Lands (Ques.) 4310 (iii).

N.T.Ry. Commisison, Number of Members, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 630 (i).

N.T.Ry., Wheat Shipments, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4012 (iii).

Naval Defence, Lands available for Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7320 (iv).

Souris Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).

S. A. War, Expenditures for Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 632 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7756 (v); (Dom. exhibitions) 7387; (experimental farms) 7341 (iv), 7765 (v).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farms) 227; Indian Affairs (salaries) 366 (i).

Dom. Lands (timber protection) 8492 (v).

Indians—Man. (Sioux) 7853 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 541 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 935 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1169 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3068 (ii).

Railways—I C. R. (Pintsch gas) 2944 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3072 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Act) 5715 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5967 (iv).

Trachoma in Regina Schools (remarks) 3390 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop Res. (Mr. Perley) 1409 (i).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (v).

——— Timber Reserve, Tree Planting, &c. (Ques.) 5932, 6181 (iv).

Walton, Mr. Geo., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3734 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

Western Grain Trade, Letter from Mr. R. McKenzie (read) 8577 (v).

See 'Grain.'

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7274 (iv).

Budget, The, 1804 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 767 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5658 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6302 (iv).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7890 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6285 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3649 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5408 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6383 (iv).

SEGUIN, Mr. P. A., *L'Assomption.*

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to (remarks) 6394 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4991 (iii).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *East Peterborough.*

Budget, The, 1868 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5667 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3463 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6305 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2645 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (analysis) 1354 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (cold storage) 7383; (experimental branch farms) 7392; (experimental farms) 7333 (iv), 7766; (live stock industry) 7749 (v); (seeds) 7389 (iv).

Canals—Galops (concrete piers) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (protection walls) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Sault Ste Marie (iron mooring posts) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 3126 (ii).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7770 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 568 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 693; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3460 (ii); (Victoria) 5747 (iii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 1355 (i).

Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909 (Ques.) 1376 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *North Ontario.*

Bank Act (stock) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 205 (i).

——— M. to withdraw Bill, 1209 (i).

Bank Act Amt. (B. 57) 1° m., 923 (i).

Cement Merger, Complaints *re* illegal combination, &c. (Ques.) 2296 (ii).

Central Experimental Farm, Number of Horses, &c. (Ques.) 5002 (iii).

Couchiching and Simcoe Lakes, Lowering of Water, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7000 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii); 5772 (iii).

Dredging Inspection on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199 (i).

Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1154 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5837 (iii).

I. C. R. Dismissals for each month from Oct. 1908 to March, 1909 (Ques.) 1776 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Board of Arbitrators, Names Contractors Claims *re* Over-classification (Ques.) 836 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) 6370 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4475 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5245, 5307 (iii).

Pork Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Report *re* (Ques.) 5782 (iii).

Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., Number of Persons accommodated, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure (Ques.) 4309, 4846 (iii).

Rules of House, in Com. on Rep., 8377 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5317 (iii); 6270, 6664; 6723 (amt.) 6724; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7251, neg. (Y. 32, N. 49) 7254 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8656 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Co., Compliance with the Act. of Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 7869, 8107, 8659 (v).

School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 432 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Bounties Act, Amt. *re* Surgeons, &c. (Ques.) 3732 (ii).
See "Volunteers," &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v).

Civil Govt.—Public Works—(salaries) 334 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armoury grants) 8570; (civil employees) 8573; (engineers' services) 8569; (pay, &c.) 8559 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 575 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7174; (Dundas) 7174; (Elora) 7174 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 542 (i); (deptl. new) 7167 (iv); (Langevin Block) 8176 (v); (Museum) 567; (Royal Mint) 557 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration sheds) 960; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works — Dredging — Generally (plant) 4777; (new plant) 4763 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 3458; (Byng Inlet) 3461; (Christian Island) 3467; (Juniper Island) 3469 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (Ste Anne des Monts) 4232; (St. Croix) 4241; (Riviere Ouelle) 4211 (iii).

Tourists Post Offices, Number temporarily established (Ques.) 170 (i).

Uxbridge Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).

Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to (Ques.) 2188 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); in Com., 8077 (v).

Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7213, 7244, 7270 (iv).

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4618 (iii).

Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 443 (i).

Budget, The, 1952 (i).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7903 (v).

Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund to *re* Purchase of School Lands (Ques.) 4616 (iii).

Estimates, Delay in bringing down (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8034 (v).

Half-Sections in Man., N. half, &c., Sale of (Ques.) 5889 (iii).

Hay Permits, from Dom. Lands, Man., Amount collected for Wood Cutting, &c. (Ques.) 3678 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5544 (iii).

McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 443 (i).

McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon Trip (Ques.) 5890 (iii).

Manitoba School Lands, Sale of (Ques.) 4309

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6367 (iv).

N.E. Quarter Section, Section 11, Sale and Refunds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

Pembina River Fishing Regulations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).

Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4519 (iii).

Quarantine Frontier Inspectors, Duties, Reps., &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).

—— Cor. *re* Apptmts. (Ques.) 5561 (iii).

—— Apptmts. of (M. for cor., &c.*) 4315 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8051, 8422 (v).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7086 (iv).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5532 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7757; (experimental farms) 7766; (live stock industry) 7749 (v).

Indians—Man. (clothing, &c.) 7851; (live stock) 7848 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4258 (iii).

Quarantine (steamers) 7767 (v).

Thornton, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 626 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085, 8398 (v).

Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909 (Ques.) 5777 (iii).

Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change (Ques.) 2930, 3168 (ii).

——— (M. for cor.*) 4315 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv), 8118 (v).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. (B. 213) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 6333; in Com., 6340, 6363 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for Com., 6485 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough*

Budget, The, 1690 (i).

Canada Shiping Act (inspection) Amt. (B. 15) 1° m., 204; 2° m., 512 (i).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7897 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5908 (iii); in Com., 8034 (v).

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1536 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1976 (ii).

Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c. (Ques.) 259 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Com., Report (presented) 7867 (v).

——— (M.) to conc. in Report of Com., 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2691 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Com., 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 3133 (ii).

——— M. to conc. in 5th Rep., 3986 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries Sel. Com. (M.) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7324 (iv).

Post Offices opened in 1909, Dom. and Weekly Mails, N.S. (Ques.) 625 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6518; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6581 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Method, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c. (Ques.) 3168 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c. (Ques.) 444 (i).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6701 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 8519 (v).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1046 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8004 (v).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *North Middlesex.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6317 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Annuities, Can. Govt., Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 385 (i).

B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 643 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co., Control of other Rys., Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1207 (i).

——— Subsidies *re* main and branch lines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2298 (ii).

Cirkle, Mr. F., Unprofessional Conduct, Charge, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5502 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7908 (v).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1192 (i).

Great Lakes Dredging Co.'s Contract *re* Kaministiqua River (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1251 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2902 (ii).

Mines and Minerals Committee (M.) *re* Sittings, 6276 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3982 (ii), 3987 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8048, 8423, 8593 (v).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1040 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 93) 1°*, 1731 (i).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 130) 1°*, 2792 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1587 (i).

SMITH, Mr. ROBT., *Stormont.*

Budget, The, 2269 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5323, 5348 (iii); on M. for 3°, 7253 (iv).

SMYTH, Mr. W. R., *East Algoma.*

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Floods, &c. (remarks) 5226 (iii).

Dom. Police, Number sent to Thunder Bay, &c. *re* Election of 1909 (Ques.) 1007 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3430 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4975 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5424 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Picnic Islands) 3457; (Providence Bay) 3457 (ii); Que (Roberval) 940 (i).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges, N.B. (St. John) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. (Maurice) 6150; (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. Charles Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Agriculture, Dept. of, Administration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7194 (iv).

Bellechasse Electoral District, Pet., Judgment *re* (notification) 3476 (ii).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s sec. (read) 922 (i), 6606 (iv).
See 'Senate.'

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs Members remarks checked, 6396 (iv).

Budget, The, Interruptions, &c. (ruling) 2084 (ii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 2109 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Controverted Elections Petitions, Certificate of Judges (presented) 1, 21 (i).

—— P. E. I., Certificate of Judges (presented) 256 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Dauphin Post Office, Opening of, Members' remarks checked, 3136 (ii).

Distribution Office, Recommendation *re* Salary Increases, 620 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 94) Ruling *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1730 (i).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce (remarks) 1688 (i).

Drill Halls, and Armouries, &c. (remarks) 1535 (i).

Dufferin, Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 1731 (i).

—— Vacancy (notification) 620 (i).

Escheats to the Crown, B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Com. on Res., 6508 (iv).

Essex Electoral District Certificate (presented) 620 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7822 (v).

Garrison Artillery Guns, Ques. (Mr. Barnard) ruling *re* Question asked by another Member, 1791, 1799 (i).

Gaspereau Dredging, demand for Papers (remarks) 2490 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Crocket) for papers to be laid on Table (ruling) 2632 (ii).

Glover, Robert, Pet. ruled out of Order, 1586 (i).

Govt. Railway Bill, Conference with Senate, Mess. from the Senate, 8834 (v).

Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Members remarks checked, 8241 (v).

House of Commons Staff, Re-organization of, withdrawn, 7977 (v).

Indian Lands, Sale in Alberta, Irregularity of Discussion (remarks) 119 (i).

Industrial Disputes Bill, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8117 (v).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie to introduce (ruling) 518 (i).

—— on Ques. of Order (ruling) 620 (i).

I. C. R. Branch Lines B. 17, Members remarks checked, 1126 (i).

—— on Order for 2°, 1803 (i).

—— Res. from Senate re Amendments, 8828, 8855 (v).

I.C.R., Safety of Travel (remarks) 2278 (ii)

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on Ques. of Order re laying Letters on Table (ruling) 502 (i).

International Waterways Canal, &c. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, Members' Remarks checked, 2679 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. to con. in 2nd Rep. of Com., Members remarks checked, 2893 (ii).

Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 5 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104 (v).

Lumsden Charges, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonald) 5199 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Priv., Irregularity of Debate (ruling) 5570 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Committee, 6016 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, Vote of Sol. Gen., on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) 8168 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, Reading Documents (remarks) 2685 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex., Assent to Bills (read) 5557, 5628 (iii).

——— Estimates for 1909-10 (read) 154, 377 (i).

——— Estimates, Suppl, 1910 (read) 377 (i); 2949 (ii); 5277 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 7519 (v).

——— Internal Economy Com. (read) 97 (i).

——— Opening (read) 1 (i).

N. T. Ry., Counsel before Public Accounts Committee (remarks) 4517 (iii).

Naval Service Appointments, Members remarks checked, 8839 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Nesbitt) re King's speech (ruling) 5100 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 3983 (ii).

Naval Defence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Rutan) (remarks) 5003 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95, Ruling *re* interrupting h. m. (Mr. Clare) 4929, 4937 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7563 (v).

Nickel Mines in Canada, Members remarks checked, 2191 (ii).

Nickel Mines in Can., Control by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Conmee) 2493 (ii).

Ottawa City and Quebec City Representation in H. of C., Ques. (Mr. Meighen) *re* Disposal of Protests, 802 (i).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted in ref. to Ruling, 833 (i).

——— Vacancy (notification) 1729 (i).

——— Certificate of Election (notice) 3476 (ii).

Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3477 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 3744 (ii).

Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy to, Members remarks checked, 4712 (iii).

Private Bills: *See* 'Senate.'

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 8833 (v).

——— Mess. from His Ex., 8857 (v).

Questions withdrawn, Procedure *re* (ruling) 1799 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller), on Ques. of Order (Mr. Wilson) *re* Translation of Evidence (ruling) 6404 (iv).

——— Members Remarks checked, 6720 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, remarks checked, 462 (i).

Railway Committee, Rules *re* (remarks) 8833 (v).

Railway Passenger Service, Ques. of Order, 379 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6172 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association incorp. B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 2°, 7287 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, Interruptions of Members (remarks) 7600 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Carvell) 7676 (v).

——— (ruling) *re* Question of Mr. Meighen, 7695 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 7691 (v).

Ross Rifles, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Answer of Minister of Militia (ruling) 1586 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Co.'s Incorporation, Rep. *re* Application (remarks) 1529 (i).

——— Members remarks checked, 8108 (v).

——— on Senate Amts. (ruling) 8655 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, 7256 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bradbury) 7072 (iv), 7522 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 7148 (iv).

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Members remarks checked, 1445 (i).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rule, &c. (read) 5776 (iii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Sunday Postal Service, Closing of P. O. at Winnipeg, Members Remarks checked, 2931 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S. (Mr. Lewis) Members Remarks checked, 5892 (iii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2663 (ii).

Toronto 'World,' Ownership, Member asked to withdraw stmnt., 5998 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

West Middlesex Electoral District, Certificate of Election of Mr. D. C. Ross (notification) 413 (i).

Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes, Members remarks checked, 3135 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) *South Perth.*

B. C. Public Works, Govt. Expenditures, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 4290 (iii)

Budget, The, Members Remarks checked, 2229 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Campbell) 2267 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) Members Remarks checked, 7895 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Customs Laws, on M. for 3°, 8002 (v).

Conservation Bill, Members Remarks checked, 6141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crosby) 5539 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 5535 (iii).

Manufacturers Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2279 (ii).

Mayes Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., Members Remarks checked, 589 (i).

N.T. Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission (ruling) *re* Points of Order, 8310 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ref. to Governor General or Sovereign not permissible (ruling) 4204 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6143 (iv).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Speaking in Com. (ruling) 4798 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin), Amt. (read) 1364 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 4736 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 7316 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., Procedure *re* Discussion (ruling) 6558 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. McColl) 6579 (iv).

Restigouche Log Driving, &c., B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) 6171 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, Charges against Ministers (ruling) 7630 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Owen) *re* Discussion (ruling) 3845 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., Members asked to withdraw offensive language, 5399 (iii).

——— Members Remarks checked, 6231 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6723 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Neely) 5412 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 6352 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Tobin) 5434 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, &c. (cold storage) on Ques. of Order, 7365 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Richibucto) Members remarks checked, 3439 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Meteghan) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) 997 (i).

Pubic Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 7509 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) Denials must be accepted (ruling) 546 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 665; (Marieville) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox)—(ruling) 686 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonell) 6778 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (remarks) 8077 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Address, The 73 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7193 (iv).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir F. Borden) in Com., 6003 (iv).

Blythe, Walter, Commutation of Death Sen-Sentence (remarks) 2712 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2012 (ii).

Budget, The, 1601 (i).

——— (remarks) 2065 (ii).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., on Res., 6950 (iv).

Clarry, L. F., Charges re Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5225 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6845, 6887 (iv); in Com., 7895; on M. for 3°, 7977 (v).

——— Ques. of Order re Customs Law, on M. for 3°, 8002 (v).

Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1363 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Committee on Standing Orders, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6606 (iv).

Conservation: *See* 'Natural.'

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) 5896 (iii).

——— Answers of P.M.G. (remarks) 8818 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6988 (v).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6629 (iv).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3053 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3874, 3916 (ii), 5772 (iii).

Dufferin Election, Date of (remarks) 623 (i).

——— Representation of: (notice) 521 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1272, 1284 (i).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv); in Com., 8385 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6183 (iv).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5910 (iii).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3061 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199; on M. for 2°, 747; on M. for 3°, 817 (i).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).
See 'Race Track.'

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. ,(Mr. White) for O. C.'s, 3574 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Measures for Session (remarks) on Easter Adjournment, 5893 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8056, 8380; in Com., 8625 (v).

Halifax Roundhouse Property, Valuation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6760 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5803, 5841 (iii).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5923 (iii); in Com., 5934 (iv).

Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8030 (v).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 7949, 8460, 8461 (v).

I. C. R., Sale of, on prop, Res. (Mr. Black) 2302 (ii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1104 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 508; on laying letters on Table, 502 (i).

——— B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2674 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Guthrie) to refund fees, 7512 (v).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8764 (v).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5764 (iii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1226 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2911 (ii).

Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8106, 8229 (v).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6016 (iv).
See 'N. T. Ry.'

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2688 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 657 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2785 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6280; on M. for 3°, 6618 (iv).

Merchants and General Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 2714 (ii).

Militia Clothing, Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6015; in Com., 6192 (iv).

Militia Stores Building, Loss by Fire to Clothing, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

Milk Testing, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Mines and Minerals Committee, on M. (Mr. R. Smith) *re* sittings, 6276 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2281 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5902; in Com. on B., 5904 (iii).

Motor Vehicle Injuries B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2035 (ii).

National Battlefields Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 5889 (iii), in Com., 6599 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification of Material, Lumsden Charges, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
See 'Lumsden.'

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 6336; in Com., 6364 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3281 (ii); in Com., 7396, 7485 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95, Ques. of Order, 3983 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4205 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5285 (iii).

Newspapers in Ontario, Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6142 (iv).

Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill.'

Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).

Ottawa and Montreal Power Transmission Co.'s Bill (Mr. Perley) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6504 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com. on Amt., 1365 (i).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1323 (i).

——— Par. in Toronto 'World,' 521 (i).

——— Disposal of Protests (remarks) 803 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3747 (ii).

Protection Piers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3857 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 610 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Consideration to Quebec Bridge Co. *re* Franchise, &c. (Ques.) 260 (i).

Quebec Judges, Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6984 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Questions standing as Notices of Motions (remarks) 6941 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., on Procedure *re* discussion, 6558 (iv).
See 'Gambling.'

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 456; on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6010 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, 493 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 472 (i).

Ry. Committee Report, Delay in presenting (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Ry. Mail Clerks, Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars (Ques.) 5106 (iii).

Railway Passenger Service, Delays, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 379 (i).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5766 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6176 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Carvell) 3847 (ii).

——— on Ques of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7632 (v).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6373 (iv).

Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1443 (i).

——— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 7867 (v).

——— in Com., on Rep. of Com., 8366 (v).

St. Andrew's Dam Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4264 (iii).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8123 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5340 (iii), 6235, 6347, 6663, 6724; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8654 (v).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7093 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv (Mr. Bradbury) 7523 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2647 (ii).

——— B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on M. to dschg. order for 2°, 656 (i).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster 2000 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2007 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Skill and King, Release of, &c. (remarks) 7070 (iv).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Sunday Postal Service, Closing at Winnipeg, &c. (remarks) 2932 (ii).

SUPPLY

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 5728; (experimental farms) 5725 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 8821 (v).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194; Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v); Post Office (salaries) 6696 (iv).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8807 (v).

Fisheries (fish breeding) 8540 (v); (fish transportation) 5748; (hatcheries) 5750 (iii); (protection service) 8509 (v).

House of Commons (Library) 8802 (v).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii); (agents, &c.) 8195; (contingent expenses) 8207 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 8528; (ice breaker, Thunder Bay) 8526 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 8808 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 5703 (iii), 8810 (v); (Can. and G. B.) 8808 (v); (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii); (Halifax and Liverpool) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound) 8809 (v); (Rivière du Loup) 5712 (iii).

Marine (dredging plant) 8523 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8496 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 8519; (hydrographic surveys) 8511; (patrol vessels) 8521; (salaries) 8510; (schools of navigation) 8518; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755; (rural delivery) 5753 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 593 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 574; (Lunenburg) 576 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Elora) 7176 (iv); (Guelph) 7498; (Harriston) 7500; (Kincardine) 7504; (Listowel) 7507; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 7511, 8170; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8177 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 537 (i); (deptl., new) 7167 (iv); (military stores) 597; (museum) 539 (i); (Parliament driveway) 8173; (Printing Bureau) 8170 (v); (Royal Mint) 557; (standardizing room) 573 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Fraserville) 662; (Grosse Isle) 663; (immigration sheds) 962; (Joliette) 663; (Marieville) 693; (Montreal P. O.) 700; Montreal postal station) 703; (Quebec barracks) 976; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (St. Lambert) 956 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Generally (new plant) 4740; (vessel repairs) 4732 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6130 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 4290 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4258; (Winnipeg beach) 4270 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3422; (Shediac) 3450 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 3457; (Brockville) 3455; (Byng Inlet) 3459; (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851; (Goderich) 3468; (Lion's Head) 3470; (Michipicoten) 3471 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5729 (iii), 6101 (iv); (Thornbury) 3475 (ii); (Tiffin) 5746 (iii), 6122 (iv); (Toronto) 3852 (ii); (Victoria) 5747, 6123 (iv); (Whitby) 8818 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I., (Brudenell) 2694; (Haggerty's) 2694; (Miminegash) 2695; (Naufrage) 2695; (Red Point) 2696; (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Gaspé) 3894; (Grand Mechin) 3902; (Grand Rivière) 3903; (Grand Vallee) 3905; (Grosse Isle) 3905; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Kamouraska) 3907; (Le Petit Debarquement) 3907 (ii); (Levis) 6102 (iv); (Matane) 3907; (Natashquan) 3910; (New Carlisle) 3912; (Norway Bay) 3912; (Paspebiac) 3913; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3914 (ii); (St. Charles) 6102 (iv); (Three Rivers) 4247; (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5724 (iii).

Public Works — Miscellaneous (International Commission, N.B.) 6164; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6165; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6160; (Ottawa water-storage dams) 6163; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.B. (St. John) 6151; Ont. (Chapeau) 6150; Ont. and Que. (Hawkesbury) 6151; Que. (Restigouche) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Edmonton-Athabaska) 6154; Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (iv).

Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8820 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Beresford subway) 2872 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. Quebec Bridge (construction) 8821 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration Act) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5946, 5974 (iv).

—— Information *re* (remarks) 5278, 5762 (iii), 5932 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1092 (i).

—— (remarks) on M. for Supply, 2661 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6011 (iv).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6792 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1429 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6376 (iv).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8007 (v).

Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6374 (iv); 8458 (v).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3438 (ii).

Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5795 (iii); in Com., 5938; on M. for 3°, 6618 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2426 (ii).

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N.S., Expenditure to date, &c. (Ques.) 3676 (ii).

Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re* (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c., of Crew, Wages, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Number, Dates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

—— Dismissals by Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 164 (i).

—— Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).

—— Passes from 1908 to 1909, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 276 (i).

—— inquiry for ret., 4812 (iii).

—— Purchasing Agent, Names, &c. (Ques.) 272 (i).

—— Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Bill, 8483 (v).

—— Sleeping Cars, Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co. (Ques.) 5105 (iii).

—— Standard Pay for Machinists (Ques.) 259 (i).

Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re* (Ques.) 1198 (i).

McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3733 (ii).

Magdalen Islands and Pictou SS. Services, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Leave of Absence to Crew to vote (Ques.) 4077 (iii).

Pictou Post Office Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3489 (ii).

Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c. (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Miscellaneous (Mrs. J. Gordon, allowance) 5616 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Dufferin) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1165 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (air-brakes) 2882; (Beresford subway) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (highways) 2882; (Loggieville) 2886; (original construction) 2943; (Pintsch gas 2944; (Robinson's crossing) 2945 (ii).

Weights and Measures (gas inspection) 1355; (inspection) 1355 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Agriculture, Dept. of, Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7204 (iv).

Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).

Baie St. Paul, Title to Lot 73, Applications *re* Purchase (Ques.) 1017 (i).

Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c. (Ques.) 6182 (iv).

Budget, The (remarks) 1616 (i).

Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

Charleston or Kelmont P. O., Pets. *re* Establishing (M. for copies*) 2150 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7902 (v).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7804 (v).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Holland Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

—— Boxes (remarks) 7881 (v).

Homesteading on Section 34, Tp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4080 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 5539 (iii).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 122) 1° m., 2329 (ii).

Kilmant and Shackleton, Application for Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).

Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4081 (iii).

Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 7290 (iv).

Lilly, Wm., Homestead Pre-emption of S.W. ¼, 32-7-5, &c. (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, on M for Sup., 5573 (iii).

McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 658 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6304 (iv).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5133 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4306 (iii).

Port Colborne Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7325 (iv).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 477 (i).

Ross Rifles, Distribution of, Ques. of Priv., 339 (i).

St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4264 (iii).

St. Laurent, Man., Wharf Piers, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1195 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2648 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 7759 (v); (archives) 7284; (cold storage) 7364; (Dom. exhibitions) 7384; (experimental farms) 7336 (iv), 7765 (v).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 362 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Laurent wharf) 4254 (iii).

Indians—Alberta (agricultural implements) 7857; (clothing, &c.) 7851; (medical attendance) 7849 (v).

Post Office—Miscellaneous (Holland) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 600; (museum) 570 (i).

Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c. (Ques.) 272 (i).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).

Welland Canal run through Lot 50, Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 8660 (v).

STEWART, Mr. T. J., *West Hamilton.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 909 (i).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5680 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Post Office (salaries) 6693 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6381 (iv).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *West Peterborough.*

Budget, The, 1636 (i).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1731 (i)

STRATTON, Mr. J. R.—*Con.*

Cirkle, Fritz., Emplymt. by Dept of Mines (Ques.) 5497 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5806 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6319 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6500, 6519 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8052 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1175 (i).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E. *Bellechasse.*

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 3389 (ii).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907 (iii); in Com., 8042 (v).

Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1151 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., Ques. of Order, 5535 (iii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. (Graham) on M. for 2°, 1109 (i).

I. C. R. Derailments during 1909 (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 2298 (ii).

Laurentian Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 5687 (iii).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2282 (ii).

Naval B. 95, on M. for 2° (remarks) 4108 (iii)

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6500 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7689 (v).

Ross Rifles, Weight of, &c. (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rules *re* (remarks) 5777 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (translation) 1343 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 937 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry and Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO., *Leeds.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7221 (iv).

Aud. Gen.'s Report, Delay in bringing down (remarks) 8856 (v).

—— Vol. II., on Inquiry for, 1445 (i).

Budget, The, (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c. (Ques.) 1969 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*
Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6846; in Com., 6904 (iv).
Co-operative Societies B. 26 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 2156 (ii).
Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6631 (iv).
Customs and Excise Revenues for 1909-10, &c. (Ques.) 8109 (v).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).
Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of (Ques.) 631 (i).
Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to (Ques.) 849 (i).
Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).
Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7289 (iv).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) 7832 (v).
French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 184; on M. for 2°, 779 (i).
Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders re (Ques.) 4617 (iii).
G.T.P. Bonds, Total Amount guaranteed to 31st March, 1910 (Ques.) 8237 (v).
House of Commons, Steps and Walks to, Matting Coverings (remarks) 448 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5537 (iii).
Indian Industrial School, Regina, Closing of (Ques.) 6179 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act (warehouse) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 152 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7944 (v).
'J. G. Witherbee,' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Johnson, Mr. Arthur, Engineer on 'Reliever,' Certificate, &c. (Ques.) 3734 (ii).
Labour Dept., Rent of Building, &c. (Ques.) 627 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2901 (ii).
La Butte Indian School, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 6179 (iv).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep. on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8105 (v).
Lumsden Charges, &c. (M.) to adjn. debate, 5599 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Amt., Ques. of Order re Sol. Gen.'s Vote, 8167 (v).
Maritime Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 849 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., on Res., 6098 (iv).
Milk Tests, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).
Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 3294 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7441 (v).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6965 (iv).
Paul, Mr. William, Purchase by Govt. of Gasolene Boat (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).
Public Works Employees and Election Campaign (remarks) 2489 (ii).
Questions standing as Notices of Motion (remarks) 6941 (iv).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6501 (iv).
Retail Merchants Association incorp. B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 2°, 7287 (iv).
Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Construction *re*, Division of Cost, &c. (Ques.) 8239 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5320 5396 (iii), 6670 (iv); Reps. of Engineers (remarks) 5560 (iii).
Saturday Sitting of Hse (remarks) 8110 (v).
Supplies purchased for Ry. Commission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4518 (iii).
Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5530 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Adulteration of Food (inspectors) 1346 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (archives) 7284; (Can. exhibit, London) 7380; (census) 7373; (cold storage) 7362; (dairy and fruit) 7362 (iv); (experimental farms) 5724 (iii); (experimental farms) 7764 (v): (farm bulletins) 7377; (Patent Record) 7371; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 7769 (v).
Customs Outside service (salaries) 1358 (i).
Excise (methylated spirits) 1344; (provisional allowances) 1344; (translation) 1343; (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).
Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5748 (iii).
House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7774 (v).
Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).
Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7838 (v).
Indians—Man. (live stock) 7848; (Sioux) 7853 (v).
Indians—N.B. (salaries) 7846 (v).
Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7836 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (Lennox Island wharf) 7847 (v).

Indians—Sask. (Elkhorn schools) 7861 (v).

Inland Revenue (minor revenues) 1358 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811; (Can. and Mexico) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound) 8809; (Riviere du Loup) 8810 (v).

Miscellaneous—(Can. Handicrafts guild) 7866; (Naturalization Act) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa(astronomical observatory) 421, 541 (i); (grounds) 8192; (Parliament driveway) 8174 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs) 825 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4760 (iii).

Public Works—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5614 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Malcolm) 1164 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3835 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3863; (L'Ange Gardien) 3862 (ii);

Quarantine (Public Health Act) 7392; (steamers) 7392 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Weights and Measures (electric inspection) 1356 (i).

Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1, 1910, &c. (Ques.) 8237 (v).

U S., Emigration from Canada, Rep. of American Counsel at Kingston (Ques.) 431

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8090, 8389 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8008 (v).

Wrecking Plant on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts (M. for cor.) 644 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*

Barge, W. R., Application *re* License, Extension of Time, &c. (Ques.) 5002 (iii).

Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts. (Ques.) 2716 (ii).

B. C. Lt.-Governorship, Appmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 523 (i).

—— Recommendations from Political Organizations *re* F. C. Wade, K.C. (Ques.) 382 (i).

B. C. Public Works, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

Central Park, New Westminster, B.C., Post Office, Pet. *re* Closing (Ques.) 2188, 2293 (ii).

—— (M. for cor.*) 3169 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7883 (v).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 633 (i).

Experimental Farm at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8035, 8059 (v).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Compensation Claims, Disputes, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).

Franking Privilege, Justice Dept. (Ques.) 1207 (i).

—— Political Literature franked by Sol. Gen. on M. for Sup., 7784; (amt.) 7792; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 79) 7834 (v).

Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c. (Ques.) 2487 (ii).

—— Inundations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).

International Fisheries Commission, Regulations *re*, Legislation by Parlt., &c. (Ques.) 3490 (ii).

Japanese Immigration from U.S. entering B.C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. to ref. to Special Com., 1264 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2894 (ii).

Mail Matter, Free Delivery to Street Address (Ques.) 7869 (v).

—— (remarks) 8118 (v).

N.T.Ry. Commissioners, Profits *re* Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 7563 (v).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4307 (iii).

New Westminster, Dom. Land, Lease, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i), 3160 (ii).

—— Penitentiary, Contract *re* Fish Supply (Ques.) 7516 (v).

—— Post Office Apptmts., Application to, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).

Pitt Meadows, B.C., Lease of Lands on special Terms, &c. (Ques.) 274 (i).

Port Moody Wharf Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii.)

Postal Violations, Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 2292 (ii).

Post Office Promotional Examinations, 1908, Accepted Answer to question 4 (Ques.) 2290 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensation, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces (prop. res.) 2003 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 369, Labour (salaries) 239 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7773 (v).

Public Works — Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 8190 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Chilliwack) 4298; (Columbia river) 4280; (Coquitlam) 4291; (Fraser river) 4295; (Lillooet river) 4298; (Port Moody) 4728; (Serpentine river) 4304 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bic) 3871; (Carleton) 3885 (ii); (Laprairie) 4221 (Richelieu river) 4212; (Ste. Croix) 4244; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii).

Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms (Ques.) 2291 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1093 (i).

Veterinary Service, B.C., Vacancies, Examinations, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 8445 (v).

—— Govt. Title to beds of Streams, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).

Westminster District, Land Leased to B. C. Mills, Timber and Trading Co., (Ques.) 2291 (ii).

Western Power Co.'s (B. 86) in Com., 3432 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Comox-Atlin.*

Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost (Ans.) 4310 (iii).

Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints re (Ans.) 4311 (iii).

Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount collected for 1907-9 (Ans.) 7872 (v).

B.C. Public Works, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).

Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment (Ans.) 5002 (iii).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 4515 (iii).

Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported (Ans.) 631 (i).
See 'Inland.'

Cirkle, Mr. Fritz., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5498 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7310 (iv).

Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers (remarks) 8585 (v).

—— (stmnt. read) 8831 (v).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7886 (v).

Conservation Commission, Regulation *re* Fisheries (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Electrical Measure Units (B. 7) 1°*, 96 (i); on Order for 2°, 5673 (iii).

Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

Estimates, Delay in bringing down (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8530 (v).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8520 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (prop. res.) 4708 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5906, 1°*, 5921 (iii); in Com., 8032, 8058 (v).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Compensation Claims *re* Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Fisheries Regulations *re* Manitoba, on Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 5894 (iii).
See 'Man.' 'Lobsters.'

Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6798 (iv).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 132) 1° m., 3056 (ii); in Com., 5680 (iii).

Gervais, Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6178 (iv).

Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures, acting as Insurance agent, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).

'Hudson,' Str., Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 4518 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 9) prop. Res., 98; in Com. on Res., 151; in Com., 522; 3° m., 811 (i).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Dept., Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 3935 (ii).

Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer (Ans.) 4844 (iii).

Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman Roy, Charges re (Ans.) 4517 (iii).

Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).

Liquor Compounding, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).

Lobster Canning Plant, Connection of Fishery Officers *re* (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Report, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104, 8234 (v).

McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. in Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto (Ans.) 5678) (ii).

Maganatawan Wharfinger, Apptmnt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 7289 (iv).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Manitoba Fisheries Regulations, Amts. *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'

Military Articles for Uniforms, Free Importation of (Ans.) 2927 (ii).

Milk Standards, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).

Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c. (Ans.) 5498 (iii).

Naval Service, Names of Cruisers, Purchase, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3931 (ii).

Nickel Mines, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson (remarks) 2190 (ii).

Pembina River Fishing Regulations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8530 (v).

'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge (Ans.) 8239 (v).

Pure Food Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. J. A. Currie) on M. for 1°, 2796 (ii).

Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c. (Ans.) 6178 (iv).

Rescue Stations in Coal Mining Districts, Establishment of (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Sailing Directions to Capts. of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).

Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v).

Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 5891 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (inspectors, &c.) 1345; (prosecutions) 1349 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (contingencies) 231; (salaries) 229; Mines (salaries) 336 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 1331; (extra hours) 1336; (inspectors salaries) 1331; (methylated spirits) 1344; (provisional allowances) 1344; (tobacco stamps) 1342; (translation) 1343; (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).

Fisheries (B. C. claims) 8552; (Canadian exhibit) 8544; (cold storage) 8545; (customs bureau) 8551; (dog fish) 8546; (fish breeding) 8540 (v); (fish transportation) 5747 (iii); (fishways) 8534 (v); (hatcheries) 5751 (iii); (legal expenses) 8543; (oyster culture) 8545 (v); (protection service) 5752 (iii); (provincial jurisdiction) 8546; (salaries) 8536 (v).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769; (books, &c.) 8556; (maps, &c.) 8556; (specimens) 8556; (surveys) 8555 (v).

Inland Revenue (minor revenues) 1358 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 8525; (buoy steamer) 8528; (ice breaker, Thunder Bay) 8526; (pensions) 8528; (salaries) 8523; (signal service) 8527 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5709; (Victoria and San Francisco) 5711 (iii).

Marine (dredging plant) 8523; (piers, Lake St. Peter) 8523; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8521; (Sorel yard property) 8523 (v).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mines, &c. (explosives) 8556; (ore deposits) 8553; (peat bogs) 8553 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 8519; (icebreakers) 8514; (patrol vessels) 8521; (schools of navigation) 8518 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Chilliwack) 4303; (Columbia river) 4281; (Queen Charlotte) 4717 (iii).

Weights and Measures (electric inspection) 1356; (gas inspection) 1355; (inspectors) 1355; (travelling expenses) 1356 (i).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).

Vitrified Sewer Pipe, Imports, Duties collected, &c. (Ans.) 3931 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Reps. of Messrs. Costello and Clarke (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

Yukon Territory, Goods imported free, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3492 (ii).

Zinc Ores, &c., Smelting (B. 182) Prop. Res., 4848; in Com. on Res., 5794; 1°*, 5801 (iii); in Com., 5935; 3° m., 6617 (iv).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *North Lanark.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7234 (iv).

Alien Labour Law, Infraction *re* Mechanics in Shipbuilding (remarks) 4813 (iii).

Budget, The, (remarks) 1621 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1293 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Recognition of Services (remarks) 7068 (iv).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7947 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5097 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6223 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5310 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2462 (ii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6562 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (contingent expenses) 8212 (v).

...ical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1088 (i).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7278 (iv).

Budget, The, 1817, 1949 (i).

Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1372 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1272 (i).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J.—*Con.*

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2658 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7363 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5422 (ii).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps. Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance of Light, on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Papers, 321 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 6120 (iv).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

H. of C., Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to (Ques.) 8677 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 2221; in Com., 3430 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1878 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kincardine) 7504 (v).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4622 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que (Godfroy) 3893 (ii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*

Budget, The, 1935 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry., Claims *re* Right of Way (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8702 (v).

Chambers of Commerce incorp. (B. 220) 1°*, 8213 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 740 (i).

Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction, &c (Ques.) 6937 (iv).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr Verville) on M. for 2°, 1221 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4893 (iii).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 6178 (iv).

Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Protection *re* Invasion, &c. (Ques.) 7513 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, Ques. of Order, 7691 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1512 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5478 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Roch) 833 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5613 (iii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4161 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 8817 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*

Budget, The, 2127 (ii).

Conservation of Natural Resources B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6372 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 94) 1° m., 1731 (i).

—— M. to Introduce, 1688 (i).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186 (i).

G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 127) 1°*, 2631 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5545 (iii).

I. C. R., Low Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies B., 8482 (v).

—— Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2325 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 659 (i).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2730 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4830 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) on Amt. in Com., 1365 (i).

Pioneers Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 211) 1°*, 7512 (v).

Protectorate Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 5929 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6593 (iv).

Railway Committee, Rules *re* Bills (remarks) 8833 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 103 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5768 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8434, 8598 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1540 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5352 (iii), 6259 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. (B. 87) 1° m., 1687 (i); 2° m., 2056 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7178 (iv); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 417, 538; (Royal Mint) 563 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); in Com., 8073 (v).

Weyburn Security Bank incorp. (B. 156) 1°*, 4922 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Evers, T., Total Payments to *re* Lachine Canal Expenses (Ques.) 2428, 2927 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works (B. 21) 1° m., 256; 2° m., 1209; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 1263 (i).

Independent Order of Rechabites incorp., (B. 112) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

Industrial Conditions, Increases in Wages, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i).

Labour, Hours of Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2897 (ii).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs, &c. under Denis O'Brien (Ques.) 1964 (ii).

—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 627 (i).

—— Carpenter Shop, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 1006 (i).

—— Dismissals, &c. by Denis O'Brien, Pay Sheets, &c., (M. for copy*) 1547 (i).

—— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotion, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).

—— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to (Ques.) 5103 (iii).

—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100 (Ques.) 2428 (ii).

—— Supply of Douglas Fir, Quantity on hand, &c. (Ques.) 1368 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4383 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 671 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1052 (i).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *Centre York, Ont.*

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, (M. for papers) 2009 (ii).

Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures, acting as Insurance Agent, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).

Horse-Racing Regulation (B. 81) 1° m., 1529 (i).

—— (remarks) 6617 (iv).

Lyons, Mr. Alex., Detention at Ellis Island (remarks) 8586 (v).

McArthur, F. J. Gustin Relief (B. 140) 1°*, 3390 (ii).

Markham Post Office Site, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 99 (i).

—— Completion and Opening (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State (Ques.) 849 (i).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6014; in Com., 6193 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5149 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost in 1909 Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

North Toronto, Free Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).

Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53 and 54, Terms of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1373 (i).

Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 5890 (iii).

S. A. Patriotic Fund, Control of, Complaints *re* &c. (Ques.) 2952 (ii).

Stanley Barracks, Sale of Baby Farm, &c (Ques.) 2952 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3107 (ii)

Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 7864 (v).

Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duty collected &c. (Ques.) 3931 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).

Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c. (M. for memorials, &c.) 2019 (ii).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B. N. A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2735 (ii).

See 'Representation.'

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3946 (ii).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

P. E. I. Ry., Branch through New London. Memorials, &c. *re* Surveys (M. for copies*) 5500 (iii).

P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorial, Surveys *re* Construction (M. for copies) 277 (i)

P. E. I. Winter Communication, Changes in Routes, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies) 3171 (ii).

Public Accounts Com. (M.) to ref. Aud Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602 (i).

Representation in H. of C. of Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c. (M. for copy)—(amt.) 644 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*

Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909 (Ques.) 842 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, O.C.'s &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3495 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6616 (iv).

Incubators, Total Number imported from U. S., 1909 (Ques.) 169 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2815 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6216 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., on Amt., 1365 (i).

Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 4129; (remarks) 5279 (iii).

Petawawa Wharf, Protection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).

Return, Inquiry for, 8585 (v).

St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 841 (i).

Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6060 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 7750 (v).

Waterways Committee, Meeting, &c. (remarks) 3390 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alberta.*

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s (B. 154) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

Pine Pass Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 515 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7366 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Saskatchewan river channel) 4275 (iii).

WILCOX, Mr. O. J., *North Essex.*

Budget, The, 2168 (ii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6999 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations and N. Essex Fishermen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).

I.C.R. Wire Fencing, Tenders, Prices quoted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

——— Tenders for 1909, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for Com., 6448 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Outside ports (contingencies) 8806 (v).

Walkerville, Post Office, Appropriation for (Ques.) 1373 (i).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to (remarks) 6396 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, 3544 (ii).

Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

Mail Privileges *re* Postal Regulations, Members Privileges, &c. (Ques.) 2146 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4457 (iii).

Postal Regulations, Duration of Recess of Parlt. (Ques.) 2486 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 880 (i); on M. for Com., Ques. of Order *re* Translation of Evidence before Special Com., Appeal from Speaker's Decision, Neg. (Y. 55; N. 99) 6406 (iv).

Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard, &c. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1352 (i).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6846 (iv).

Emigration from Canada, System of Record-keeping (Ques.) 268 (i).

Immigrants located on Bay of Quinte Ry., Number, &c. (Ques.) 7872 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5519; in Com., 5545 (iii); 5802, 5830, 5880 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 171 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2222, 2797 (ii).

Immigration O.C.'s and Regulations (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8107, 8230 (v).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

Napanee River Dredging (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Napanee River, Dredging, on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1194 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co. Claims for Moneys, Fiat granted, &c. (Ques.) 640 (i).

——— Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies*) 644 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).

Rideau Hall Furniture, Inquiry for Ret., 8742 (v).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8371 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194 (v); Post Office (Salaries) 6696 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 8195 (v): (contingent expenses) 8210 (v).

Indians — Generally (land management fund) 7838; Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 ; Ont. and Que. (surveys) 7837 (v).

Public Works — Buildings — Alta. (Lethbridge) 8188; (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (tobacco stations) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 542 (i); (grounds) 8191; (Rideau Hall grounds) 8192 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec P. O.) 824 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monuments) 6158; (Ottawa river water storage dams) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (city bridges) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6155 (iv).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Army Service Corps, Charges *re* two Officers, &c. (Ques.) 2288 (ii).
See 'de la Ronde.'

Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c. (Ques.) 5498 (iii).

Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c. (M. for cor*.) 5501 (iii).

De la Rondes, Major and Capt., Charges *re* Malfeasance in Army Service Corps (M. for cor.*) 414 (i).

——— (Ques.) 135 (i).

——— Rep. of Justice Dept. (Ques.) 5500 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Drill Halls and Armouries, &c., Contribution to Cost of (Ques.) 1534 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 2149 (ii).

Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Contract to C. A. Barnett, &c. (Ques.) 4312 (iii).

Eastern Cavalry Bridage, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 636 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 265 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants, &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Garrison and Artillery Regiments, Supply of 12-pounder B. L. Guns (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Halifax and Esquimalt Docks, Protection *re* Deterioration, &c. (Ques.) 1010 (i).

Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Import of Military Clothing (M. for cor.*) 3495 (ii).

Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes (Ques). 843 (i).

Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c. (Ques.) 637 (i).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1360; in Com., 3137 (ii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7944 (v).

Militia Active Service, Requirements *re* Standard Rifle Shooting, &c. (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Military Articles for Uniforms, &c., Free Importation of (Ques.) 2927 (ii).

Militia Clerks, Apptmts. without Examination, &c. (Ques.) 1375 (i).

Militia Clothing, Amounts deducted from Allowances for Deficiencies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

——— Life of, Purchases of New Articles (Ques.) 1018 (i).

Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 275 (i).

Militia Expenditure re Fortifications, &c., Submission to Leader of Opposition (Ques.) 1778 (i).

Militia Field Allowance, Expenses of Staff Officers (Ques.) 1201 (i).

Militia, Govt. Policy *re* Armouries, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Militia Harness and Saddlery Tenders, &c for 1909 (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1780 (i).

Militia Inspection Pay, Rates to Inspectors (Ques.) 1535 (i).

Militia Medical Attendance, Money Allowance for married Officers (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Militia Officers, Provisional School Allowance (Ques.) 1019 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Ordnance Stores, Damage by Fire, Value, &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

Militia Pay and Allowance Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1377 (i).

Militia Provisions re Arms, &c. for active War Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 842 (i).

Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, Date of Issue, &c. (Ques.) 639 (i).

Militia Tents, Average Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1779 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

Military Topographical Surveys, Expenditure re (Ques.) 1375 (i).

Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re* (Ques.) 1200 (i).

Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate, &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).

Ordnance Militia Stores Buildings, Instruction to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling (Ques.) 837 (i).

Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c. (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
See 'de la Ronde.'

Permanent Militia Corps, Increase of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 843 (i).

—— Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1781 (i).

—— Officers, Entertaining Allowance (Ques.) 1530 (i).

—— Requirements re Instructions, &c. (Ques.) 1011 (i).

—— Schools of Instruction, Number, Certificates issued, &c. (Ques.) 1531 (i).

—— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 266 (i).

Permanent Officers, Annual Cost per man (Ques.) 1013 (i).

—— Payments re Scale, &c. (Ques.) 1012 (i).

Public Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contracts (Ques.) 1203 (i).

Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c. (Ques.) 265 (i).

Rifle Practice, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

—— Schools of Instruction at St. John (Ques.) 1776 (i).

Ross Rifles, Answer of Minister to Question: Ques. of Order, 1597 (i).

—— Dates of Issue of Special Marks (M. for ret.*) 154 (i).

Ross Rifles, Marks I and Marks II**, Defects, Issue of, Contract re (Ques.) 1532; on Ques. of Order, 1534 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle Mark II**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c. (Ques.) 273 (i).

—— Contract *re* (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

—— Number received and contracted for, &c. (Ques.) 5499 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Regulations *re* National Rifle Association, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4529 (iii).

—— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c. (Ques.) 134 (i).

—— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn *re* Bisley Meet (Ques.) 4082 (iii).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que. &c. (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

R. N. W. M. Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Sask., Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 843; (i).

St. Johns Que., Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c. (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 3738 (ii).

Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1780 (i).
See 'Militia.'

Sub-target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c .(Ques.) 1535 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Fraserville) 662; (generally, renewals, &c.) 662; (Grosse Isle) 665; (Joliette) 662; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Lachine, heating) 667; (Levis) 668; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968 (i).

U. S. Training Vessels on Great Lakes, Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).

Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1777 (i).

Woollen Industry, Rep. of Mr. Costello and W. G. Clarke (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Beaumarais Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).

Combines Investigation (B. 101) on M. for Com. on Res., 6892 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5526; in Com., 5832 (iii).

Insects, Pests Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5667 (iii).

Latchford Dam, Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5152 (iii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4839 (iii).

Oka Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4841 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4843 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2653 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (improvements) 3126; (Newmarket) 3118 (ii).

Indians — Generally (land management (fund) 7837 (v).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 7846 (v).

Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 7843; (surveys) 7337 (v).

Indians—P. E. I. (Lennox Island Wharf) 7847 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5763; (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Wolfville) 579 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (Royal Mint) 564 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 580 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 683; (Rock Island) 947; (Roberval) 931; (St. Henri) 952 (i).

Public Works — Dredging — Mar. Provs. (generally) 4784 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6132 (iv); Dredging (new plant) 4760 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1175 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5732 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Paspebiac) 3912 (ii); (Riviere Ouelle) 4212; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (Ste Croix) 4236; (Three Rivers) 4250; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii);

Railways—Miscellaneous (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6012 (iv).

Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).

Wharfs under P. W. Dept, Collection of Dues (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Accidents on Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Address, The, in Ans. to His. Ex.'s Speech: Moved (Mr. Ecrement) 22; Seconded (Mr. Kyte) 27.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 33; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Monk) 47; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 52; (Mr. Foster) 60; (Mr. A. Haggart) 67; (Mr. Sproule) 73; (Mr. Lewis) 82; (Mr. Graham) Denial *re* reported Speech, 81 (i).

——— M. *re* Precedence (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).

——— M. to Present (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).

——— Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1586 (i).

Address to Earl Grey on close of Term of Office: Moved (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8737; Seconded (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8740 (v).

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5003 (iii).

Administration of Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Adulteration of Food, Inspectors, Prosecutions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i).

Aid to C. N. Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 227.'

Aids to Navigation, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 8525 (v).

Air-Brakes to Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2881 (ii).

'Air-Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations re: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Airships, Development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1369 (i).

——— Assistance to Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 446 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture Bulletins, Number distributed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 789 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Administration: Statement (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Sup., 7351, 7191, 7270 (iv).

——— Criticism of Methods: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Campbell) 1364 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 5724 (iii), 7764 (v).

Agriculture and Experimental Farms, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4618 (iii).

Animal Breeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).

Animals' Health: in Com. of Sup., 7755 (v).

Apples grown in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) &c., in Com. on Bill, 5635 (iii).

Cattle Inspection on Ships: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).

Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 7373 (iv).

Cold Storage for Fruit: in Com. of Sup., 7383 (iv).

Cold Storage Warehouses for Food Products: in Co. of Sup., 7362 (iv).

Dairying and Fruit Industries, Transportation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).

Experimental Farms at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2294 (ii).

Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

——— Branch Stations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5724 (iii), 7392 (iv), 7764-5 (v).

Experimental Farms, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).

Experimental Farm at Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5002 (iii).

——— Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2150 (ii).

Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).

Farm and Dairy Produce, Amount exported: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1016 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (ii).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).

Holsteins and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4309 (iii).

Live Stock Industry, Development of: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (v).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4519 (iii).
Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4532 (iii).
Swine Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Report, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5782 (iii).
Swine Commission, Report of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).
Swine Industry in Ireland, Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Broder) 5689 (iii).
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5777 (iii).
Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Alberta Coal Areas, Total Estimated Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 1010 (i).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 219.'
Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'
Alcoholism International Conference, Canadian Representation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 521 (i).
Alfalfa Seed: *See* 'B. Nos. 16 and 55.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1020 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
—— Violation of *re* Mechanics in Shipbuilding: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 4813 (iii).
Alien Labourers on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3057, 3209 (ii).
Allard and Prevost, Govt. Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crothers) 2488 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crothers) 2635 (ii).
All-Red Route, Rep. *re* Negotiations, Legislation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 269 (i).
Analytical Index to Hansard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Angus, Wm., Apptmt. as Naturalization Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3165 (ii).
Animal Breeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).
Animals' Health: in Com. of Sup., 7755 (v).
Annapolis Harbour Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
Annual Drill, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8564 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Annuities Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Administration, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2142 (ii).
—— Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 385 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Appeals from Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Apples grown in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 5635 (iii).
Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 2288 (ii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 7284 (iv).
—— Protection *re* Fire: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1019 (i).
Arctic Expedition Tablet, Authority for placing in H. of C.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1596 (i).
——Corrected Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 1730 (i).
'Arctic' Str., Official Rep. *re* Cruise: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1014 (i).
Arichat Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Armouries, Drill Halls, Construction, Conribution *re* Cost: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
Armouries and Drill Halls: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 5689 (iii), 8742 (v)
See 'Militia,' 'Drill Halls.'
Armouries and Drill Halls, Man., Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 788 (i).
Armoury Grants: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Arms, &c., for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 443 (i).
Army Service Corps, Charges *re* two Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2288 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
Arrow Lake Telephone System: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Arthabaska 'Gazette' Declarations, &c., *re* Franking Privileges: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavergne) 2149 (ii).
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Artillery Horses, Purchased for Petawawa Camp, Govt. Policy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for: Ques (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1371 (i).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3057 (ii).
Assault: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Assay Office, Vancouver, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7769 (v).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).
Associated Press Despatches rrom England Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'

Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 536 (i).
—— Additional Buildings, Dr. King's Residence: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Athabasca River Channel, Removing Boulders, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Athalmer Wharf, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Atlantic Ports to Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1193 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Report, Delay in bringing down: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8856 (v).
—— Vols. I. and III: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
—— Vol. II.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1730 (i).
—— Vol. II: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1445 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7768 (v).
Automobiles injuring People: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Automobiles, Use of: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Aylmer Post Office, Addition: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Aylmer Wharf, Lake Deschenes: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Baby Farm, Sale by Militia Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
See 'Militia.'
Baie St. Paul, Loss of Title of Lot 73: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1017 (i).
Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1593 (i).
Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4310 (iii).
Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
Bamfield Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 18, 56, 57.'
Banking Act, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6947 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3479 (ii), 4307 (iii).
Banking Act, Expiration of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 2950 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2061 (ii).
Bank Bills: *See* 'Currency.'
Bank Deposits in 1909: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5001 (iii).
Bank Shareholders List: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4846 (iii).
Barge, W. R., Application *re* Licenses, Extension of Time, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5002 (iii).
Barr, Dr., M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 201 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 380 (i).
Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
Barthelmes, Alexander Augustus, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2426 (ii).
Bathurst Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).
See 'Gaspereaux,' 'Loggie,' &c.
Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
Bathurst Pubic Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4311 (iii).
Bayside Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3732 (ii).
—— Lease to Messrs. McIntyre & Roberts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2141 (ii).
Beaumarais Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
Becancour River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3865, 3875 (ii).
Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 7290 (iv).
Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2716 (ii).
Belfast Pier, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Bellechasse Controverted Election, Petition: Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Belle River Harbour, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievance *re* Operation by G. T. Ry., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 102 (i).
See 'B. No. 5.'
Beresford Subway, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
'Bessemer No. 2,' Str., Wreck of on Lake Erie, Negligence re Signals (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
—— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
See 'Marine.'

Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).

Bills of Lading on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 25.'

Bills, Royal Assent. Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 922 (i); 5628 (iii); 6606 (iv).

Bills from Senate, Numbering, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6177 (iv).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 3 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act,—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 93; 2°, 413, 448 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 94; 2°, 452 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 95; 2°, 467 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Northrup).
1°, 96; 2°, 480 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 96; 2°, 856 (i); M. for Com., 6398; in Com., 6500, 6510, 7258; 3°, 7270 (iv).

Bill (No. 7) Respecting the Units of Electrical Measure.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°*, 96 (i); wthdn., 5673 (iii).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 126; 2°, 499; wthdn., 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).
Res. prop., 98; in Com. on Res., 151; 1°* of B., 154; 2° and in Com., 522; 3°, 811 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 162 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 163 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting a certain Supplementary Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 172; in Com. on Res., 173; 1°* of B., 199; 2°, 705, 744; in Com., 781; 3°, 812 (i).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting Injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 201 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii), 8729; in Com., 8729; 3°*, 8731 (v).

Bill (No. 14) To amend the Criminal Code respecting offensive Weapons and Capital Offences.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 204 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 15) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Sinclair)
1°, 204; 2°, 512 (i).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Seed Control Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 204; wthdn., 656 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To authorize the Government of Canada to acquire, by lease, lines of Railway connected with the Government Railways.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 205; 2°, 1102; in Com., 1130 (i); 3°, 2191 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8402, 8828, 8854, 8855 (v).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 205; wthdn., 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 206; 2°, 1136; in Com., 1138 (i); 3°, 2637 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) To prevent the introduction or spreading of Insects, Pests and Diseases destructive to Vegetation.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 200; in Com. on Res., 209; 1°* of B., 212 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5627, 5630; 3°*, 5673 (iii).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°, 256; 2°, 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 22) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 256; 2°, 1268 (i).

Bill (No. 23) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 257; 2°, 1296 (i).

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 257; 2°*, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Water Carriage of Goods.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 258; 2°, 1299 (i); in Com., 8004; 3°*, 8027 (v).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting Co-operative Societies.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 340 (i); 2° m., 2156; 2°*, 3206 (ii).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the British North American Mining Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 556 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 556; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—(Mr. Lavergne).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 1920 (i).

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Northern Mortgage Company of Canada.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557 (i); 3°, 2279, 2373 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., 1364; 3°*, 1366 (i).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Union Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., 2098; in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).
1°*, 380 (i); 2°*, 2167 (ii).

Bill (No. 40) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 429; withdn., 656 (i).

Bill (No. 41) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°*, 430; 2°, 805; in Com., 807 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Hudson Bay Insurance Company.—(Mr. Knowles.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3181 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Ethier)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (iii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 744; in Com., and 3°*, 1366 (i)

Bill (No. 46) To incorporate the Pine Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Victoria, Alberta).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 744; in Com., and 3°*, 1366 (i)

Bill (No. 47) To provide for Inspection of Vessels not now inspected.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 515 (i).

Bill (No. 48) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Papineau).
1°, 621 (i); 2°, 2032 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 520; in Com. on Res., 657; 1°* of B., 661 (i); withdn., 5674 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Harris).
1°, 705 (i); 2°*, 3206 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Roy, Montmagny).
1°*, 782; 2°*, 956 (i); in Com., 2279; 3°, 2280 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company.—(Mr. Rutan).
1°*, 782; 2°*, 956 (i); in Com., 4752, 4814, 5235 5279; 3°*, 5317 (iii).

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1° 782 (i); 2° m., 2156 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
In Com. on Res., 807; 1°* of B., 808 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To amend the Seed Control Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
In Com. on Res., 808; 1°* of B., 811 (i); 2°, 2637; in Com., 2638; 3°*, 2661 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Demers).
1°, 922 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 57 To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 923 (i).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1099; 2°*, 1333 (i); in Com., 2258; 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Mayrand).
1°*, 1099; 2°*, 1333 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 60) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Campbell).
1°*, 1102 (i).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., 3150; 3°*, 3151 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Ethier).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 1193 (i); 2°, 2039 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 8731 (v).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Improved Paper Machinery Company.—(Mr. Worthington).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i).

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Neely).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 4753, 4839; 3°*, 4922 (iii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Toronto Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting Assault and Offences against the Person.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1360 (i); 2°, 2040 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1361 (i).

Bill (No. 73) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 1362 (i); 2°, 2040; in Com., 2054, 2153 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°, 1362 (i); 2°, 2158 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Harris).
1°, 1363 (i); 2°*, 2056 (ii); M. for Com., 8731; in Com., 8732; 3°*, 8733 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 76) To amend the Savings Banks Act.—(Mr. Boyer).
1°, 1440 (i).

Bill (No. 77) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Boyer).
1°, 1441 (i).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).
1°*, 1528; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2259 (ii).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1529; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 6139, 6169, 6739; 3°*, 6886 (iv).

Bill (No. 80) To incorporate l'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 1529; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3139; 3°*, 3150 (ii).

Bill (No. 81) To regulate Horse Racing.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°, 1529 (i).

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Merchants and General Insurance Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 1587; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 2714; 3°*, 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1587; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.—(Mr. Armstrong).
1°, 1587 (i).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).
1°, 1588 (i); 2°, 2162; in Com., 2166; 3°*, 2167 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 1687; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3432; 3°*, 3876 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To amend an Act to authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Turriff).
1° m., 1688 (i); 2°, 2056 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 1689 (i).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 2671; 3°*, 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Stratton).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3929; 3°*, 3930 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting a Patent of the Mond Nickel Company, Limited.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1731 (i); 2°*, 1964; in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) To amend the Dominion Lands Act—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 1731 (i).

Bill (No. 95) Respecting the Naval Service of Canada.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 1732 (i); 2° m., 2952, 3210, 3296, 3575, 3683, 3747, 3945 (ii), 3987, 4025, 4083, 4129, 4316, 4403, 4535, 4618, 4848, 4922, 5003; Amt. (Mr. Monk) neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095; Amt. (Mr. Borden) neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101; on M. for 2°, 5107; Amt. (Mr. Northrup) neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191; 2° agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5194; Res. prop., 5195 (iii), 6509; M. for Com., 6948; in Com. on Res., 7294 (iv); in Com. on B. 7393; 3° m., 7528, agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7590; Res. *re* withdn., 8742 (v).

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2101; in Com., 3150; 3°*, 3150 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2101; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2259 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°, 2101 (ii); in Com., 4841; 3°*, 4842 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting Oaths.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1878 (i).

Bill (No. 101) To provide for the Investigation of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers which may enhance prices or restrict competition to the detriment of consumers.—(Mr. King).
1°, 2056; Res. prop., 2489 (ii), 6802, 6886; in Com. on Res., 6904; 2°, 6904; in Com., 6904 (iv), 7881, 7977; 3°, 8003; Sen. Amts., 8777 (v).

Bill (No. 102) Respecting Immigration.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 2133 (ii); 2°, 5502; in Com., 5529, 5532, 5802, 5821, 5851 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8400 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 103) To amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.— (Mr. Pugsley).
1°, 2135 (ii); 2°, 5674 (iii); M. for Com., 6202; in Com., 6209, 6963; 3°*, 7071 (iv).

Bill (No. 104) To control the rates and facilities of Ocean Cable Companies, and to amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 2136 (ii); 2°, 6007; in Com., 6010; 3°*, 6011 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8388 (v).

Bill (No. 105) To amend the Telegraphs Act. —(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 2138 (ii); 2° and in Com., 6011; 3°*, 6012 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8389 (v).

Bill (No. 106) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 107) To incorporate the Ottawa Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Gladu).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 108) To incorporate the Rainy River Radial Railway.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5765; 3°*, 5772 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 2184 (ii).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company. —(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Dominion Millers' Association.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., 3481, 3872, 3915 (ii), 4025, 5772; 3°*, 5776 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To incorporate the Independent Order of Rechabites.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., and 3°*, 3876 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., 3430; 3°*, 3432 (ii).

Bill (No. 114) Respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Forget).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; 3°*, 3930 (ii).

Bill (No. 115) To incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373 (ii); in Com., 5317, 5722 (iii), 6138, 6169, 6226, 6341, 6663, 6721; 3° m., 6886, 7251 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8653 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 116) To incorporate the Toronto and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373 (ii); in Com., 6768; 3°*, 6886 (iv).

Bill (No. 117) For the Relief of George Robert Buttonshaw.—(Mr. Campbell).
1°*, 2710; 2°*, 2840; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 118) To incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Cowan).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2671 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 119) To incorporate the International Waterways Canal and Construction Company.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°*, 2329; 2°, 2672, 3151 (ii); wthdn., 7512 (v).

Bill (No. 120) Respecting the Royal Guardians.—(Mr. Rivet).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., 7256; 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 121) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., 4753; 3°*, 4754 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Staples).
1°, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii).

Bill (No. 123) Respecting the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).
1°*, 2426; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8657 (v).

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).
1°*, 2426; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 125) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 2485 (ii); 2°, 5921; in Com., and 3°*, 5922 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8401 (v).

Bill (No. 126) To correct a clerical Error in the French Convention Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 2486 (ii); 2°, 6620; in Com., and 3°*, 6620 (iv).

Bill (No. 127) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 2631; 2°*, 3390 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4755 (iii).

Bill (No. 128) To incorporate the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5763; 3°*, 5850 (iii).

Bill (No. 129) To incorporate the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Low).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 130) Respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting Pure Foods.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 2792 (ii).

Bill (No. 132) To amend the Gas Inspection Act.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°, 3056 (ii); 2°, 5680; 3°*, 5687 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate), To incorporate the Merchants Bank of Canada Pension Fund.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°*, 3133; 2°*, 3254; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate), For the Relief of Hope Eileen Moreland Drinkle.—(Mr. McCarthy).
1°*, 3133; 2°*, 3254; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 3133 (ii).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate), Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. McColl).
1°*, 3296; 2°*, 3438 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate), Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 3296; 2°*, 3438 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5723 (iii).

Bill (No. 138) To amend the Customs and Fisheries Protection Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 3290 (ii); 2°, 6189; in Com., and 3°*, 6190 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate), Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 3389; 2°*, 3482 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate), For the relief of Frederick Joseph Gustin McArthur.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 3390; 2°*, 3875 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 141) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 3390 (ii); 2°, 5922; in Com., 5925 (iii), 5934; 3°*, 5934 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate), To incorporate the Congregational Union of Canada.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 3481; 2°*, 3625 (ii); in Com., 4754; 3°*, 4844 (iii).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Magrath).
1°, 3670 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate), For the relief of Jessie Maud Mary Maxwell.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 3829; 2°*, 3931 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 3914 (ii); 2°, 8405; in Com., 8406; 3°*, 8422 (v).

Bill (No. 146, from the Senate), Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty).
1°*, 4128; 2°*, 4246; ref. back to Ry. Com., 5235 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate) For the relief of Archibald Laurie.—(Mr. Congdon).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate) For the relief of Bernard Shea.—(Mr. Rankin).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate) For the Relief of Clara Louise Holden.—(Mr. Rankin).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 150) Respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to The Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Company.—(Mr. Reid, Restigouche).
1°*, 4402; 2°, 4842 (iii); in Com., 6139, 6169; 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 151) To provide for the adjudication of small claims arising in respect of the operation of the Government Railways.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 4402 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6600; 3°*, 6601 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) To incorporate the Northern Quebec Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Turcotte, Quebec).
2°*, 4754; in Com., 5722; 3°*, 5850 (iii).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate), For the Relief of James Albert Green.—(Mr. Prowse).
1°*, 5103; 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com.., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. W. H. White).
1°*, 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate), To amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°*, 4922 (iii); 2°, 6329; in Com., 6330; 3°*, 6332 (iv).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) To incorporate the Weyburn Security Bank.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°* 4922; 2°*, 5496; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate) For the Relief of Cecilia Marie Pringle.—(Mr. Price).
1°*, 4922; 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Ann Reed.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 5103; 2°, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 4996 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6182; 3°*, 6187 (iv).

Bill (No. 160, from the Senate) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. W. M. Martin).
1°*, 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the Sovereign Trust Company, and to change its name to 'The Federal Trust Company.'—(Mr. Nesbitt).
2°*, 5496; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) For the relief of Alexander Augustus Barthelmes.—(Mr. W. M. Martin).
1°* 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 163) To amend the Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 4996 (iii); 2°, 6376 (iv); in Com., 8072, 8389; 3°*, 8400 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 5103, 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 165, from the Senate) For the relief of Elmore Walker Scott.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 5557; 2°*, 5777 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°*, 5617 (iii); 2°, 7940; in Com., 7942, 8459; 3°*, 8476 (v).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 5617, 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) To incorporate the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming.—Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).

1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*,5617; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Co.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 173) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Financial Years ending respectively, the 31st March, 1910, and the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5529; in Com. on Ways and Means, 5606, 5626; 1° of B., 5626; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5627 (iii).

Bill (No. 174) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°, 5621 (iii).

Bill (No. 175) To amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.—(Mr. Beauparlant).

1°, 5620 (iii).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) To incorporate the Laurentian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 5687 (iii); 2°* 6798; in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) To incorporate the Morrisburg Ferry and Dock Company.—(Mr. Broder).

1°*, 5759; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Montreal Transmission Company, Limited.—(Mr. Perley).

1°*, 5759 (iii); 2°*, 6798 (iv); in Com., 8599; 3°*, 8618 (v).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) For the Relief of Helena Mellor Fleming.—(Mr. Knowles).

1°*, 5759; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 180) To amend the Royal Military College Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 2633; in Com. on Res., 5783; 1°*, of B., 5791 (iii); 2°, 6098; in Com., and 3°*, 6099 (iv).

Bill (No. 181) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Public Lands, and the acquisition of certain other Lands, in or in the vicinity of the Cities of Toronto and Winnipeg, respectively.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 2634; in Com. on Res., 5791; 1°* of B., 5793 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5941, 6003; 3°*, 6005 (iv)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 182) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada, and to promote the production in Canada of Zinc.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 4848; in Com. on Res., 5794; 1°* of B., 5801 (iii); 2e and in Com., 5935; 3°*, 6617 (iv).

Bill (No. 83, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin).

1°*, 5886 (iii); 2°*, 6140; in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 184) To provide for the Testing of Glassware used in connection with Milk Tests.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5884; 1°* of B., 5884 (iii); 2°, 6005; in Com., 6006; 3°*, 6007 (iv).

Bill (No. 185) Respecting the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 5687; in Com. on Res., 5884; 1°* of B., 5885 (iii); 2°, 6332; in Com., 6338, 6359; 3°, 6619 (iv).

Bill (No. 186) To amend the Irrigation Act —(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5886 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6200; 3°*, 6202 (iv).

Bill (No. 187) To confirm and declare the rights of the Crown with respect to Water and Water Power, and relating to the diversion, acquisition and use of Water in the Railway Belt in British Columbia.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5887 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6375; in Com., 8435, 8706 (iv).

Bill (No. 188) To amend the Act respecting the National Battlefield at Québec.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 5888 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6598; 3°*, 6600 (iv).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate) To incorporate the Protectorate Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 5929; 2°*, 6140; in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) To incorporate the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin).

1°*,5921; 2°* 6798 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 191) To provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5898; 1°* of B., 5904; 2°, 5904 (iii); in Com., 6601; 3°*, 6601 (iv).

Bill (No. 192) To amend the Fisheries Act. —(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 4708; in Com. on Res., 5906; 1°* of B., 5921 (iii); 2° and in Com., 8032, 8058; 3°*, 8072 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 5929; 2°, 6279; in Com., 6279; 3°, 6618 (iv).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Militia Pension Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden).
Res. prop., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6012, 6097; 1°* of B.. 6098; 2°, 6190; in Com., 6190; 3°*, 6194 (iv).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting the Currency Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 2632 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6188; 1°* of B., 6189; 2° and in Com,. 6620, 6641; 3°*, 6646 (iv).

Bill (No. 196) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1910.—(Mr. Fielding).
M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 6397; in Com., 6397; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6398 (iv).

Bill (No. 197) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 6100; in Com. on Res., 6601; 1° of B., 6389; 2° and in Com., 7313; 3°*, 7330 (iv).

Bill (No. 198) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.—(Mr. King).
Res. prop., 4848 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6603; 1* of B., 6605 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8027; 3°*, 8032 (v).

Bill (No. 199) Respecting licenses to Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 6607 (iv).

Bill (No. 200) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 6607 (iv).

Bill (No. 201, from the Senate) For the Relief of John Green.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 202, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Thornton Brownlee.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) Respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 204) To authorize the Erection of certain Wharfs and Buildings in the Harbour of St. John.—(Mr. Pugsley).
1°, 6934 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8120; 3°*, 8129 (v).

Bill (No. 205) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6948; 1°*, 2°* of B., 6962; in Com., 7295 (iv); 3°*, 7528; Sen. Amts., 8772 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 206) Respecting Escheats.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 6508; in Com. on Res., 6974; 1°* of B., 6976 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8384; 3°*, 8388 (v).

Bill (No. 207) To amend the Judges Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 6607; in Com. on Res., 6976; 1°* of B., 6985 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8383; 3°*, 8384 (v).

Bill (No. 208) To provide for the Payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Graham).
Res. prop., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6985; 1°* of B., 7009 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8129; 3°*, 8131 (v).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Murphy).
1°, 7181 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8381; 3°*, 8382 (v).

Bill (No. 210, from the Senate) To incorporate the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°, 7286; 2°, 7287 (iv); in Com., 7868, 8043, 8422, 8587; 3°*, 8599 (v).

Bill (No. 211, from the Senate) To incorporate the Pioneers Loan Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 7512; 2°*, 7868; in Com. and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 7512 (v).

Bill (No. 213, from the Senate) Respecting the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Sifton).
1°*, 7650; 2°, 7868; in Com. and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 214, from the Senate) Respecting the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 7650; 2°*, 7868; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 215, from the Senate) To incorporate the Buctouche Railway and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 7650; 2°*, 7846; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 216, from the Senate) Respecting the British Northwestern Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 7867; 2°*, 8043; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 217) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 7867; 2° and in Com., 8382; 3°*, 8383 (v).

Bill (No. 218, from the Senate) Respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 7975; 2°, 8055, 8380, 8618; 3°, 8652 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 219, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 7975; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 220, from the Senate) To incorporate the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 8213; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 221, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Alexander Hurst Forster.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 222, from the Senate) For the Relief of Emily Maud Nicoll.—(Mr. Osler).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 223, from the Senate), For the Relief of Edna Shibley De Mar.—(Mr. Barker).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 224, from the Senate) for the Relief of Clifford Buell Lillie.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 225, from the Senate) for the Relief of Rowland James Botterill.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 226) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in Aid of the construction of Lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 7873, 8239; in Com. on Res., 8477; 1°*, 2°* of B., 8480; in Com., 8480; 3°*, 8679 (v).

Bill (No. 227) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company, and to aid in the construction of its Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 8110; in Com. on Res., 8483; 1° of B., 8487; 2°*, and in Com., 8487; 3°*, 8679 (iv).

Bill (No. 228) To assist in maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian Press (Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 8239; in Com. on Res., 8679; 1°* 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8687 (v).

Bill (No. 229) To encourage the construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 6276 (iv); withdwn., 8003; res. prop., 8113; in Com. on Res., 8687; 1°* of B., 8697; 2°, and in Com., 8673; 3°* 8764 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 230) Respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 8697; 1°* of B., 8704; 2° and in Com., 8770; 3°*, 8771 (v).

Bill (No. 231) Respecting Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 8362; in Com. on Res., 8705; 1°* of B., 8705; 2° and in Com., 8764; 3°*, 8770 (v).

Bill (No. 232) To amend the Government Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 8733; 2° and in Com., 8772; 3°*, 8776 (v).

Bill (No. 233) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1907 (Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8705, 8742; in Com. on Ways and Means, 8757; 1°* of B., 8763; 2°, 8841; in Com., and 3°*, 8854 (v).

Bill (No. 234, from the Senate) To correct an error in the Telegraphs Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 8776; 2°*, 8777; in Com., 8777; 3°* 8777 (v).

Bill (No. 235) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Financial Year ending the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. of Ways and Means, 8856; 1°*, 2°*, 8856; in Com.., 8856; 3°*, 8856 (v).

Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendance: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).

——— Proposed Lease: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Magrath) 3170 (ii).

Black Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Blairmore Station Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7871 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).

Blue Rocks Islands Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Bluff Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Blythe, Walter, Commutation of Death Sentence: Correction re Crown's Action (Mr. Aylesworth) 2712 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2009 (ii).

Board of Ry. Commissioners, Jurisdiction: *See* 'B. No. 104, 145.'

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5778 (iii).

——— Pet. *re.*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4313 (iii)

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N. S., Expenditure to date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3676 (ii).

See 'Toney.'

Boivin, Elzear, Payment *re* Telegraph Construction: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870 (v).
Bookmaking and Pool Rooms: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Botterill, Rowland James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 225.'
Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Bounties on Iron and Steel: *See* 'B. No. 231.
Bounties on Lead and Zinc: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Bounty to S. A. Volunteers: *See* 'B. No. 87 and 163.'
Bourgeois, Mr. B., Emplymt. by N. T. Ry., Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3166, 3676 (ii).
Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. Seguin) 6394 (iv).
Bow River Coal Lands, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 3170 (ii).
Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3057 (ii).
Branch Lines on I. C. R., Requirement of: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6182 (iv).
—— Drill Hall, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Brandon Land Agencies, Number employed, Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2950 (ii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 213.'
Brantford Telephone Memorial: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Breen's Pond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Bridges, Wharfs, &c., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
B. C., Claim *re* Fisheries Collections: in Com. of Sup., 8552 (v).
—— Expenditure by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).
—— Judicial Appointments, Delays, &c., on M. to adjn: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5 (i).
—— Reply to Mr. Borden (Mr. Aylesworth) 11 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 531 (i).
See 'Judicial.'
B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 384 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 643 (i).
B. C. Lt. Governorship, Recommendations from Liberal Organizations *re* F. C. Wade, K.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 382 (i).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 523 (i).
B. C. Ry. Belt, Claims *re* Streams, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
B.C. Ry. Belt, Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 187'.
B. C. Ry. Subsidies, Particulars *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5929 (iii).
British North America Mining Co.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
British Northwestern Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice, and National Trust Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 6799 (iv).
Brockville Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Brooklyn Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).
Brown, Hon. George, Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
Brownlee, James Thornton: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewals: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3735 (ii).
Brudenell Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Brule Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Buctouche Channel Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Buctouche Ry. and Transportation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Budget, The—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
—— Debate: (Mr. Fielding) 1446; (Mr. Foster) 1474; (Mr. Miller) 1507; (Mr. Sproule) 1601; (Mr. Fowke) 1613; (Mr. Staples) remarks, 1616; (Mr. Thoburn) remarks, 1621; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1626; (Mr. Stratton) 1636; (Mr. McCall) 1655; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 1662; (Mr. Barnard) 1673; (Mr. E. Roy) 1678; (Mr. Sinclair) 1690; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1701; (Mr. Schell) 1804; (Mr. Lake) 1828, (Mr. Rivet) 1842; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1858; (Mr. Low) 1864; (Mr. Sexsmith) 1868; (Mr. M. Clark) 1880; (Mr. Crothers) 1894; (Mr. Congdon) 1903; (Mr. Magrath) 1920; (Mr. E. Paquet) 1929; (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 1935; (Mr. Arthurs) 1946; (Mr. Thornton) 1949; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1952 (i); (Mr. Paterson) 2061; (Mr. Sproule) 2065; (Mr. Burrell) 2067; (Mr. J. Haggart) 2067; (Mr. Wallace) 2069; (Mr. Hughes) 2069; A. Currie) 2076; (Mr. Lalor) 2079; (Mr. Armstrong) 2080; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2081; Ques. of Order, 2085; (Mr. Speaker) Ruling, 2084; (Mr. Foster) 2082; (Mr. Boyce) 2093, 2102; (Mr. Turriff) 2127; (Mr. Wilcox) 2168; (Mr. Loggie) 2178, 2215, 2222; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2218; (Mr. Edwards) 2227; (Speaker, Dep.) Ques. of Order, 2229; (Mr. Owen) 2246; (Mr. Nesbitt) 2246; (Mr. Campbell) 2259; (Mr. Speaker, Dep.) Ques. of Order, 2267; (Mr. Robert Smith) 2269 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 1002 (i).
Buildings, Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
—— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870 (v).
See 'Lake St. Peter.'

Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount for 1907-9: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 7872 (v).
Burk's Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5001 (iii).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Business of the Hse., Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 118 (i).
Buttonshaw, George Robert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Byng Inlet Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Cabano Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3878 (ii).
Cable Co.'s Rates: *See* 'B. No. 104 and 234.'
Cable Cos. and Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Camborne Postmaster, B.C., Pet. *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1016 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 2713 (ii).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
Campbellford Post Office: Remarks (Mr Owen) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).
Campbell River Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8808 (v).
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (iii), 8810 (v).
Canada Gazette, French Edition: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 8585 (v).
Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 633 (i).
See 'Germany.'
Canada and G. B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8808 (v).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii), 8809 (v).
Canadian Fisheries Commissions, Number since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1198 (i).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 8544 (v).
Can. Handicrafts Guild: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5498 (iii).
Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
Can. Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Canadian Attache at Washington: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1582 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4708 (iii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount of U. S. Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2150 (ii).
See 'Currency.'
Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Schaffner) 1101 (i).
Canadian Exhibit in London: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Canadian Flag: *See* 'Flags.'
Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 7514 (iv).
Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5501 (iii).
See 'de la Ronde.'
Canadian Navy, Number of Applications *re* Positions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2717 (ii).
——— Pets. to Govt. and Parliament *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5782 (iii).
——— Purchase, by Govt. of Vessels, O.C's. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2930 (ii).
——— Names of Cruisers, &c., purchased, description, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3931 (ii).
See 'Naval,' &c.
Canadian Navy Shipbuilding, Tenders *re* Great Lake Shipyards and Rush-Bagot Treaty: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 844 (i).
Can. Northern Alberta Ry. Co., Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 227.'
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Canadian Northern Railway, Claims *re* Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) on M. for Sup., 8782 (v).
——— Control of other Ry. Cos., Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1207 (i).
——— Subsidies *re* Main and Branch Lines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 2298 (ii).
C.P.R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
C.P.R., Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 15, 74, 77.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
CANALS.
Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent: M. for copy (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Messrs. McIntyre & Robert, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2141 (ii).

—— Arrears of Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3732 (ii).

Canals, Arbitrations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).

Canal Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 5759 (iii).

Chambly Canal, Canton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

—— Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment *re* Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2486 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

—— Extension of Concrete Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

—— Lock 17, Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

—— Removing High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

Galops Canals, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canals, O.C.'s, &c. *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. G. V. White) 3495 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122, 3123 (ii).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs under Denis O'Brien: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1964 (ii).

—— Basins and Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).

—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 627 (i).

—— Carpenter Shop, Number and Names of Employees, Dismissals, &c. Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1006 (i).

—— Concrete Vertical Walls: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).

—— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1367 (i).

—— Dismissals, &c. by Denis O'Brien, Pay Sheets, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Verville) 1547 (i).

—— Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1368 (i).

—— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5103 (iii).

—— Evers, T., Emplymt. as Electrician: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428, 2927 (ii).

—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428 (ii).

Lake St. Francis Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

CANALS—*Con*

New York Canals, Use by Canadian Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4128 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).

—— Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens: Read (Mr. Perley) 5625 (iii).

Quebec Canals, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

—— Iron Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Purchase of Tool Grinders: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).

—— Slope Trimming, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 3105 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 384 (i).

Trent Canal, Clarry, L. F., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4714, 5209 (iii), 6096 (iv).

—— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5781 (iii).

—— Instructions, Payments, &c. as Agent *re* Trent Canal Lands: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6391 (iv).

—— Payments to re Trent Canal Floods: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7516 (v).

Trent Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

—— Damages to Property: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

—— Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 446 (i).

—— Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1207 (i).

—— Floods in twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3733 (ii).

—— Holland River Channel, Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 170, 626 (i).

—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 1099 (ii).

Trent Canal, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3126 (ii).

Trent Canal—Newmarket: M. (Mr. Campbell) to reduce vote, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).

—— Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 98 (i).

—— Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

Trent Canal, Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2187 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).

——— Water Powers, Control by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 2185 (ii).

Welland Canal, Expenditure re Surveys, &c. (Mr. Foster) 1968 (ii).

——— Land Purchases, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

Welland Canal, Port Colborne Elevators, Expenditure *re* Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3295 (ii).

——— Officials: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

———Right of Way. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8661 (v).

Welland Canal, Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).

Welland Canal, Route through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 8660 (v).

——— Surveys *re* New Canal: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1969 (ii).

Cap à l'Aigle Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3881 (ii).

Cape Bald Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).

Cape de Chatte Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3888 (ii).

Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).

Capital Cases, Action of Crown: Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 2712 (ii).

Capital Offences: *See* 'B. Nos. 14, 71.'

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 642 (i).

Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 6157 (iv).

Carleton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land, Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2717 (ii).

See 'Frontenac.'

Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming: *See* 'B. No. 170.'

Cattle Guards on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'

Cattle Inspection on Ships: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).

Chambers of Commerce, P.Q., Federation: *See* 'B. No. 220.'

Chambly Canal, Canton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

See 'Canals.'

Chambly River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).

Champlain Monument: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).

Chance Harbour Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).

Chapeau Bridge, Culbute Canal, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).

Chapel Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

Charleston or Kelmont P. O., Pets. *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 2150 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

Charlottetown, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).

——— Increased Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii).

Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c.: Motion for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3170 (ii).

——— Shareholders: Report presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5759 (iii).

See 'Finance.'

Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii)

Chatham, Diversion of I.C.R. Line to Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2874 (ii).

Chaudiere Junction, I. C. R. Signals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).

Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation, Pension, &c. (Mr. Monk) 636 (i).

Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).

Chicoutimi Public Building, Ground Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of by Govt: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).

Chilliwack River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4293 (iii).

Chinamen, Number paying Capitation Tax. Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 7870 (v).

China Point Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act: in Com. of Sup., 8810 (v).

Christian Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of, Rate of Speed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1201 (i).

Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 923, 1298 (i).
Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instructions to Capt. Jemmet: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5499 (iii).
——— Original Field Notes: M. for Papers* (Mr. Burrell) 4315 (iii).
Cement Merger: *See* 'Combines Bill 101.'
Cement Merger, Complaints *re* Illegal Combination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2296 (ii).
——— Protection *re* Combine: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 106 (i).
Cement Trust: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Census: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Census, Decennial, Date of taking: Ques. (Mr Boyer) 1371 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 7373, 7763 (v).
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Central Economy Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Central Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Central Park Post Office, Action *re* Pet.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
——— Change of Location, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
——— Date of Discontinuance, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2293 (ii).
——— Pets. *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).
Centreville Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
——— Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 978 (i).
Certificates to Masters and Mates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 631 (i).
Cirkle, Mr. Fritz, Emplymt. in Dept. of Mines, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stratton) 5497 (iii).
——— Unprofessional Conduct, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. Smith) 5502 (iii).
Civil Employees, Salaries *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Civil Engineers: *See* 'Engineers,' &c.
Civil Govt. Expenditures, Increases of: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 212 (i). *See* 'Supply.'
Civil Servants, in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Rivet) 845 (i).
Civil Service Act (garnisheeing of wages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Civil Service Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Civil Service Amt Amt. Bill: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beauparlant) 7066 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmts., Number of passing Examinations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2256 (ii).
——— Apptmts. under C. S. Act, Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 3170 (ii).
Civil Service Employees, Number in 1909, Total Cost: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 4315 (iii).
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 1730 (i).
Civil Service, Outside, Legislation *re* Reorganization: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 6917 (iv).
Claims Adjudication Treaty Ratification: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5278 (iii).
Claims against Govt. Rys., Adjudication: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Claims for Damages on Trent Canal: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 5209 (iii), 6391 (iv), 7516 (v).
——— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5781 (iii). *See* 'Canals—Trent.'
Clear Lake, Application to raise Water Level, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3495 (ii).
Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 842 (i).
Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5000 (iii).
Coal Oil Lands, Acres sold, Leased, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 277 (i).
Coal Oil: *See* 'Petroleum.'
Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c.. Revenue *re* Royalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 414 (i).
Coal and Timber Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5560 (iii).
Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8585 (v). *See* 'Lightkeepers.'
Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 1372 (i).
Coins, Minting of: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Coins, Uncurrent and Foreign, Removal from Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii). *See* 'Can. Coins.'
Cold Storage for Bait, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Cold Storage for Fruit: in Com. of Sup., 7383 (iv).
Cold Storage Plant, Barrington, N.S., Application *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1972 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses for Food Products, in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Dock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 29.'
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4277 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade: Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1363 (i).
Combines, Investigation: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Combines Bill: Personal Explanation (Mr. King) *re* Speech, 7188 (iv).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 8810 (v).
Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1977 (ii).
Committee, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5, 22 (i).
——— Lists: Presented(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 155 (i).
——— M. to add Names, 1001 (i).
Committee on Standing Orders: M. (Mr. McCraney) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 6605 (iv).
Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 5104 (iii).
Compensation to Alberta and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3291 (ii).
Congregational Union of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Conservation of Natural Resources: *See* 'B. Nos. 84, 115 and 185.'
Conservation Commission: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
——— Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1590 (i).
——— Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4845 (iii).
——— Regulations re Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3486 (ii).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Consideration of Bill: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6140 (iv).
Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 853 (i).
See 'Can. Attache.'
Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Miller) 1378 (i).
Contrecoeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3889 (ii).
Controverted Election Petitions, Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1, 21 (i).
Controverted Elections, P.E.I., Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 256 (i).
Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 142 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Co-operative Societies B. 26, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8205 (ii).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4291 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
——— Extension of Concrete Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
——— Lock 17, Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
——— Removing High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4517 (iii).
——— Discrimination *re* Postage: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 5894 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
——— Postal Regulations, P.M.G.'s Answers, Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8818 (v).
Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3156 (ii).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Courtenay Bay—Marsh Road: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Cove Head Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Creosoted Timber for Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Criminal Code Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 14, 41, 71, 75, 81, 85.'
Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund to *re* Purchase of School Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4616 (iii).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 4, 145.'
Crown, Escheats to: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1529 (i).
Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Currency Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Currency, Dom., Issue of Clean Circulation. Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 8238 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7188 (iv).
Customs Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Customs Act (reporting of vessels) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Customs Tariff Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 233.'
CUSTOMS.
Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5001 (iii).
Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 633 (i).
Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 842 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Customs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 243 (i).
Customs and Excise Revenue for 1909-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8109 (v).
Customs Outside Ports, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i), 8803 (iv).
Incubators, Total Number imported from U.S., 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 169 (i).
——— M. for Ret.*: (Mr. G. V. White) 414 (i).
Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6391 (iv).
McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3491 (ii).
Machinery Steel, Quantities imported for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1015 (i).
Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6507 (iv).
School Slates and Lead Pencils, Number imported, Valuations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6506 (iv).
Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duties collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3931 (ii).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (v).
Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1376 (i).
Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of Duty, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3492 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industries, Transportation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).
Dale, Sydney J., Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Dalhousie Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2707 (ii).
Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Charges *re* Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i), 4790 (iii).
Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 3136 (ii).
David's Cove Breakwater: in Com of Sup., 985 (i).
Daylight Saving: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 514 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 2424; M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 3052 (ii).
——— Translators, Apptmt. of: M. (Mr. Fielding) 3914 (ii).
Deep Brook Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
Deep Water Weirs in Charlotte, Number of Licenses issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
Delap's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecution: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8678 (v).
de la Ronde, Major and Capt., Charges of Malfeasance in Army Service Corps: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 414 (i).
——— Charges *re* Militia Frauds: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 135 (i).
——— Rep. of Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5500 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Delisle Postmaster Alfred Gagné, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Delorey's Beach Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
De Mar, Edna Shibley, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 223.'
Deptl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5106 (iii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 631 (i).
Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Digby Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).
Digby Harbour, Piers: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
——— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).
Digby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Diligent River Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Disallowance of Ontario Legislation: Inquiry for Reps. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv), 7650 (v).
Distilleries, Extra Duty, Payments for: in Com. of Sup., 1331 (i).
Distribution Office, H. of C., Salary Increases: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Divorce: *See* 'Bills, Nos. 117, 134, 140, 144, 147, 148, 149, 153, 157, 158, 162, 165, 179, 201, 202, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225.'
Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3293 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
——— Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dollar Bills: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
See 'Currency.'
Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Bank: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Dom. Coal Co. and Cumberland Coal Co.'s Strike, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 2285 (ii).
Dominion Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7384 (iv) .
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 94 and 143.'
Dom. Lands Act B. 94, Ruling *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1730 (i).
Dom. Lands Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 8488 (v).
Dom. Lands Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenues: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3290 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Total Acreage of Arable Lands: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2925 (ii).
See 'Half Sections,' 'Homesteads,' 'Interior,' 'N. E. Section.'
Dom. Millers' Association: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Dom. Police sent to Thunder Bay, Rainy River &c. during Election 1909: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 1007 (i).
Dominion Traffic Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Dorchester Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3890 (ii).
Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3165 (ii).
Doukhobors, Comparison *re* h. m. for Dauphin, Ques. of Order (Mr. Campbell) 5532 (iii).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
Drawbars on Freight Cars, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3159 (ii).
Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6508 (iv).
See 'Bathurst' &c.
Dredging, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges *re* Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
Dredging Inspection on Public Works: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).
Dredging, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6137 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4780, 5608 (iii).
——— Mar. Provs., Repairs to Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii).
Dredging Plant, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4777 (iii).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
——— Ont and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4759 (iii); 6124 (iv).
——— St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
——— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Contribution to Cost by Municipalities: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1534 (i).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Erection, Cost of Sites, Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 1546 (i).
See 'Armouries.'
Drinkle, Hope Eileen Moreland, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application, &c. *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 104 (i).
See 'Port Arthur.'
Dry Dock at Sault Ste. Marie, Application *re* Subsidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 105 (i).
See 'Sault Ste. Marie.'
Dry Docks, Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 229.'
Dual Representation in H. of C., Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6802 (iv).
See 'H. of C. Members,' 'Representation,' 'Ottawa City,' &c.
Dublin Shore Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dubuc, Chief Justice, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1975 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 2277 (ii).
See 'Judges, Man.,' &c.
Dufferin Electoral Division, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620, 1731 (i).
——— Date of: Remarks(Mr. Sproule) 623 (i).
——— Representation of: Notice (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).
Duncan Life Boat Station: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
Dunn, John A., Application for N. W. Lands: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3170 (ii).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1009 (i).

Du Tremblay, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecutions: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8678 (v).
'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c., of Crew, Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3486 (ii).
Easter Adjournment: M. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).
Eastern Deptl. Bldg., Ottawa, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 571 (i).
Eastern Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 636 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments to by Pub. Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2717 (ii).
Eastern Passage Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Eastern Townships Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Edmonton-Athabaska Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Offices, Revenue per Month, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1590 (i).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay List: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Militia.
Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 21, 109.'
Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 167 (i).
Electric Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
Electrical Measuring: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Elevators at Terminal Points, Building, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 1022 (i).
Elliott Bros. & R. Carson, Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Emigration from Canada, System of Record Keeping: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 268 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii), 6163 (iv).
Engineers' Services *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).
Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c.: M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. Warburton) 2019 (ii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Escheats to the Crown: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transporting Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1017 (i).
Esquimalt Battery Guns, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Barnard) 3170 (ii).
Esquimalt Fortificatons, Dismantling of, Imp. Conc.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2292 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 633 (i).
—— Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Essex Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Essex Terminal Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Estimates, Delay in Bringing down: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Estimates, The, 1909-10: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 154 (i).
—— Suppl., 1910: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).
—— (1911) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7519 (v).
Estimates, Suppl.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3987 (iii).
Evers, Mr. T., Emplymt. as Electrician on Lachine Canal: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428, 2927 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Excise Bonding Warehouses, Licenses: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Excise, French Translation: in Com. of Sup., 1342 (i).
—— Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1331 (i).
—— Provisional Allowance in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
—— Surveys, Special Pay for Extra Hours: in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
—— Travelling Expenses, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
Exhibition at Charlottetown: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (v).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 5728 (iii).
Exhibitions, Foreign, Canadian Participation *re*, Expenditure by Canada: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1977 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farms at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor 2294 (ii).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv.
—— Branch Stations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5724 (iii), 7392 (iv), 7764-5 (v).
Experimental Farms Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).

Experimental Farm, Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2150 (ii).

Experimental Farm at Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5002 (iii).

Explosives on Construction Works, Number of Accidents, Investigations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Robb) 172 (i).

Explosives, Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).

Extension, B.C., Mining Disaster, Medals Awarded, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).

External Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 337 (i).

Factories Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).

Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).

Farm and Dairy Produce, Amount exported: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1016 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (ii).

Father Point Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).

Federation of Chambers of Commerce of P.Q.: *See* 'B. No. 220.'

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3207 (ii).

Federal Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'

Fences along Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'

Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1207 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 789 (i).

——— Recognition of Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 7068 (iv).

——— Request *re* Indemnity: Ques. (Mr. Papineau) 5560 (iii).

See 'Volunteers Bills Nos. 87 and 163.'

Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7289 (iv).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv), 8190 (v).

Fiddler's Elbow, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S., Gift to: *See* 'Ministers of the Crown.'

Fighting Island Channel Improvement: Remarks (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 3860 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).

FINANCE.

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols. 1. and III.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

——— Vol. II.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1730 (i).

Aud. General's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7768 (iv).

Banking Act, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6947 (iv).

——— Expiration of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 2950 (ii).

Bank Deposits in 1909: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5001 (iii).

Bank Shareholders List: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4846 (iii).

——— Report presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5759 (iii).

Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).

Canadian Coinage, Amount of U.S. Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2150 (ii).

Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3170 (ii).

Coins Uncurrent and Foreign, Removal from circulation: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).

Currency, Dom., Issue of Clean Circulation: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 8238 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7188 (iv).

Estimates, The, 1909-10: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 154 (i).

——— Suppl., 1910: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).

——— (1911) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7519 (v).

Finance and Treasury Board Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 335 (i).

Financial Statement—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).

Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 631 (i).

Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3294 (ii).

Old Age Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).

——— Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Administration, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2142 (ii).

Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).

Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1st, 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (iv).

Temporary Loans since beginning of present Session, Conditions re: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).

——— since June 1st, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 169 (i).

Fires caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Fires caused by Govt. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
Fisheries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Fish Industry of Can. and Combines: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Fisheries Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Fish used as Fertilizers: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Fishing Vessels, Licenses to: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
FISHERIES.
Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1593 (i).
Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4310 (iii).
Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
B.C., Claim *re* Fisheries Collections: in Com. of Sup., 8552 (v).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 8544 (v).
Chambly River Dam, and Fishing Right: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).
Cold Storage for Bait, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
——— Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).
Fish Contract for Penitentiary: *See* 'Penitentiary.'
Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6798 (iv).
Fish Fry, Application Forms: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 3058 (ii).
Fish Prices in B.C., 7884 (iv).
Fish Transportation and Conservation: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii).
Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Jameson) 4811 (iii).
——— Fisheries Commission, Number since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1198 (i).
Fisheries Regulations, Violation of, Names of Persons, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations and N. Essex Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
Fisheries Revenue, Alberta and Sask., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1021 (i).
Fishermen's Bait Associations, Amounts paid for Storage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1015 (i).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fishery Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v).
Fishing Licenses in B. C., Compensation Claims, Disputes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3933 (ii).
Fishways Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v).
Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3737 (ii).
Hatcheries and Breeding Establishment for Fish: in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).
Hatcheries at Berens River and Snake Island, Total Cost: (Mr. Bradbury) 632 (i).
Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 384 (i).
Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity Packed, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
——— Number of Licenses issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
——— Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1777 (i).
Intelligence Bureau *re* Fisheries and Customs: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3490 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Henderson) 1880 (i).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Jameson) 3059 (ii).
International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 381 (i), 2153 (ii).
Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
——— Letters from Mr. Wold: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 6720 (iv).
Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).
Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8543 (v).
Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 259 (i).
Lobster Canning Plants, Names of Officers connected with: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3936 (ii).
Lobster Cannery Licenses, Number issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Report: Presented (Mr. Sinclair) 7867 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2149 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 2667, 2683 (ii).
——— Changes in Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3391 (ii).
——— Evidence and Rep., Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 276 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell) 1302, 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* 'up to date' (Mr. Campbell) 2151 (ii).
——— Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4308 (iii).
——— Regulations in Man.: Inquiry for (Mr Bradbury) 3480 (ii), 5894 (iii).
——— Signing of Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2061 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries (lobster industry) Com.: M. to conc. in Rep. (Mr. Sinclair) 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at the Hague, Counsel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
Pembina River Fishing Regulations: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Protection Service, Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii), 8509 (v).
Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8546 (v).
Quebec Fisheries and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6940 (iv).
Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 1022 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2798 (ii).
Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).
Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts *re* Spawn: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 133 (i).
Fleming, Helena Mellor, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 631 (i).
Forests. Conservation of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Forest and Timber Protection: in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
Forster, James Alexander Hurst, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 221.'
Fort George Canyon Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease to R. J. Dunlop: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
Fort William and Port Arthur Grain Supervisors, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3482 (ii).
Fort William Wharf, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4311 (iii).
Fox Island Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Franking Privilege, Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1207 (i).
Franking Privilege, Political Literature and Sol. Gen.'s Frank: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7784, (amt.) 7792, neg. (Y. 49; N. 79) 7834 (v).
Fraser River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).
Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2487 (ii).
Fraserville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Fredericton Building, Pavements: in Com. of Sup., 581 (i).
Freight Rates, Guarantee against Loss: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
French Canadian Party in Parlt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Blondin) 8115 (v).
French Floods Relief Fund: Grant to, 3059; Tel. from Sir Francis Bertie: Read (Mr. Fielding) 3295 (ii).
French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
See 'Militia.'
French Treaty Amt: *See* 'B. Nos. 12 and 126.'
French Treaty, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R .L. Borden) 6 (i).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
——— Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8664 (v).
——— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
——— Provisions *re* Termination: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 276 (i).
——— Similar Treatment to Germany: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
See 'German,' &c.
Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1371 (i).
——— Govt. Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 262 (i).
Frontenac Mail Contracts, Payments, Revenue &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5105 (iii), 7066 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Galops Canals, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).
Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3937 (ii).
Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).
Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Road, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Gardiner, Wm. Reid, Cancellation of Entry, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 5502 (iii).
Garrison Artillery Guns, Supply of Field Guns, &c.: Ques. dropped, 1790; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* asking by another Member, 1791; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1791, 1799; Answered by Minister, 1800 (i).
Garrison Artillery Regiment, Number, Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
——— Supply of 12-pounder Guns: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1593 (i).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Gas Inspection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Gas Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
Gaspe Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3892 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging, Total Payments to Mar. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2487; Demand for Papers read by Minister (Mr. Crocket) 2489 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).
See 'Bathurst,' &c., 'Mar. Dredging Co.'
Gatineau and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Geological Survey, Purchase of Books, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Georgetown Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Georgian Bay Canals, O.C.'s., &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. G. V. White) 3495 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. G. V. White) 6616 (iv).
——— Ret.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8734 (v).
German Surtax, Error in Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4712 (iii).
——— Explanations *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3679 (ii).
German Tariff, Agreement wtih Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3829 (ii).
Germany and Canada Trade Relations, Similar Treatment as France: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 785, 1196 (i).
See 'Can. and Germany,' 'Customs,' &c.
German Trade Relations, Par. in New York 'Herald': Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 2635 (ii).
——— Value of Exports. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 261 (i).
Gervais, Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6178 (iv).
Gervais, Mrs. C., Issue of Scrip, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6934 (iv).
Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4617 (iii).
Gimli Wharf Extension: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
Glassware used in Milk Tests, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Glover, Robert, Pet.: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1586 (i).
Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 3933 (ii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Godfroy Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment of Indemnity *re* Damages on Chambly Canal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2486 (ii).
Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3294 (ii).
Gordon, Mrs. John, Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 5616 (iii).
Govt. Annuities Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.'
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6099 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr Foster) 926 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Fielding) 3829 (ii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2221 (ii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 4315 (iii).
——— Remarks on Easter Adjournment (Mr. Sproule) 5893 (iii).
——— Unopposed Motions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4308 (iii).
Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 3944 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 3986 (iii).
See 'Dredges.'
Govt. Employees, Garnisheeing Wages: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).

Govt. Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright: *See* 'Frontenac.'
Govt. Rys. Act (damages by fire) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court *re* Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
See 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1536 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1976 (ii).
Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3484 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1004 (i).
Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2184 (ii).
Govt. Weigher at Montreal, Apptmt. of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 1546 (i).
Gowganda Junction Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49, 88.
Grain Exports from Montreal for Ten Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 782 (i).
Grain Inspection Board: in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Grain Mixing by Elevator Men at Fort William, &c., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 5933 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West: M. for Papers (Mr. McCarthy) 1687 (i).
Grain shipped from and received at Lake Ports, Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 445 (i).
Grain Supervisors at Fort William, &c., Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3482 (ii).
Grain Survey Board: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Grain Trade, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8584 (v).
—— Letter of Mr. R. McKenzie: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
—— Over-classification of Grades: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 8343; Reply (Mr. Oliver) 8363 (v).
—— Terminal Elevator Co., Tel., &c., Read (Mr. Schaffner) 8240 (iv).
Grand Bend Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Grand Bend Pier: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Grand Mechin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3900 (ii).
Grand Mere Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6799 (iv).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
G. T. R. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. N. 164.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.
Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2137 (ii).
Bonds guaranteed, Total Amount to 31st March, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (v).
Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Locations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1366 (i).
Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 386 (i).
—— Memorandum from Chairman to Prime Minister: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2139 (ii).
—— Classifications submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 261 (i).
——Written Objections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
Construction Contracts, N.B., Provisions *re* Sub-letting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 383 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 643 (i)
—— Provision *re* Forfeits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 387 (i).
—— Corrected Answer, 447 (i).
Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3156 (ii).
Eastern Div. Survey, Location, &c., Names of Engineers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1687 (i).
Engineers' Complaints against Arbitrators: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2141 (ii).
Entrance into Brandon, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3159 (ii).
Hodgins, Major, Name of Asst. Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
—— Payments to Counsel, Total Cost.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7064 (iv).
Land Sales along Lines: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1966 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Accidents, Circular *re* Explosives: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 4512 (iii).
—— Adjustment of Disputed Item ref. to in Letter of Aud. Gen., O. C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 3495 (ii).
—— Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 164 (i).
—— Board of Arbitrators, Names, Contractors claims *re* over-classification: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 836 (i).
—— Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal from N. T. Ry., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3166, 3676 (ii).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
——— Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lennox) 643 (i).
N.T. Ry. Commission: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3682 (ii).
——— Number of Members, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 630 (i).
——— Profits *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3165 (ii).
——— Rep.: M. to print (Mr. Graham) 97 (i).
——— Rep., Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 622 (i).
National Transcontinental Ry. Construction, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii); 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
——— Names of Contractors, Estimated Expenditures, &c.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, on M. for Sup., 8242 (Amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).
N.T. Ry., Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 165 (i).
——— Date of Contract for Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 164 (i).
——— Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F': Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2285 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Lumsden, Hugh, Resignation, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 97 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 258 (i).
——— Return, Arrangement of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
——— Printing of Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 377 (i).
——— Additional Letter to Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 448, 622 (i).
——— Delay in Printing Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1302 (i).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 2330, 2949 (ii).
——— on Order being called for Com.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2189 (ii).
——— Meeting of Com.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3480 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. (Mr. Lennox) to consider, 5820 (iii), 6015 (iv).
——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5196 (iii).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
——— Error in Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5277 (iii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5562; on M. for Sup. (Mr. Barker) 5570 (iii).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, Apptmt. of Counsel: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4070; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).
——— Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4516 (iii).
——— Payment of Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8841 (v).
———Payment of Counsel Fees: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).
N.T.Ry. and G.T.P. Commission, Investigations *re* Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 260 (i).
——— Letter to Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
——— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3491 (ii).
——— McIntosh, Mr., Promotion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
———M. for Cor.*, &c. (Mr. Lennox) 1686 (i).
N. T. Ry., Objections *re* Classification, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3169 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Contract to O'Brien & Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2715, 3291, 3490 (ii).
——— Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2283 (ii).
N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).
N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6392 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Tenders *re* St. Boniface Shops: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8835 (iv).
——— Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
——— Wheat Shipments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1206 (i).
N. T. Ry. from Winnipeg to Superior, Date of Opening for Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 165 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
Opening of Winnipeg to Lake Superior Division, ref. to in Speech from Throne: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost, Verification of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1783 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Progress Estimates, Amounts claimed in District 'A' Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2140 (ii).
Remuneration to Govt. Directors: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N. T. Ry. Commissioners: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Meighen) 643 (i).
Terminals, Expenditure *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1205 (i).
Winnipeg to Edmonton Section, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 129, 623 (i).
Grande Vallée Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3904 (ii).
Gratuitiies *re* Militia Services: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures acting as Insurance Agent: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6505 (iv).
Gravenhurst Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Contracts on Kaministiquia River: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3484 (ii).
Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Night Letter Rates *re* French Language: Remarks (Mr. E. Roy) 8240 (v).
Green, James Albert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Green, John, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2427 (ii).
Grenville Station to Grenville Village, Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 131 (i).
Grimsby Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i), 8814 (v).
Grist Mills, &c., Indians in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
—— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7496, 8169 (v).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Gulf Shore Breakwaters: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendation of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6798 (iv).
Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1206 (i).
Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3737 (ii).
Habitant River Wharf at Canning: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Haggerty's Wharf Pier Head: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Haileybury Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5931 (iv).
—— Location since January, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6937 (iv).
Half-Sections in Man., N. ½, &c., Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5889 (iii).
Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Observations of Sir. Wm. White *re* Condition: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).
—— Stmnt. read (Sir Frederick Borden) 1961 (ii).
—— Protection *re* Deterioration: Ques. (Mr Worthington) 1010 (i).
See 'Esquimalt,' 'Militia.'
Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3672 (ii).
Halifax Dom. Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 574 (i).
Halifax Harbour Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4714 (iii).
Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2430 (ii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2883 (ii).
Halifax and Liverpool SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8809 (v).
Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3483 (ii).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Hampton Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Hansard, Analytical Index, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Hansard Debates, Omission from: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7880 (v).
See 'Debates,'
Harbour Commissioners of Montreal: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Harbours and Rivers, Bridge Work, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers—B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276, 4715 (iii).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 2697, 3391 (ii).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 976, 992 (i).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 3455, 3833 (ii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 4210 (iii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Harland and Wolff Shipbuilders, Rep. *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1363 (i).
Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry., P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 3063 (ii).
Harrington Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (v).
Hartland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Hatcheries and Breeding Establishments for Fish: in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).
Hawkesbury Bridge, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
Hay and Wood Permits from Dom. Lands, Man., Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3678 (ii).
See 'Wood.'
Heating and Lighting Contracts in Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
See 'Pub. Works—Ottawa.'
Hecla Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).
Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity Packed, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Herring Fisheries, Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1777 (i).
'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 130 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Daniel) 290 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 1880 (i).
See 'Life Saving,' 'Old Proprietor.'
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Imports of Military Clothing, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 3495 (ii).
Highways Protection, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 587 (i).
Historical Manuscripts Commission, Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 790 (i).
Hodgins Investigations, Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7064 (iv).
See 'G. T. P.'
Holden, Clara Louise, Relief of: *See* 'B. 149.'
Holland Post Office Postal Boxes: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7865, 7881 (v).
Holland River Channel, Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 170, 626 (i).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 1099 (i).
Holsteins and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4309 (iii).
Homesteading Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1784 (i).
Homesteads Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 847 (i).
Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 270 (i).
Homestead Patents for S. W. ¼, 18-19-20, 2nd Meridian, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 6936 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, Available for Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 6935 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, Total Acreage in Alta and Sask., Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2951 (ii).
Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
Homesteading on Sections 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4080 (iii).
Homesteads for Women, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
Horses exported from Ont. into N. W. Ter., Disinfecting stockyards: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4812 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) on M. for Sup., 4209 (iii).
Horse Racing: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 81.'
Horse-racing Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 6617 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
See 'Labour.'
Hours of Ry. Men: *See* 'B. No. 66'
House of Commons Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS.
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3057 (ii).
Bellechasse Controverted Election, Petition: Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 923, 1298 (i).
Controverted Election Petitions, Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1, 21 (i).
——— P. E. I., Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 256 (i).
Dual Representation in H. of C., Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6802 (iv).
Dufferin, Electoral District, Representations of: Notice (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).
——— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1731 (i).
——— Date of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 623 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).

Essex Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).

House of Commons and Senate Officials residing in Buildings, Estimate of Rents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain 1023 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3058, 3296 (ii).

House of Commons, Corridors, Coloured Clergyman ejected: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 7182 (iv).

Internal Economy Commission: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 96 (i).

Library: in Com, of Sup., 8802 (v).

Library of Parlt.: Rep. presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).

Mar. Provs. Representation in H. of C., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Warburton) 644 (i).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B.N.A. Act.: Prop. Res., 2718 (ii).

Member introduced, 413, 1001 (i).

Members, Names of 221 *re* Dom. Statutes: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Campbell) 1547 (i).

Middlesex, W., Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 413 (i).

N.S. Representation in H. of C., Amt. in B.N.A. Act: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).

Ottawa and Quebec East Electoral Districts, Decision of Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 413 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1446 (i).

—— Resignation of Prime Minister, 1689 (i).

—— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1729 (i).

Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation, Cor. in Toronto 'World': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).

—— Ques. *re* Disposal of Protests by Speaker, 802 (i).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted (Mr. Speaker) 833 (i).

—— Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).

Ottawa Electoral District, Judgment *re*: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).

Proportional Representation in the House of Commons: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 136 (i).

—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 429 (i).

Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt. of Com.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) 376 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Rules of the House: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1536, 1545 (i).

—— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4307, 5893 (iii).

—— Special Committee *re*: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1299 (i).

—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1441 (i), 8365 (v).

—— Report laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7867 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7527 (v).

Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8110 (v).

Sessional Employees, H. of C., Number in Jan.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4514, 5001 (iii).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Best) 5502 (iii).

Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 7771 (v).

Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Mr. Speaker Blanchet: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).

Staff Reorganization: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6389 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7071 (iv), 7520 (v).

—— M. to disch. Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7872 (v).

—— Notice (Mr. Speaker) to withdraw, 7977 (v).

—— Staff Increases: M. (Mr. Fielding) 8830 (v).

Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolmie) 8677 (v).

Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 629 (i).

Hudson Bay Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.

Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3067 (ii), 8820 (v).

—— Estimates, &c.: Statement Read (Mr. Graham) 3206 (ii).

—— Number of Acres of Land sold: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).

—— Par. in Newspapers *re* Obstructions: Remarks (Mr. MacNutt) 7187 (iv).

'Hudson' Str., Purchase of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122, 3123 (ii).

Hunting and Homicide: *See* 'B. No. 71.'

Hydro-Electric Legislation, Disallowance: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv). *See* 'Disallowance.

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8511 (v).

Hydrographic Surveys, Irrigation Report: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 5103 (iii).
Icebreakers and Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).
Icebreakers, Thunder Bay District: in Com. of Sup., 8526 (v).
Ile Verte Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 102, 135.'
IMMIGRATION.
Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii).
Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 171 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2222, 2797 (ii).
Agents in Belgium, Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Paquet) 1022 (i).
Agents in Canada and G. B., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8195 (v).
Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 101 (i).
—— Total Expenditure, Rep. of Mr. Wiallard: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 790 (i).
Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Schaffner) 1101 (i).
Emigration from Canada, System of Record Keeping: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 268 (i).
Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
Immigration Buildings, Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
Immigration Contingent Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 8207 (v).
Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 128 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 637 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, Number for 1908, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 7872 (v).
Immigrants located on Bay of Quinte Ry., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 7872 (v).
Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 2294 (ii).
Immigration Official, Dr. Lavoie, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 8109 (v).
Immigration O.C.'s and Regulations: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 6609 (iv).
—— Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 926, 959 (i).
Immigration Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8494 (v).
IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigrants, Treatment *re* Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 6945 (iv).
Japanese Immigration from U. S. entering B. C.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Lethbridge Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (v).
Medical Inspection, Cor. since 1st Jan., 1908: M. for Copy* (Mr. Paquet) 1380 (i).
Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv).
North Sydney Immigration Shed: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
SS. Passengers at St. John, N.B., Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7976 (iv).
—— Letter of Supt.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 8579 (v).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
U. S. Immigration from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 431 (i).
U. S. Immigrants from, Remarks of Bruce Walker: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1369 (i).
—— Number of Inmates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 5890 (iii).
Winnipeg Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 206 (i).
—— Instruction to Canada's Representative: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 923 (i).
Imperial Conference, Distribution of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Paquette) 276 (i).
—— Secretariat, Cor. *re* Formation, &c.: M. for Copy of Cor. (Mr. Foster) 388 (i).
—— Stmnt. of Cost, Conversion into Canadian Currency: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 856 (i).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 639, 783 (i).
Imperial Export Co., Applications *re* Service between Can. and Australia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1100 (i).
Improved Paper Machinery Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6937 (iv).
Increased Facilities, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Incubators and Brooders, Total Number imported in Canada: M. for Ret.* (Mr. G. White) 414 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. G. White) 169 (i).
Independent Order of Rechabites: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Index to Hansard: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Indian Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
INDIANS.
Agricultural Implements to Indians in Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (v).
Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
——— Proposed Lease: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Magrath) 3170 (ii).
B. C. Indians, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7858 (v).
Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instructions to Capt. Jemmet: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5499 (iii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Burrell) 4315 (iii).
Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Road, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5931 (iv).
——— Location since Jan. 1910: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6937 (iv).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 345, 414 (i).
Indian Lands in Alberta, Disposal by Govt. on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 119 (i).
——— Irregularity of Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 119 (i).
Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale, Terms and Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 783 (i).
Indian Schools, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 7861 (v).
——— Industrial Schools, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6390 (iv).
——— Industrial School, Regina, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
——— La Butte Indian School, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
Indian Land Management Fund: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (v).
Indians, Man., Annuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7848 (v).
——— Clothing: in Com. of Sup., 7851 (v).
——— General Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
——— Grist Mills, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Indians, Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (v).
——— Live Stock: in Com. of Sup., 7848 (v).
——— Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
——— Supplies to Destitute Indians: in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
——— N. B., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7846 (v).
——— N. S., Roads, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7845 (v).
——— Oka, Settlement of: Remarks: (Mr Wright) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).
——— Ont. and Que., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (v).
——— Ont. and Que., Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (v).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (v).
Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
Peigan Reserve, Open for Homesteading, Purposes, Disposal of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6936 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 172 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1801 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).
Pointe Bleue Indian Agent W. Donohue, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
P. E. I., Relief, Seed Grain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).
See general heading.
Sioux Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 843 (i).
Indiantown and Blackville Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Industrial Conditions, Increases in Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 168 (i).
Industrial Disputes, Investigation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 23 and 198.'
Industrial Disputes B. 23: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) *re* Discussion, 6941 (iv).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8116 (v).
Industrial Disputes Act: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
——— Legislation *re* Amt.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).

Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6390 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 and 131.'
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 229 (i).
——— Minor Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Insects, Pests, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Inspection and Sale Act Amt: *See* 'B. Nos. 40 and 54.'
Inspection Act (pure food) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Inspection of Glassware in Milk Tests: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Inspection of Meat: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Inspection of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Inspection of Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Inspection and Sales Act, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce Bill: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act, Trade and Commerce: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Insurance Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5893 (iii).
——— Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
Intelligence Bureau *re* Fisheries and Customs: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
I. C. R., Adjudication of Claims: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
I. C. R., Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
I. C. R., Damages by Fire: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
I. C. R.: Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court *re* Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
I. C. R. Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.
Accidents, Number, Dates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 5501 (ii).
Air-Brakes to Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 2881 (ii).
Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) on M. for Sup., 2798 (ii).
——— Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 2840 (ii).
Beresford Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Board of Commissioners, Names, Dates of Apptmt. Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 99 (i).
——— Additional Powers: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 627 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Board of Commissioners, Dismissals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3091 (ii).
——— Dismissals by Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 128, 164 (i)
——— Dismissals by Board of Management, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
——— French Representation: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7519 (v).
——— Rep. to Hse: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2791 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Chatham, Diversion of Line to Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2874 (ii).
Chaudiere Junction, Signals, &c.: in Com. Sup., 2873 (ii).
Derailments, Number during 1909: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 2141 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Talbot) 2298 (ii).
Dismissals for each month from Oct., 1908, to March, 1909: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1776 (i).
Drawbars on Freight Cars: in Com .of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Employees, Number in 1907-8-9: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 835 (i).
Employees, Passes, Number issued for Sept., Oct. and Nov.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2716 (ii).
Employees, Payments to: Names, Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1021 (i).
Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipt, &c: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1367 (i).
Halifax Increased Accomodation: in Com. of Sup., 2883 (ii).
Highways Protection: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Indiantown and Blackville Line: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 1208 (i).
I.C.R., Sale of to other Ry. Cos.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2299 (ii).
Lac au Salmon Overhead Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Locomotive and Carshops Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (ii).
Loggieville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2885 (ii).
Low Rates: Inquiry for Information (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8481 (v).
McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c., Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3733 (ii).
Moncton Cut-off: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
Original Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Passes, alleged to be stolen, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Passes, Sale and Distribution, Padded Pay Lists on Windsor Branch: M. for Papers* (Mr. Foster) 801 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2634 (ii).
Passes from 1908 to 1909, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 276 (i).
———Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Stanfield) 4812 (iii).
Pintsch Gas, Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Purchasing Agent, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 272 (i).
Repairs to Car No. 37: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2286 (ii).
Riviere du Loup, Coal Shed, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4128 (iii).
——— Crossing Protection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1778 (i).
——— Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
——— Workshops, Electrical Development, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 6182 (iv).
Robinson's Crossing Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Safety of Travel: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2278 (ii).
Side Ladders for Box Cars: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Sleeping Cars, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 4847 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5105 (iii).
——— Instructions to Sleeping Car Conductors *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 4512 (iii).
Standard Pay for Machinists: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 259 (i).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Train Service between Pictou and Oxford Junction, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3171 (ii).
Water on Passenger Trains, Filtering, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 1303
Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 332, 343 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 344 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Wire Fencing, Tenders for 1909, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1974 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wilcox) 2150 (ii).
See 'Govt. Rys.' 'P.E.I.' 'Railways,' &c.
Interest Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 8, 73, 122.'
Interest by Banks: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
INTERIOR.
Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 7290 (iv).
Brandon Agency, Number employed, Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2950 (ii).
Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c., Revenue *re* Royalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 414 (i).
Coal and Timber Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5560 (iii).
Compensation to Alberta and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3291 (ii).
Dom. Lands Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenues: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3290 (ii).
Dom. Lands Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Dom. Lands, Total Acreage of Arable Lands: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2925 (ii).
Half-Sections in Man., N. ½, &c., Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5889 (iii).
Hay and Wood Permits in Man., Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3678 (ii).
Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1784 (i).
Homestead Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 847 (i).
Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 270 (i).
Homestead Patents for S.W. ¼, 18-19-20, 2nd Meridian, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 6936 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, available for Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 6935 (iv).
Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
——— Total Acreage in Alta. and Sask., Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2951 (ii).
Homesteading on Section 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4080 (iii).
Homesteads for Women, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 8194 (v).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7767, 8194 (v).
Interior and Indian Affairs Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).
—— Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4081 (iii).
New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
Peace River District, Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2924 (ii).
—— Portions opened up for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4313 (iii).
Peace River Land Co., Disposal of Lands by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1535 (i).
Pincher Creek Sub-land Agency: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8840 (v).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 432 (i).
Printing, &c., *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 8493 (v).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Removal of Squatters: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1368 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
Sauvé, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign: M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyer) 2032 (ii).
School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 432 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Description of Areas under Agreement with Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1686 (i).
Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).
Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 272 (i).
Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (v).
—— Tree Planting, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5932 (iv), 6181 (iv).
Internal Economy Commission: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 96 (i).
International Commission, St. John River, Obstructions, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3490 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Jameson) 3059 (ii).
International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 381 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1880 (i), 2153 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
International Waterways, Canal and Construction Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
See 'Waterways.'
Inverness Broad Cove Mines Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4513 (iii).
Iron Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 231.'
Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 4083 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'
James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Inland Rev. Dept., Prosecutions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 3935 (ii).
Japanese Immigration from U. S. entering B.C.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Japan Trade Commission, Cor. Reps., &c., of Mr. W. T. R. Preston: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 328 (i).
Japan-United States Treaty, Safeguarding Canadian Rights: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5761 (iii).
'J. G. Witherbee' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1975 (ii).
Joggin's Mines Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4844 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3734 (ii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Jones, Hon. L. M., and F. T. Frost, Apptmts. to Senate: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2189 (ii).
Judges' Act (Man. and Que.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
See 'Man. King's Bench.'
Judicial Apptmts. in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 623 (i).
See 'B.C.'
Judicial Business, Montreal District: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1792 (i).
Judique Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Juniper Island, Stony Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Justice, Administraton of: in Com. of Sup., 8798 (v).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 7 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Kamloops to Fennels Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
Kamloops to Okanagan Valley, Telephone Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Kamouraska Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S., Action of Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) 851 (i).
Kemptville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Kensington Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
—— Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1783, 1970 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in debate on Budget, 2106 (ii).
—— Repairs, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3736 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Kilmant and Shacleton, Application *re* Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7504 (v).
King, Chief Astronomer: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Kingsport Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1193 (i).
Kingston Mills Bridge Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i).
Kingston Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
Kingston R. M. College: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7519 (v).
Kouchibouguac Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
Krick, Mr. W. W., Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland, Date of Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 835 (i).
Labelle Settlers Grievances: Remarks (Mr. Major) on M. for Sup., 8778 (v).
Labour Dept., Industrial Disputes Act: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
—— Rent of Y. M. C. A. Building: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 627 (i).
—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. King) 7 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Labour, Hours on Public Works, Com. on B. 21: 1st Report presented (Mr. King) 1586 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2887; Agreed to (Y. 114; N. 36) 2923 (ii).
Labourers' on Rys., Pay: *See* 'B No. 39.'
La Butte Indian School, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
—— Letter from Mr. Wold: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 6720 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs under Denis O'Brien: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1964 (ii).
—— Basins and Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).
—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 627 (i).
—— Carpenter Shop, Number and Names of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1006 (i).
—— Concrete Vertical Walls: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).
—— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1367 (i).
—— Pay Sheets, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Verville) 1547 (i).
Lachine Canal, Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1368 (i).
—— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5103 (iii).
—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428 (ii).
Lachine Post Office, Tower Clock: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachine Public Building, Heating Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachute Post Office, Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 3137; 3483 (ii); 5689
Lac au Saumon Overhead Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Lafontaine, Sir L. H., Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
La Have River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Aylmer Wharf, Stratford Centre: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 1600 (i).
—— Stmnt. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1194 (i).
Lake Nipissing Flooded Lands Compensation, &c., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2295 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 850 (i).
Lake Nipissing Water Level, Claims for Damages, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 6164 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4517 (iii).
——Piers: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lake St. Francis Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii)
Lake Winnipeg Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
(Mr. Campbell) in Sup., 8540 (v).
Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery: Remarks
Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).
See 'Baby Farm B.'
Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Land Titles Act, Moneys received, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 1022 (i).
L'Ange Gardien Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Langevin Block, Boilers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).
'Lansdowne, Wreck of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Laplante, Mr., Salary Increase: Remarks Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8827 (v).
Laprairie Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3482 (ii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Latchford Dam, Montreal river: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 3165 (ii).
Laurentian Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Laurie, Archibald, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).
—— Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4081 (iii).
Lead Ores, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 640 (i).
'Leebro' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 788 (i).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8543 (v).
Leitche's Creek Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lemieux, Ed., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Lennox Island Indian Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).
Lennox Island, Port Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Leonardville, Deer Island Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Le Petit Débarquement: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Lethbridge Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (v).
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 582, 941 (i), 7781 (v).
—— Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 641 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 1380 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Magrath) 3682 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Magrath) 8855 (v).
Lethbridge Post Office, Total Revenue for ten months, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3933 (ii).
Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c.: (Mr. Staples) 7290 (iv).
Level Crossings Across Rys.: *See* 'B. Nos. 4, 145.'
Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1198 (i).
Lévis, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 6102 (iv).
—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Lewes and Yukon River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).
Library, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Library of Parlt. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).
Licenses to Fishing Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia': Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 107 (i).
See 'Hestia.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lightkeepers in N. S., Coal Supply: Stmnt. (Mr. Templeman) 8831 (v).
See 'Coal.'
Lightkeepers' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
—— Increase in: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1589 (i).

Lillie, Clifford Buell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 224.'
Lillooet River Obstructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).
Lilly, Wm., Homestead Pre-emption of S.W. quarter 32-7-5, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6936 (iv).
Limerick to Gravelburg, Wood Mountain Telegraph Line: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
L'Institut de Notre-Dame des Missions: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty; Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6391 (iv).
Lion's Head Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
Liquor Compounding, Fraudulent Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Liscombe Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
Litchfield Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little Anse Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little River Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Development of: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (v).
Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques: (Mr Monk) 641 (i).
Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
Loans, Temporary, since June 1st, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 169 (i).
See 'Temporary.'
Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 259 (i).
Lobster Cannery Licenses, Number issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
Lobster Canning Plant, Names of Officers connected with: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3936 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2149 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Report: Presented (Mr. Sinclair) 7867 (v).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation: M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8101, 8214 (v).
See 'Fisheries.'
Lockport, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Locomotive and Car Shops Machinery, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (ii).
Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2488 (ii), 5622 (iii).
See 'Bathurst.'
Loggieville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2885 (ii).
London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Long Sault Rapids Dam. Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1194 (i).
—— Deputation *re* Building of a Dam: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2060 (ii).
—— Par. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5933 (iv).
Long Sault Rapids Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Lower Argyle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
Lyons, Mr. Alex., Detention at Ellis Island: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 8586 (v).
Macleod Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
McArthur, Frederick Joseph Gustin, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 443 (i).
McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3491
McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iv).
McGregor's Creek Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3733 (ii).
McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. by Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
McLean, A., Payments for Purchase of Wood: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon trip: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5890 (iii).
McNair's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4081 (iii).
Mace's Bay Pier-head: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Machinery Steel, Quantities imported for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1015 (i).
Maganatawan Wharfinger, Apptmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 7289 (iv).
Magdalen Island and Pictou SS. Service, Tenders, Susbidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7065 (iv).
Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6507 (iv).
Mails addressed to Street Numbers, Free Delivery, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8118 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7869 (v).

Mails between G. B. and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5501 (iii).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8581 (v).

Mail Contracts with Capt, Noonan, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1379 (i).

Mail Delivery Free, Closing of Distribution Offices: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).

Mail Delivery Free in Sydney: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137 (ii).
See 'Sydney.'

Mail Privileges to Members *re* Postal Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2146 (ii).
See 'Franking.'

Mail Services, Supts. of Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii), 8808 (v).

Malbaie (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Main-a-Dieu Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Manitoba Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 207.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on M. for Sup., 8131; Amt. 8141, neg. (Y. 63; N. 102) 8166 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Man. Govts., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Molloy) 4315 (iii).

—— Cor., &c. with Man. Govt.: M. for Copies (Mr. Roche) 644 (i).

—— Extension, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 131 (i).

Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49, 88.'

Manitoba Fisheries Commission Report, Changes, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3391 (ii).

—— Ques. of Priv. *re* 'up to date' (Mr. Campbell) 2151 (ii).

—— on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 2667, 2683 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 3480 (ii).

—— Regulations, Amts re: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4308 (iii).

Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 4846 (iii).
See 'Judges.'

—— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 5624 (iii).

Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'

Manitoba School Lands, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4309 (iii).

—— Subsidy re School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 4310 (iii).

Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).

MARINE.

Aids to Navigation, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 8525 (v).

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2426 (ii).

B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 384 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 643 (i).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 7514 (v).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1969 (ii).

Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N. S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8585 (v).

—— Stmt. (Mr. Templeman) 8831 (v).

Duncan Cove Life Boat Station: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c. of Crew, Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3486 (ii).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4617 (iii).

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1536 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1976 (ii).

Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3484 (ii).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1004 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 130 (i).

—— M. for Cor. (Mr. Daniel) 290 (i).

—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 1880 (i).
See 'Life Saving.'

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8511 (v).

Icebreakers and Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).

Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 1600 (i).

—— Stmnt.: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).

'Lansdowne,' Wreck of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia': Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 107 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lightkeepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
——— Increase in: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1589 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 7 (i).
——— Sel. Com.: M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 108 (i).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Patrol Vessels for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
Pensions *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Pilots' Association Fund, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 7517 (v).
Pintsch and Acetylene Gas, Accidents *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 802 (i).
Port Stanley Life-Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6178 (iv).
Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 8518 (v).
Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 106 (i).
Seal Cove Life Boats, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2146 (ii).
Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 444 (i).
Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5890 (iii).
Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1530 (i).
Wrecking Plant for B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 444 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 644 (i).
Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
——— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Mar. Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2928 (ii).
——— Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
See 'Gaspereaux.'
Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act: Prop Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2718; (Mr. Turriff) 2730; (Mr. Warburton) 2735; (Mr. Daniel) 2746; (Mr. McCraney) 2756; (Mr. Crocket) 2761; (Mr. Richards) 2767; (Mr. Pugsley) 2768; (Mr. McKenzie) 2773; (Mr. Fraser) 2777; (Mr. Jameson) 2779; (Mr. Sproule) 2785; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2788 (ii).
Markham Post Office Site, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 99 (i).
——— Completion, and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 3137 (ii).
Martin Island, River Sydenham Protection Banks: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
Masset, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Matane Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Maxwell, Jessie Maud Mary: *See* 'B. No. 144.'
Mayes Contract, Charges against Min. of Pub. Works: Ques of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 589 (i).
See 'Bathurst,' &c.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Meat, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Member introduced, 413, 1001, 1731 (i).
Mercer, R. G., Apptmt. as Supt. of Ry. Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Merchants Bank of Canada, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Merchants and General Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Mergers, Investigation of: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates for 1909-10: Read (Mr. Speaker) 154 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates, 1910; Read (Mr. Speaker) 377 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).

Mess. from His Ex.: Suppl. Estimates, 1911: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7519 (v).
——— Internal Economy Commission: Read (Mr. Speaker) 97 (i).
——— Prorogation (Mr. Speaker) 8833 (v).
——— Supply Bill Read (Mr. Speaker) 5557 (iii).
Messenger in Aud. Gen.'s Office: *See* 'S. A. War.'
Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Meteghan River Breakwater, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Methylated Spirits: in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 849 (i).
See 'Race Track,' &c.
Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 783 (i).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Middle Island, Port Medway Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Middlesex, W., Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 413 (i).
Military Lands, Purchase of: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Militia Pension Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
MILITIA.
Airships, Development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 446, 1369 (i).
Annual Drill, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8564 (v).
Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 2288 (ii).
Armouries and Drill Halls, Contribution to Cost by Municipalities: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1534 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2119 (ii).
See 'Drill Halls.'
——— Man., Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 788 (i).
Armoury Grants: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Arms, &c., for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Army Service, Ottawa Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2289 (ii).
Artillery Horses, Purchased for Petawawa Camp, Govt. Policy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1371 (i).
Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Brandon Drill Hall, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5498 (iii).
Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5501 (iii).
Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land, Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2717 (ii).
See 'Frontenac.'
Charlottetown Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
De la Ronde, Major and Captain, Charges *re* Militia Frauds: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 135 (i), 2288 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 414 (i).
——— Rep. of Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5500 (iii).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Erection, Cost of Sites, Place for Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 1546 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 5689 (iii).
See 'Armouries.'
Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 636 (i).
Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay List: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Savard,' 'Scott,' &c.
Engineers Services *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).
Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transporting Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1017 (i).
Esquimalt Battery Guns, Cor. *re*, M. for Copy* (Mr. Barnard) 3170 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 633 (i).
——— Dismantling of, Imp. conc.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2292 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt.: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4311 (iii).
French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1371 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Frontenac County, Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 262 (i).

Garrison Artillery, Supply of Field Guns, &c.: Ques. dropped, 1790; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* asking by another Member, 1791; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1791, 1799 (i); Answered by Minister, 1800 (i).

Garrison Artillery Regiments, Number, Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).

——— Supply of 12-pounder Guns: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1593 (i).

Gratuities *re* Militia Services: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).

Guelph Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 8169 (v).

Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Observations of Sir Wm. White *re* Condition: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).

——— Stmnt. read (Sir Frederick Borden) 1961 (ii).

——— Protection *re* Deterioration: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1010 (i).

Halifax Harbour Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4714 (iii).

Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Imports of Military Clothing, &c.: M. for cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 3495 (ii).

Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).

See 'Artillery.'

Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).

Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1193 (i).

Kingston R. M. College: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).

See 'R. M. C.'

Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).

Militia Camps, Instructions to: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).

Militia Clerks, Apptmt. without Examination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1375 (i).

Militia Clothing, Fixed Life, Issue of New Material: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1018 (i), 2927 (ii).

Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 275 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).

Militia and Defence: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7767, 8573 (v).

Militia Expenditures *re* Fortifications, &c., Submission to Leader of Opposition: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1778 (i).

Militia Field Allowances, Expenses of Staff Officers: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1201 (i).

Militia Govt. Police *re* Armouries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).

Militia Harness and Saddlery, Tenders, &c., for 1909: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1780 (i).

Militia Inspection, Pay, Rates of to Inspectors: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).

Militia Medical Attendance, Govt. Allowance for Married Officers: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1595 (i).

Militia Pay and Aloowances, Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1377 (i).

Militia Properties: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).

Militia Provisions *re* Arms for active War Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 842 (i).

Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, Date of Issue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 639 (i).

Militia Uniforms, Clothing, Free Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2927 (ii).

See 'Highland,' &c.

Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1200 (i).

Monuments *re* Battlefields: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).

National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3671 (ii).

——— Total Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 787 (i).

Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate Grounds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).

Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5781 (iii).

Ottawa Militia Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).

——— Damage by Fire, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 386 (i).

——— Insurance *re* Fire: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 967-975 (i).

——— Instructions to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 837 (i).

——— Loss by Fire to Clothing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 845 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Pay and Allowances for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8559 (v).
Pay Lists of 18th Regt., Personations, &c.: Ques.(Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Permanent Force, Annual Cost per Man, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1013 (i).
——— Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1781 (i).
——— Increase of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
——— Number of Re-enlistments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3735 (ii).
——— Officers' Entertaining Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1530 (i).
——— Requirements *re* Instuctions, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1011 (i).
——— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1531 (i).
——— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4129 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 4129, 5279 (iii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Provisional School Allowances: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1019 (i).
Quebec Barracks for Permanent Corps: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
Quebec Citadel Drill Shed: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Allen) 1789 (i).
Quebec Militia Ordnance Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
Rifle Practices, Facilities *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).
Rifle Practices for Schools of Instruction at St. John: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 8561 (v).
Rifle Ranges in Regina for N. W. M. Police: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Rifle Shooting, Standard *re* Efficiency: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1595 (i).
Ross Rifle, Marks I and II**, Defects, Issue of, Contract re: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1532 (i).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, Ques. of Order *re* Answer of Minister (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).
——— Withdrawal by Minister, 1597 (i).
Ross Rifles, Mark II**, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
——— Number received, Contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5499 (iii).
——— Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 273 (i).
Ross Rifles, Dates of Issue of Special Marks: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 154 (i).
——— Distribution of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Hughes) 338 (i).
——— Regulation of National Rifle Ass'cn.: M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4519 (iii).
——— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 134 (i).
——— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn re Bisley Meet: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4082 (iii)
——— Weight of, &c.: Ques. Mr. Talbot) 8678 (v).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3491 (ii).
R.M.C. College Buildings, Change of Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 3169 (ii).
——— Servants' Quarters, Completion of, Total Cost, Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i), 5781 (iii).
——— Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 381 (i).
St. Johns, Que., Govt. Lands used by Militia, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Hughes) 3494 (ii).
——— Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3738 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Savard, Lt.-Col., 18th Regt., Retention of Moneys from Capt. Talbot: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8658 (v).
——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (v).
Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
——— Resignation from 18th Regiment,. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8109 (v).
Stanley Barracks, Purchase of Land *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
Sub-Target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment *re* Allowances for 1907: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
Tents, Average Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
Topographical Surveys, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1375 (i).
Toronto Barracks, Disposal of Site on Humber River: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3167 (ii).
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1777 (i).
Milk Standards, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
Milk Tests and Glassware: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Milledgeville-Holderville, N.B., Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).
Miminegash Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 336 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Public Gifts, Acceptance of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).
Minnedosa Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Mint, Royal, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 103 (i).
See 'Ottawa Mint.'
Mira River Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7507 (v).
Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1200 (i).
Moncton Cut-Off, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
—— Locomotive and Carshops: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Mond Nickel Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Monopolies, Investigation of: See 'B. No. 101.'
Montebello Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Montreal Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5498 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Montreal Post Office and Postal Stations, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1581 (i).
Montreal Postal Station 'D': in Com. of Sup., 703 (i).
Montreal River, Contract *re* Improvements, Name, Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1014 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Stmnt. of Expenditure, Indebtedness, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1580 (i).
Monuments *re* Battlefields: in Com. of Sup. 8575 (v).
Monuments, Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6099 (iv).
Morrisburg Ferry and Dock Co.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Motions to Adjn., Rulings of Mr. Speaker: Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 126 (i).
Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1600 (i).
Motors injuring People: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Motors, 'Use of' and 'Joy Rides': *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Mounted Police Barracks, Calgary, Application *re* Transfer to Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1206 (i).
Mounted Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Saskatchewan, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
Mounted Police Force, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
—— Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Lourier) 1730 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7510 (v).
Mudie, Allen R., and Thos. G. Warwick, Claims *re* Section 24-38-10, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lake) 1022 (i).
Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Go. Taylor) 3294 (ii).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Music, Copyright of: *See* 'B. No. 41.'

Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Napanee River Dredging: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1022 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).
——— Dredging for coming Season: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1194 (i).
Natashquan Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
National Anthem, Singing *re* Naval Debate: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3208 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3671 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 787 (i).
National Park, Sask., Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 790 (i).
National Resources Commission, Names of Members, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY.
Accidents, Circular *re* Explosives: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 4512 (iii).
Adjustment of Disputed Item, ref. to in Letter of Aud. Gen., O.C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 3495 (ii).
Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 164 (i).
——— Board of Arbitrators, Names, Contractors' Claims *re* Over-Classification: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 836 (i).
Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden: (M.) Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 2330, 2949 (ii).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel *re* Lumsden Charges: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4070; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).
——— Letters of Aud. Gen., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 386 (i).
——— Letter to Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i)
——— Letter to Prime Minister: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 448, 622 (i).
——— Meeting of Com.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3480 (ii).
——— on Order being called for Com.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2189 (ii).
——— Payments of Counsel Fees: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).
——— Payment of Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8841 (v).
NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY—*Con.*
——— on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden 697 (i).
——— Classification, Lumsden Charges, Rep., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr.R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
——— Return, Arrangement of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
——— Resignation: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 258 (i).
——— Printing of Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 377 (i).
——— Delay in Printing Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1302 (i).
——— Classification, 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com.: (Mr. Lennox) Notice of M. to consider, 5820 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Lennox) to consider, 6015 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).
——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5196 (iii).
——— Error in Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5277 (ii).
——— Changes in Report: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5562; on M. for Sup., (Mr. Barker) 5570 (iii).
Commissioners' Rep., Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 622 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3682
——— M. to print (Mr. Graham) 97 (i).
Commissioners, Profits *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3165 (ii).
Commission, McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c., Certificate: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Lennox) 1686 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
Commissioners, Number of Members, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 630 (i).
Construction, prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, on M. for Sup. 8242 (amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).
Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii), 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
——— Names of Contractors, Estimated Expenditures, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
——— Provision *re* Forfeits, corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 447 (i).
Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4516 (iii).
Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 165 (i).
——— Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 164 (i).

NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY—*Con.*
Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F': Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2285 (ii).
Hodgins, Major, Name of Ass't. Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3491 (ii).
Objections *re* Classifications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3169 (ii).
O'Brien & Fowler, Contract to, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2715, 3490, 3291 (ii).
Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2283 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6392 (iv).
Tenders *re* St. Boniface Shop: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8835 (v).
Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
Wheat Shipments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1206 (i).
Winnipeg and Lake Superior Division, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 165, (i); 2284 (ii).
Naturalization Act: in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv).
Natural Resources, Conservation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 84, 115 and 185.' *See* 'Conservation.'
Naufrage Pond, Protecting Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Naval Cadets, Instructions *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1971 (ii).
Naval Defence Conference, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6 (i).
—— Information from New Zealand: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 623 (i).
Naval Service of Canada, Establishment B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1° m., 1732 (i).
Debate:
(Mr. R. L. Borden) 1738; (Mr. Jameson) 1762; (Mr. Monk) 1769; (i)); 2° m. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2952 (ii).
Debate:
(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2979; (amt.) 2991; (Mr. Monk) 2991; (Sir Frederick Borden) 3002; (Mr. Lemieux) 3023; (Mr. Middlebro) 3210; (Mr. Fowke) 3236; (Mr. Burrell) 3245; (Mr. Clark) 3269; (Mr. Sproule) 3281; (Sir Frederick Borden) 3296; (Mr. Foster) 3344; (Mr. Macdonald) 3386, 3575; (Mr. Roche) 3619; (Mr. Sealey) 3649; (Mr. Goodeve) 3659; (Mr. Beauparlant) 3683; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3697; (Mr. Congdon) 3720, 3748; (Mr. Hughes) 3760; (Mr. H. H. McLean) 3798; (Mr. Broder) 3822; (Mr. Warburton) 3946; (Mr. Cowan) 3962; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 3982 (ii); 3987 (iii); (Mr. Schaffner) 4012; (Mr. Rivet) 4036; (Mr. Edwards) 4064, 4083; (Mr. Béland) 4108; (Mr. Doherty) 4125, 4129; (Mr. Turgeon) 4161; (Mr. Barnard) 4182; (Mr. Devlin) 4197, 4316; (Mr. Magrath) 4328; (Mr. McKenzie) 4343 (Mr. Daniel) 4367; (Mr. Verville) 4383; (Mr. Best) 4392; (Mr. Demers) 4396; (Mr. Lewis) 4403; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4413; (Mr. Armstrong) 4423; (Mr. Geoffrion) 4444; (Mr. Blondin) 4453; (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4457; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4475; (Mr. Boyer) 4490; (Mr. Nantel) 4535; (Mr. C. Roy) 4570; (Mr. Crothers) 4583; (Mr. Dubeau) 4611; (Mr. Donnelly) 4618; (Mr. G. A. Turcotte) 4622; (Mr. Porter) 4639; (Mr. E. Roy) 4667; (Mr. E. Paquet) 4678; (Mr. Lachance) 4848; (Mr. Perley) 4863; (Mr. Crocket) 4873; (Mr. McAllister) 4879; (Mr. Herron) 4888; (Mr. J. Turcotte) 4893; (Mr. Marshall) 4910; (Mr. Molloy) 4913; (Mr. Clare) 4922; (Mr. Neely) 4931; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4947, (Mr. Gervais) 4951; (Mr. Wm. R. Smyth) 4975; (Mr. Gladu) 4983; (Mr. Beattie) 4989; (Mr. Séguin) 4991; (Mr. Emmerson) 5003; (Mr. Lancaster) 5016; (Mr. Lalor) 5031; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5042; (Mr. Lortie) 5069; (Mr. Owen) 5079; (Mr. Proulx) 5082; (Mr. Meighen) 5081; (Mr. MacNutt) 5091; Amt. (Mr. Monk) Neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095; (Mr. Thoburn) 5097; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101; (Mr. Northrup) 5102; (Amt.) 5107; Neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191; 2° agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5193; (Mr. Staples) 5133; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5142; (Mr. Wallace) 5149; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 5152; (Mr. Lake) 5158; (Mr. Campbell) 5175 (iii).
In Committee:
(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Amt., 7393-7495; (Mr. Sproule) 7396; (Mr. Northrup) 7396-7495; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7396-7495; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7398; (Mr. Hughes) 7399; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7400; (Mr. Aylesworth) 7403; (Mr. Congdon) 7417; (Mr. Lancaster) 7418; (Mr. Doherty) 7419; (Mr. Daniel) 7434; (Mr. Blain) 7435; (Sir Frederick Borden) 7440; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7441; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7442; (Mr. H. H. McLean) 7443; (Mr. Boyce) 7444; (Mr. Armstrong) 7452; (Mr. J. Haggart) 7454; (Mr. Fielding) 7467; (Mr. Burrell) 7472; (Mr. Macdonald) 7474; (Mr. Edwards) 7481; 3° m., 7528 Agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7590; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7528; (Sir Frederick Borden) 7529; (Mr. Fielding) 7536; (Mr. Burrell) 7540; (Mr. Cowan) 7543; (Mr. Bristol) 7544, 7567; (Mr. Middlebro) 7545 (v).
Naval Defence Bill: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 520, 1100, 1600 (i).
—— on Order for Com.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 6948 (iv).

Naval Defence, Personal Eplanation (Mr. Edwards) *re* 'Globe' report, 4533 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) *re* Sir Frederick Borden's Speech, correction, &c., 4710 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) *re* 'Round Robin,' 4305 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Rutan) 5002 (iii).
—— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 855 (i).
Naval Defence, Further Documents: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2797 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2931 (ii).
Naval Defence, Land Available for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1367 (i).
Naval Defence Programme, List of Experts, Technical Adviser, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1546 (i).
Naval Service of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Naval Service Appointments, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8838 (v).
—— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8495 (v).
—— Number of Applicants, Policy of Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
—— Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Expenditure *re* 'upkeep,' &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3738 (ii).
See 'Niobe.'
Naval Service Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).
See 'Wireless.'
Naval Ships, Purchase by Govt., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1972 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Nechaco and Stewart River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Negro Clergyman in House: *See* 'Parliamentary Corridors.'
Neguac Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Nelson River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
New Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
New London Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 98 (i).
—— Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3395 (ii).
Newspaper Despatches from England, Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Newspaper, List *re* Advertising Public Works: Remarks: (Mr. Blain) 6141 (iv), 8818 (v); List read (Mr. Pugsley) 8825 (v).
Newspaper Postage to U.S., Classification, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1973 (ii).
New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 788 (i), 3169 (ii).
New Westminster, P.O., B.C., Basis of Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
New Westminster Penitentiary Fish Contract: *See* 'Penitentiary.'
New York State Canals, Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens: Read (Mr. Perley) 5625 (iii).
—— Reciprocal Use of by Canadians: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).
—— Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4128 (iii).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7511, 8169 (v).
Nickel Deposits in Canada, Control of by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Conmee) 2490 (ii).
Nickel Mines in Canada, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson *re* Control by Americans: Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2189 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Nicoll, Emily Maud, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 222.'
'Niobe,' Purchase of, without Parliamentary Authority: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3481 (ii).
Nitinat Lake Outlet, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Nootka Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 850 (i).
—— Payments to, for 1908-9. Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 2718 (ii).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at The Hague, Counsel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims for Moneys, Fiat, &c. granted: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 640 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 644 (i).
—— Pet. of Right, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1547 (i).
North Bay Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
—— Inspector: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

N.E. ¼ Section, Section 11, Sale and Refunds, &c.: M. For Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5502 (iii).
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Northern Mortgage Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Northport Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2711 (ii).
See 'Arctic.'
North Saskatchewan River, Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4273 (iii).
North Sydney Immigration Shed: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
North Thompson Valley Telegraph Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
North Toronto Free Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4077 (iii).
——— Names of Employees, Total Expenses *re* Operating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4078 (iii).
Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53 and 54, Terms of Sale: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1373 (i).
Norway Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
N.S. Representation in H. of C., Amt. in B. N.A. Act: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
Nyanza Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Oakville Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).
Oaths: *See* 'B. Nos. 1 and 100.'
Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill,' &c.
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
Offences against the Person: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Oka Indians, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).
Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* Drainage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 8582 (v).
Okanagan Lake Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.'
Old Age Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
See 'Finance.'
Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 108 (i).
See 'Hestia.'
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Order, Ques. of (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Speaking in Com., 4798; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4798 (iii).
Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate Grounds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
Ordnance Militia Stores Building, Instruction to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 837 (i).
Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5781 (iii).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Ore, Theft of: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Original Construction, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2289 (ii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Allotted Space, Number of Occupants, Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 623 (i).
——— Design Competition: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6180 (iv).
——— Sussex Street, Architect's Plans: in Com. of Sup., 7166 (iv).
——— (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1009 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa City Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).
——— New: in Com. of Sup., 548 (i).
Ottawa Electoral District, Pet., Judgment *re*: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission: *See* 'B. No. 230.'
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8662 (v).
Ottawa Militia Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Ottawa Mint, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
See 'Mint.'
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
See 'Committee,' 6605 (iv).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Ottawa Parliament Grounds Driveway: in Com. of Sup., 8173, 8191 (v).
Ottawa Printing Bureau Building: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation in the House of Commons : Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).
—— Decision of Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 413 (i).
—— Cor. in Toronto 'World': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 521 (ii).
—— Ques. *re* Disposal of Protests by Speaker, 802 (i).
—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted (Mr. Speaker) 833 (i).
—— Prime Minister's Resignation : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1446 (i).
—— Resignation of Prime Minister, 1689 (i).
—— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1729 (i).
Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 183.'
Ottawa River Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Ottawa River Water Storage Dams: in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Ottawa Standardizing Building: in Com. of Sup., 572 (i).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Ottawa Victoria Museum: in Com. of Sup., 566 (i).
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owl's Head Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Oyamel Co., Payments to *re* Tamarack Wood: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870, 8834 (v).
Oyster Barrels: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Parker's Cove Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Parkhill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Parliamentary Corridors, Coloured Clergyman ejected: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 7182 (iv).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 1 (i).
Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
Parry Sound Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i), 5758 (iii).
Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).
Patents, Relief Bills: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Paterson, Mr. T. and J. F. Sibbard, Claims *re* Section 16-30-9: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lake) 1686 (i).
Patronage Distribution: Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 3134 (ii).
See 'Party.'
Partridge Island Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 595 (i), 3450 (ii).
Patrol Vessels for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
Patronage List and Tory Whip, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Blain) 7070 (iv).
Party Patronage, System: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2432 (ii).
—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 1792 (i).
—— on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2151 (ii).
See 'Patronage.'
Paspebiac Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Paul, Mr. William, Purchase from by Govt. of Gasolene Boat: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1975 (ii).
Pay and Allowances for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8559 (v).
Pay-lists of 18th Regiment, Personations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1376, 1535 (i).
Peace River Country, Portions opened up for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4313 (iii).
—— Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2924 (ii).
Peat Bogs, Operation: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Peat Testing Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Peigan Indian Reserve, Disposal of Sale of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 172 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1801 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6936 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).
Pembina River Fishing Regulations : Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Pender Island Canal, Cost, Length, Depth, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2427 (ii).
Penitentiary at New Westminster, Contract *re* Fish Supply: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7516 (v).
Pension Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.
See 'Finance.'
Pension Fund of Merchants Bank: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Pensions *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Pensions to Militia: *See* 'B. No. 194.'

Permanent Corps, Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1781 (i).
—— Annual Cost Per Man, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1013 (i).
—— Number of Re-enlistments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3735 (ii).
—— Officers' Entertaining Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1530 (i).
—— Requirements *re* Instructions, Payments, &c., Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1011 (i).
—— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1531 (i).
—— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266, 843 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4129 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 5279 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Petit Rocher Roadway: in Com. of Sup., 3396 (ii).
Petit Saguenay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Petroleum, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Petroleum Fields in N. W., Royalty Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
Petroleum Locations on Athabasca River, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3493 (ii).
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Piche Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Picnic Islands Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Pictou Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i)
Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3489 (i).
Pilotage Dues: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Pilots' Association Fund, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 7517 (v).
Pincher Creek Sub-land Agency: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8840 (v).
Pinckney Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pine Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8816 (v).
Pine Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Pink Rock Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).
—— Ownership: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) *re* Par. in 'Globe,' 3476 (ii).
—— Par. in 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3739 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3744 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i).
Pintsch Gas Apparatus, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Pioneers Loan Co.: *See* 'B. No. 211.'
Piper's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pitt Meadows, B.C., Lease of Land on Special Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 274 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 704 (i).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Pointe Bleue Indian Agent, W. Donohue, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Pointe du Chene, N.B., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Political Literature franked by Sol. Gen.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).
See 'Franking.'
Polytechnic School, Montreal: in Com. of Sup., 8822 (v).
Population, Method of Estimating *re* Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 4846 (iii).
Porcher Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6507 (iv).
Port Arthur Dry Dock, Applications *re* Subsidy: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3136 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5003 (iii).
See 'Dry Docks,' &c.
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5729, 6101 (iv).
See 'Fort William,' &c.
Port Bruce Harbour: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
—— Total Expenditure from 1904-9: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Officials: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).
—— Expenditure *re* Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3295 (ii).
—— Right of Way, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8661 (v).
Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).

Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
Port Dufferin Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4082 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4513 (iii).
—— Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hope Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Joly Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
Port Maitland Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
Port Malcolm Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
Port Moody Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Port Selkirk Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Port Stanley Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).
Post Office Act (inspectors' salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Post Office Act Amt. Bill: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6955 (iv).
POST OFFICE.
'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).
Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1020 (i).
Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
Blairmore Station Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7871 (v).
Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5778 (iii).
—— Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4313 (iii).
Camborne Postmaster, B. C., Pet. *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1016 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 2713 (ii).
Campbellford Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (iii).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).
Central Park Postal Service, B.C., Date of Discontinuance, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2293 (ii).
—— Pets. *re* Closing; Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
—— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
Charleston or Kelmont P.O., Pets. *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 2150 (ii).
'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4517 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Herron) 5894 (iii).
—— P. M. G.'s Answers: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8818 (v).
Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 3136 (ii).
Delisle Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3293 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1009 (i).
Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Offices, Revenue per Month, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1590 (i).
Frontenac County Mail Contracts, Route, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5105 (iii), 7066 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
Gowganda Junction Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Grenville Station to Grenville Village, Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 131 (i).
Grimsby Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i); 8814 (v).
Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3483 (ii).
Holland Post Office Postal Boxes: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7865; 7881 (v).
Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Kilmant & Shacleton, Application *re* Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Lachute Post Office, Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 3137 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 641 (i).
—— Total Revenue for ten months, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3933 (ii).
—— Cor., Reps. &c. with Depts.: M. for copies* (Mr. Magrath) 1330 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Magrath) 3682 (ii).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Magrath) 8855 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 582, 941 (i); 7781 (v).
Latellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 7290 (iv).
Macleod Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
Mails between G.B. and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 5501 (iii).
Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8581 (v).
Mail Contracts, Advertising, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).
Mail Contracts with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1379 (i).
Mail Delivery Free, Closing of Distribution Offices: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
Mail Matter, Free Delivery to Street Address: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7869 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8118 (v).
Mail Privileges to Members *re* Postal Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2146 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii); 8808 (v).
Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).
Markham Post Office Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 3137 (ii).
Mercer, R. G., Apptmt. as Supt. of Ry. Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Milledgeville-Holderville, N.B. Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Montreal Post Office and Postal Stations, Reps. &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1581 (i).
Montreal Postal Station 'D': in Com. of Sup., 703 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
New Westminster, P.O., B.C., Basis of Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
North Bay Post Office Inspector: Remarks (Mr. G. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
North Toronto Free Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Parry Sound Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Arthur) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i); 5758 (iii).
Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).
Postal Regulations during Recess of Parlt.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2486 (ii).
Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., where situated, Number accommodated, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 447 (i).
Postal Violations, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2292 (ii).
Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 267 (i).
Post Office Buildings, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Post Office Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
—— Outside Service Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii); 7863 (v).
Post Offices opened on Sundays to Boxholders: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
—— Stmnt.: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 3672 (ii). *See* 'Winnipeg.'
Post Offices, Closing on Sundays, Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2931 (ii).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
Post Offices Generally, Policy of Building: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 683 (i).
Post Office Guide, Index, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increase, Pets. *re* Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3167 (ii).
Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5779 (iii).
Post Office Mail Contracts, Advertising, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).
Post Offices opened in 1909, Dom. and Weekly Mails, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 625 (i).
Post Office Parcel Delivery, Signing for, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3682 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Post Office Promotional Examinations, 1908, Accepted Answer to Question 4: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2290 (ii).
Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 108 (i).
Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carrière) 6390 (iv).
Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 6941 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6390 (iv).
—— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5106 (iii).
—— Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6958 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6678 (iv).
River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1380 (i).
Rivière du Loup and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 630 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, Change in Design of Box: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1783 (i).
—— List of Routes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1380 (i).
—— Locks furnished Patrons: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
—— Method, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
—— Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 259 (i).
—— Stmnt. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
St. Catherines Bay and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
St. Charles, Man., Post Office Establishment of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Staples) 3682 (ii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3936 (ii).
Salmon River Post Office, Vacancy *re* Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2929 (ii).
Scotsburn-Loganville, Mail Contract, Aptmt. of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2290 (ii).
Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Sydney, N.S., Free Mail Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1014 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 1022 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137
Toronto Sub-post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Tourists' Post Offices, Number temporarily established, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 170 (i).
Troy, Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7288 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1373 (i).
Williamsville Post Office, Revenue, Pets. *re* removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7287 (iv).
Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2930, 3168 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 3134 (ii).
—— *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Answer, 3484, 3672 (ii).
See 'Post Offices, &c.'
Potatoes, Sale and Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Potvin, P. A., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4519 (iii).
Powassan—Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 108 (i).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 432 (i).
Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. Bench: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 3489 (ii).
Press Despatches from England, Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4712-13 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R., Judgments, Reps *re* Libel Suits: M. for Copy (Mr. McKenzie) 656 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
P. E. I. Ry., Branch through New London, Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 5500 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry., Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3063 3102 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch Survey: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7518 (v).
——— Royal Junction, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3170 (ii).
——— West Shore Extension, Memorials, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Richards) 5501 (iii).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorials, Surveys *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 277 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Change of Route, &c.: M. for Cor., 3171 (ii).
Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8809 (v).
'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 8238 (v).
Pringle, Cecilia Marie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Printing Outside of Govt. Bureau, Payments re &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 414 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2713 (ii).
Printing, &c., *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 8493 (v).
Printing and Stationery, Dept. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7287 (iv).
Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Private Bills, Consideration of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8364, 8380 (v).
——— M. to extend time: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1597 (i).
——— Suspension of Rules: M. (Mr. Miller) 8361 (v).
See 'Bills,' 'Senate Amts.'
Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).
Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Legal Work to Toronto Lawyers, 8362 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Barker) *re* Par. in Toronto 'World,' *re* Salary to Leader of Opposition, 6612 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of *re* Interrupting Mr. Clare *re* debate on Naval Bill (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5200 (iii).
Privilege, Ques, of *re* 'Globe's Rep. of Prime Minister's Speech (Mr. Lake) 2430 (ii).
Proportional Representation in the House of Commons: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 136 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 429 (i).
See 'Representation,' &c.
Prorogation: Mess. from His Ex., 8857 (v).
——— Round Robin *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4305 (iii).
Protection Piers, along Lake Fronts: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Protection Service, Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8509 (v).
Protectorate Life Ins. Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Providence Bay, Manitoulin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Provincial Boundaries Extensions, Notice to Provs. of N.B. and N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3166 (ii).
Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8546 (v).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602; Amt. (Mr. Blain) 612 (i).
Public Accounts Com. and N. T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Counsel by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5502 (iii).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Public Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
Public Works Health Act: in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
PUBLIC WORKS:
Annapolis Harbour Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
Arichat Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).
Athabasca River Channel, Removing Boulders, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Athalmer Wharf, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Aylmer Post Office, Additions: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Aylmer Wharf, Lake Deschenes: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Bamfield Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Bathurst Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).
See 'Loggie.'
Bathurst Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4311 (iii).
Bayside Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Beaumarais Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
Bécancour River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3865, 3875 (ii).
Belfast, Pier, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Belle River Harbour, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).
Black Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bluff Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bout de l'Ile Bridge, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. Séguin) 6394 (iv).
Breen's Pond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bridges, Dominion Traffic: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
—— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
B.C., Expenditures by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).
Brockville Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Brooklyn Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).
Brudenell Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Brulé Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Buctouche Channel Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Buildings, Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 596 (i).
—— Que. Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
See general heading.
Burk's Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com., of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Byng Inlet Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Cabano Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup. 3878 (ii).
Campbell River Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Cap à l'Aigle Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3881 (ii).
Cape Bald Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
Cap de Chatte Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3888 (ii).
Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Carleton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).
Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Central Economy Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Centreville Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
—— Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 978 (i).
Chance Harbour Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Chapeau Bridge, Culbute Canal, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Chapel Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).
Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).
Chicoutimi Public Building, Ground Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).
Chilliwack River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).
China Point Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Christian Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).
Clear Lake, Application to raise Water Level, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3495 (ii).
Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 1372 (i).
Collingwood Harbour Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4277 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Contrecoeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3889 (ii).
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4291 (iii).
Cove Head Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Creosoted Timber for Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Dalhousie Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2707 (ii).
—— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).
David's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Deep Brook Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delap's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delorey's Beach Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Digby Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).
Digby Harbour Piers: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
—— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).
Digby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Diligent River Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
Dorchester Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3890 (ii).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3159 (ii).
Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 3944 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 3986 (iii).
Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6508 (iv).
Dredging, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
—— Plant, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4777 (iii).
Dredging, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6137 (iv).
—— Plant, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging, Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4780 (iii).
—— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4738, 5608 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
—— Repairs to Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
Dredging, Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii).
—— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Dredging Plant, Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 4759 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging Inspection on Public Works: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).
Dredging Plant, St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Dublin Shore Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments to by Pub. Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2717 (ii).
Eastern Passage Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Father Point Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).
Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).
Fiddler's Elbow, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup.. 3833 (ii).
Fighting Island Channel Improvements: Remarks (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 3860 (ii).
Fort George Canyon Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Fort William Wharf, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Fox Island Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Fraser River, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2487 (ii).
Fraserville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Fredericton Building, Pavements: in Com. of Sup., 581 (i).
Gaspé Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3892 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging, Total Payments for Mar. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2487 (ii).
—— Demand for Papers read by Minister (Mr. Crocket) 2489 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Gimli Wharf Extension: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Godfroy Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Grand Bend Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Grand Mechin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3900 (ii).
Grand Mère Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6799 (iv).
Grande Rivière (Gaspé) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
Grande Vallée Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3904 (ii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Contracts on Kaministiquia River: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3484 (ii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Gulf Shore Breakwaters: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6798 (iv).
Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1206 (i).
Habitant River Wharf at Canning: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Haggerty's Wharf Pier Head: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Haileybury Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3672 (ii).
Halifax Dom. Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 574 (i).
Hampton Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: *See* general heading.
Harrington Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (v).
Hartland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Hawkesbury Bridge, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
Hecla Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 587 (i).
Ile Verte Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Inverness Broad Cove Mines Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4513 (iii).
Joggins Mines Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Judique Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i)
Juniper Island, Stoney Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Kamouraska Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Kemptville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Kensington Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
—— Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1783 (i), 1970 (ii),
—— Repairs, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3736 (ii).
—— Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Debate on Budget, 2106 (ii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7504 (v).
Kingsport Breakwater: in Com. of Sup. 995 (i).
Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i).
Kingston Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
Kouchibouguac Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
Lachine Post Office, Tower Clock: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachine Public Building, Heating Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachute Public Building, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3483 (ii); Remarks (Mr. Perley) 5689 (iii).
LaHave River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Aylmer Wharf, Stratford Centre: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 850 (i).
Lake Nipissing Water Level, Claims for Damages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4517 (iii).
Lake Winnipeg Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
L'Ange Gardien Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Laprairie Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Latchford Dam, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 3165 (ii).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
Leitche's Creek Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lennox Island Indian Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).
Lennox Island, Port Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Leonardville, Deer Island Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Le Petit Debarquement: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Lévis Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Lewes and Yukon River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).
Lillooet River Obstructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).
Lion's Head Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
Liscombe Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
Litchfield Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little Anse Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little River Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Little Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Lockport, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5622 (iii).
See 'Gaspereaux.'
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Lower Argyle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
McGregor's Creek Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
McNair's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Mace's Bay Pier-head: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Main-à-Dieu Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (ii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Maritime Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
—— Date of Work at Gaspereaux, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2928 (ii).
See 'Gaspereaux.'
Markham Post Office Building Site, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 99 (i).
Martin Island, River Sydenham Protection Banks: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
Masset, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Matane Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Meteghan River Breakwater, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley): in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 783 (i).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Middle Island, Port Medway Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Miminegash Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Minnedosa Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Mira River Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 999 (ii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7507 (v).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Montebello Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7510 (v).
Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3294 (ii).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2908 (ii).
Napanee River, Dredging for coming Season: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1194 (i).
Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Napanee River Dredging: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1022 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).
Natashquan Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
Naufrage Pond, Protecting Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Nechaco and Stewart River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Neguac Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
New Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
New London Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3395 (ii).
Newspapers, List *re* Advertising Public Works: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 8818; List read (Mr. Pugsley) 8825 (v).
See 'Public Works—Advertising.'
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7511, 8169 (v).
Nitinat Lake Outlet, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Nootka Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
North Bay Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
Northport Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
North Saskatchewan River, Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4273 (iii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4077 (iii).
——— Names of Employees, Total Expenses *re* Operating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4078 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Norway Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Nyanza Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Oakville Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).
Okanagan Lake Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).
Ottawa City Buildings, Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 536 (i).
——— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
——— Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
——— Departl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5106 (iii).
——— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 571 (i).
——— Govt. Building (Y. M. C. A.) Taxes, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1009 (i).
——— Heating and Lighting Contracts in Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
——— Labour Dept., Rent of Y. M. C. A. Building: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 627 (i).
——— Langevin Block, Boilers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).
——— National Art Gallery, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
——— Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 557 (i).
——— Mint, Royal, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 103 (i).
——— Rideau Hall Furniture: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 8742 (v).
——— Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (v).
——— Steps and Walks to House of Commons, Matting Covering: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 448 (i).
——— Ventilation of House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).
——— Victoria Museum Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
——— Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 130 (i).
Ottawa River Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Ottawa River Water Storage Dams: in Com of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owl's Head Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Parker's Cove Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Parkhill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Parrsboro' Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
Partridge Island Quarantine Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Paspebiac Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Petit Rocher Roadway: in Com. of Sup., 3396 (ii).
Petit Saguenay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Piché Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Picnic Islands Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Pictou Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3489 (ii).
Pine Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8816 (v).
Pinckney Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pink Rock Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).
See general heading.
Piper's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 704 (i).
Pointe du Chene, N.B., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Porcher Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6507 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 6101 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure from 1904-9: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
Port Dufferin Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4082 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
——— Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4513 (iii).
Port Hope Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Joly, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
Port Maitland Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
Port Malcolm Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
Port Moody Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Port Selkirk Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Protection Piers along Lake Fronts: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Providence Bay, Manitoulin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Public Works Advertising, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 8118 (v).
See 'Newspapers.'
Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i).
——— Employees during Ottawa Bye-Election Campaign: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2489 (ii).
——— Engineering Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
——— Engineers, Number of Residents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2293 (ii).
——— Engineers, Inspectors, &c., Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).
Public Works Generally in Prov. of Quebec, Uselessness of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3865 (ii).
Public Works Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Quebec East (St. Roch) Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 828 (i).
Quebec, Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 824 (i).
——— Detention Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Harbour, Levis, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec, Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
—— Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
—— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Queen Charlotte City Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Red Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7871, 8237 (v).
Red River Protection Channel: in Com. of Sup., 4266 (iii).
Restigouche River Bridge, Metapedia: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Richibucto Cape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3428, 3438 (ii).
Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).
Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8814 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere du Loup Wharf Renewals: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 114 (i).
Rivière aux Vases Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Rock Island Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (iii).
Rustico Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4263 (iii).
St. Andrew's Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
St. Andrew's Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
St. Andre de Kamouraska Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Ste. Anne des Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Charles de Caplan Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4234 (iii).
St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
Ste. Croix Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. Denis Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 110 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. John, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
—— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii), 6106 (iv).
—— Wharf Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3451 (ii).
St. John River Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).
St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 154 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 6394 (iv).
St. Joseph de Sorel Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Expenditure re: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1195 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 8522 (v).
—— Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 841 (i).
—— Expenditure *re* Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3168 (ii).
—— Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 841 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel at Kingston, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).
St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 5931 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Ste. Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 787 (i).
Sackville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).
Saguenay River Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
—— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Saw Pit Block and Span Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Seal Cove, Grand Manan Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).
Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).
Serpentine River Navigation: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4304 (iii).
Shawinigan Falls: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
Shediac Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).
Shelburne Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Shigawake Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
Shippigan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Sibley Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Skeena River Improvements, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Paysheets, &c.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).
Slides and Booms—Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, Breakwater, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Sorel Yard Property Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Souris Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
Souris, Knight's Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
South Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
South Ingonish Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Spallumcheen River Bank Protection Works in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Spanish Ship Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid *re* Public Works, Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Stewart Wharf, Portland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).
Summerside Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Summerside Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Swim's Point, Approach to Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Sydney Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Tadousac Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Tenecape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
'The Wharfs' Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Thornbury Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Three-Fathom Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (iii).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv).
Tignish Protection Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Toney River Channel Protection: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
—— Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3676 (ii).
—— M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3495 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3735 (ii).
—— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr J. D. Reid) 2929 (ii).
Tracadie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Traynor's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Tusket Wedge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Washabuck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 8185 (v).
Vancouver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Vaudreuil Cove Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Victoria Harbour, B.C., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii)., 6123 (iv).
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
West Advocate Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
West Baccaro Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
West Dublin Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
Westport Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Weymouth Port Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).
Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 260 (i).
Wharfs transferred to P.W. Dept., Revenue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Whitby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).
Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3486 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8179 (v).
Wiarton Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Winnipeg Beach Harbour, Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (iii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7289 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Winnipeg Wharfs, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).
Wolfe Island Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Yakoun River Obstruction, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Yamaska and Richelieu Surveys *re* Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5720, 5724 (iii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Pulp Co., Chicoutimi, Tolls paid *re* Saguenay Booms: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7871 (v).
Pulp and Pulpwood Exports from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 836 (i).
Pulpwood Exportation, Notice of Motion: Remarks (Mr. German) 3986 (iii).
Pure Foods, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2429, 3292 (ii).
Quarantine Inspectors, Apptmts. of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
Quarantine Inspectors for Frontier, Cor. *re* Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1208 (i), 5561 (iii).
Quarantine Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv), 7766 (v).
Quebec, Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Quebec Barracks for Permanent Corps: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Quebec Bridge, Board of Engineers, Additions, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 103 (i).
—— Consideration to Quebec Bridge Co. *re* Franchise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 260 (i).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3070 (ii), 8821 (v).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s Finances at time of Collapse, Payment to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3485 (ii).
—— Payments by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 628 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Criticism in 'Scientific American' *re* Plans: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 3390 (ii).
—— Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1969 (ii).
—— Tenders for New Piers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 840 (i).
—— Total Cost, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1205 (i).
Quebec Canals, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).
Quebec Citadel Drill Shed: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3486 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 4315 (iii).
Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Allen) 1789 (i).
Quebec Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 824 (i).
Quebec Detention Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec East (St. Roch) Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 828 (i).
Quebec Fisheries and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6940 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, Lévis, Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6178 (iv).
Quebec Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).

Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carrière) 6390 (iv).
Quebec Militia Ordnance Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Provincial Immigrant Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 926, 959 (i).
Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Invasion of, Protection: Ques. (Mr. J. P Turcotte) 7513 (v).
Quebec Superior Court, Montreal, Number of Cases standing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1369 (i).
Quebec Water Lots, Sale of, to Private individulas, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 430 (i).
Queen Charlotte City Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 6941 (iv).
Questions standing as Notices of Motions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6941 (iv).
Questions withdrawn, Procedure *re*: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1799 (i).
Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2926 (ii).
Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4532 (iii).
Race Tack Gambling: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Race Track Gambling B. 6: Ques. of Order *re* Translation of Evidence: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6404; agreed to (Y. 99; N. 55) 6405 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) *re* Letter of Minister of Justice, 6715 (iv).
Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 3. 4. 5, 24, 39, 48, 53, 66, 104, 145, 174.'
Railway Appeals from Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Ry. Belt, B.C., Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 187.'
Ry. Commission, Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Ry. Commission, Jurisdiction: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Ry. Contracts with Municipalities: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Ry. Employees, Right to Vote: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Railways and Fires: *See* 'B. No. 48,'
Ry. Labourers' Pay: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Railways, Locations of, without Consent: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Ry. Mail Service, Superintendents: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Railway Operators' Hours: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Railway Rates, Commutation Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Railways, Speed of Trains over Level Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Ry. Subsidies from Municipalities: *See* B. No. 5.'
Railway Subsidies. *See* 'B. No. 226.'
Railway Act Amt. Bills: Delay in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 925 (i).
Railway Rep. of Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7190 (iv).
Railway Committee: M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8374 (v).
—— Rules *re* Bills: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 8833 (v).
Railway Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6390 (iv).
—— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5106 (iii).
—— Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6958 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 678 (iv).
Railway Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 378 (i).
RAILWAYS:
Alien Labourers on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievances *re* Operation by G.T.Ry., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 192 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 5.'
B. C. Ry. Belt, Claims *re* Streams, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
B. C. Ry. Subsidies, Particulars *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5929 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewals: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3735 (ii).
Canadian Northern Railway, Claims *re* Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) on M. for Sup., 8782 (v).
—— Control of other Ry. Cos., Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1207 (i).
—— Subsidies *re* Main and Branch Lines, &c., M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 2298 (ii).
C.P.R. Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3067 (ii); 8820 (v).
—— Statement Read (Mr. Graham) 3206 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Number of Acres of Land: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
—— Par. in Newspapers *re* Obstructions: Remarks (Mr. MacNutt) 7187 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1198 (i).
N.B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 378
P.E.I. Railway: in Com. of Sup., 3063, 3102 (ii).
—— Branch thorugh New London, Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Warburton) 5500 (iii).
—— Murray Harbour Branch Survey: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7518 (v).
—— Royal Junction, Surveys, &c.; M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Borden) 3170 (ii).
—— West Shore Extension, Memorials, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Richards) 5501 (iii).
Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).
Quebec Bridge Co., Payments by Govt.; Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 628 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dep. Min., Apptmt. of, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2718 (ii).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 246 (i).
—— Statistical Officers: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
—— Statistics Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1729 (i).
Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4309, 4846 (iii).
Railway Commission, Apptmt. to Vacancy *re* Decease of Mr. Greenway: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 1022 (i)
—— Ques. (Mr. Roche) 131 (i).
Railway Commission, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
—— Maintenance of Board: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).
—— Supplies purchased for Ry. Commissions, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4518 (iii).
Railway Crossings, Application to Board *re* Protection, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 277 (i).
St. John River Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 122 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Operation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7292 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Train Rules Code, Approval of Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8834 (v).
—— Rules *re* Emp'oyment of Railway Men: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8586 (v).
Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1370 (i).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids; in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Rainy River Radial Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Rates of Cable Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 104 and 234.'
Rechabites, Order of: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Red Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7871, 8237 (v).
Red River Protection Channel: in Com. of Sup., 4266 (iii).
Reed, Ada Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Representation in H. of C. in Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Warburton) 644 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Rescue Station in Coal Mining District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 3935 (ii).
Residents in H. of C.: Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt, of Com.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) 376 (i).
Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
Restigouche River Bridge, Metapedia: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Retail Merchants' Association of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
Returns, Careless Arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4812, 5624 (iii); (Mr. Daniel) 924 (i); (Mr. Foster); 8580; (Mr. G. V. White) 8585 (v).
Reynolds, Conductor, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3209 (ii).
—— Tel. from Strathcona *re* Albert Medal Award: Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 4208 (iii).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Richibucto Cape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3428, 3438 (ii).
Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, Sale of: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 7592, 7650; Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7600, 7632 (v).
Rideau Hall Furniture: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 8742 (v).
Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
——— Removal of Squatters: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1368 (i).
Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
See 'Ross.'
Rifle Practices, Facilities *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).
Rifle Practices for Schools of Instruction at St. John's: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 8561 (v).
Rifle Ranges in Regina for N.W.M. Police: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8814 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere aux Vases Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputation *re* Claims of McLaren Co.: Ques. (Mr. Major) 1777 (i).
Riviere du Loup, Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
——— Crossing Protection: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1778 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Riviere du Loup and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii), 8810 (v).
Riviere du Loup Wharf Renewals: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1380 (i).
River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 114 (i).
Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Robinson's Crossing Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Robinson, Mrs., Pets. *re* Release from Imprisonment: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 924 (i).
Rock Island Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, Inquiry for Tracing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 170 (i).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
Rondeau Park Forest, Removal by Provl. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. McCoig) 6944 (iv).
Ross Rifles, Dates of Issue of Special Marks: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 154 (i).
——— Distribution of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Hughes) 338 (i).
Ross Rifle Marks I. and Marks II.**, Defects, Issue of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1532 (i).
——— Ques of Order *re* Answer of Minister (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).
——— Withdrawal by Minister, 1597 (i).
Ross Rifle Mark II.**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 273 (i).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
——— Number received, contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5499 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Regulations of National Rifle Ass'cn.: M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4519 (iii).
——— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 134 (i).
——— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn. *re* Bisley Meet: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4082 (iii).
——— Weight of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 8678 (v).
Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N.T. Ry. Commissioners: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Meighen) 643 (i).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que.: Ques. (Mr. Worthingon) 3491 (ii).
Royal Guardians: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Royal Military College Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
R.M.C. College Buildings, Change of Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 3169 (ii).
——— Cadets, Visit to Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 8584 (v).
——— Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 381 (i).
——— Servants' Cottages, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i), 5781 (iii).
Royal Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 557 (i)
Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
See 'Mint, &c.'
Royal Society Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Rules of the House: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1536. 1545 (i).
——— Special Committee *re*: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1299, 1441 (i).
——— Progress of Committee: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4307, 5893 (iii).
——— Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7527 (v).

Rules of the House, Rep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 8365 (v).
—— Report laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7867 (v).
Rural Free Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 630 (i).
—— Change in Design of Box: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1783 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, List of Routes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1380 (i).
—— Locks furnished Patrons: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
—— Method, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
—— Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 259 (i).
—— Routes, Stmnt. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
See 'Post Office.'
Rush-Bagot Treaty, Abrogation of *re* War Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5762 (iii). 7520 (v).
See 'U. S.,' 'Warships.'
Rustico Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
St. Andre de Kamouraska Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge and Approaches: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4263 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids, Construction *re*, Division of Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor)8239 (v).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
St. Andrews Rapids Locks, Tel. Read: in Com. of Sup., 8819 (v).
St. Andrews Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Ste. Anne des Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
St. Catharines Bay and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
St. Charles de Caplan Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4234 (iii).
St. Charles, Man., Post Office, Establishment of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Staples) 3682 (ii).
St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 129 (i).
—— Sale of to Private Individuals: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 625 (i).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
St. Clair River Sand, Lease by Ont. Govt. to Detroit Co.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5820 (iii).
Ste. Croix Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. Denis Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 110 (i).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
St. John Harbour, N. B., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii), 6106 (iv).
St. John Harbour Wharfs: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
St. John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 154 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 6394 (iv), 8118, 8580 (v).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Daniel) 8737 (v).
St. John River Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 122 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Operation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7292 (iv).
St. John Wharf Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3451 (ii).
St. Johns, Que., Govt. Lands used by Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3494 (ii)
—— Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
St. Joseph de Sorel Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3738 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com of Sup., 955 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Expenditure re: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1195 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 841 (i).
—— Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 841 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel at Kingston, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
—— —Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3168 (ii).
St. Lawrence, North Shore Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6153 (iv).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'

St. Lawrence Power Co., Compliance with Act of Incorp.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7869, 8107, 8659 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Application: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1529 (i).
——— Original Reps. of Engineers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 5617 (iii).
St. Leonard, N.B., and Van Buren, Me., International Bridge.: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 5931 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
St. Peters' Indian Reserve, Claims *re* Speculators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 129 (i).
——— Instruction sent to Agent *re* Surrender, M. for Copy* (Mr. Bradbury) 643 (i).
——— Instructions to Chief Justice Howell: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 2279, 2636 (ii).
——— Instructions to J. O. Lewis *re* Patents: M. for Papers* (Mr. Bradbury) 1380 (i).
——— Letter from Rainway *re* Details of Expenditure: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 1802 (i).
——— Letter of Mr. Ernest Raynor: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 1963 (ii).
——— Moneys paid *re* Surrender: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1022 (i).
——— Negotiations with Wm. Frank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7065 (iv).
——— Payments to E. Raynor: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7520 (v).
——— Reps. and Accounts of Geo. Tracey: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1976 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Williams: Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7009, neg. (Y. 57; N. 107) 7165, 7071 (iv).
——— Investigation by A. S. Williams, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Bradbury) 3494 (ii).
——— Rep. of A. S. Williams: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 5689, 5762 (iii).
——— Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 2296 (ii).
——— Treatment *re* Surrender of, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bradbury) 414 (i).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3936 (ii).
Ste. Thérèse Post Office Site, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 787 (i).
Sackville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).
Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1780 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Saguenay District, Booms, Tugs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers; Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Salaries of Civil Service: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 1022 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2798 (ii).
Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).
Salmon River Post Office, Vacancy *re* Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2929 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Saskatchewan, Provl. Subsidies Aggregate Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3167 (ii).
Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8110 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Accident, June, 1909, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 4315 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 837 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
——— Iron Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, &c., Applications *re* Subsidy, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 3833, 3945 (ii), 5278 (iii).
See 'Dry Docks.'
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Sauvé, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign: M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyer) 2032 (ii).
Savard, Lt. Col. 18th Regiment, Retention of Moneys from Capt. Talbot: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8658 (v).
——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Savings Banks Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Saw Pit Block and Span Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 432 (i).
School Lands Sales, Conditions, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5930 (iv).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 8518 (v).

School Slates and Lead Pencils, Number imported, Valuations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6506 (iv).

Scott, Col. B. A., defaulting payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8109 (v).
See 'Militia.'

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Rep. *re* to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 1444 (i).

Scott, Elmore Walker, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 165.'

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2290 (ii).

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2187 (ii).

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 106 (i).

Seal Cove, Grand Manan Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).

Seal Cove Life Boat, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2146 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2294 (ii).

Sec. of State, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 337 (i), 7767 (v).

Section 29, Twp. 9, Range 22, Applications *re* Right of Way: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Magrath) 643 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 16 and 55.'

Seeds and Seed Control Act: in Com. of Sup., 7389 (iv).

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 629 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price, Additional Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1002 (i).

——— to Homestead Holders, Quarter Section 24: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1195 (i).

Segregation: *See* 'Convicts.'

Sel. Standing Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 343 (i).

Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, Amt. to B.N.A. Act: Prop. Address to His Maj. (Mr. Lancaster) 1977; Neg. (Y. 23; N. 111) 2002 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rule *re* Consideration: (Mr. Speaker) 5776 (iii).

Senate Chamber, Redecorating: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).

Senate and H. of C. Residents: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3296 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.

Senate Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 7771 (v).

Senate Vacancies in N.S., Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 386 (i).

Senate Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. Ferguson: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1376 (i).

Serpentine River Navigation: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4304 (iii).

Sessional Employees, Number on 25th January last, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4514, 5001 (iii).

Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Mr. Speaker Blanchet: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).

Shawenegan Falls: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).

Shea, Bernard, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'

Shediac Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).

Shelburne Harbour Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).

Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).

Shigawake Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).

Shippigan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 444 (i).

——— Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5890 (iii).

Ships, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 15.'

Ships, Load Lines: *See* 'B. No. 10.'

Ships, Masters' Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Ships, Seizure of: *See* 'B. No. 138.'

Ships: *See* 'Vessels.'

Sibley Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).

Side Ladders for Box Cars, I. C. R.,: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).

Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 8527 (v).

Silver Ore, Theft of: *See* 'B. No. 85.'

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6506 (iv).

Sioux Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).

Skeena River Improvements, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).

Skill and King, Sale of Obscene Literature, Detention of Books: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7517 (v).

——— Letter of Attny. Gen. for Ont.: Read (Mr. Boyce) 8345 (v).

——— Par. in Can. Municipal Journal: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 7068 (iv).

——— Further Explanation: (Mr. Aylesworth) 7183 (iv).

Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Paysheets, &c.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

Slides and Booms—Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts *re* Spawn: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, Breakwater, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Sorel Yard Property Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Soulanges Canal, Purchase of Tool Grinders: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).
——— Slope Trimmings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).
Souris-Knight's Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Souris Life Saving Station, Ownership of Site: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7065 (iv).
Souris Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
S.A. Veteran's Association, Military Reserve: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2149 (ii).
S.A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. and Can.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1204 (i).
S.A. Patriotic Fund, Control of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
S.A. Veterans' Scrip, Amendment *re* Issue: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
——— Issue of to Relatives: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 8580 (v).
——— Locations in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1590 (i).
——— Number issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
——— Number of Warrants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 107 (i).
South African Volunteers, Bounty: *See* 'B. Nos. 87 and 163.'
S.A. Volunteers Bounties Act, Amt. *re* Surgeons: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3732 (ii).
S.A. War, Expenditure for Imp. Govt. by Canada: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 632 (i).
S.A. War, Aud. Gen.'s Messenger re-instatement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).
South Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Decription of Areas under Agreement with Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1686 (i).
South Ingonish Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Sovereign Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Spallumcheen River Bank Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Spanish Ship Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 1177 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).
Stanley Barracks, Purchase of Land *re*: Ques (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
Steamer for River St. Lawrence, Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
SS. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7976, 8477 (v).
——— Letter of Supt.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 8579 (v).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 231.'
Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolmie) 8677 (v).
Stewart Wharf, Portland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).
Stipendiary Magistrates in N. W. Ter.: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
Stone Industry Protection: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 7330 (iv).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
Strikes, Investigation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 23 and 198.'
Subsidies: *See* 'Bounties, &c.'
Subsidy to Can. Northern Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 227.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 226.'
Sub-Target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid *re* Public Works, Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Summerside Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Summerside Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Superior Court, Additional Judges in Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 332 (i).
See 'Judges,' &c.
Supply Bills: *See* 'Bills Nos. 173, 196 and 235'
SUPPLY—
Committee:
Adulteration of Food:
General Vote, 1345 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 7284 (iv).
Census and Statistics, 7373 (iv), 7763 (v).
Cold Storage for Food Products, 7362 (iv)

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—*Con.*
Cold Storage for Fruit, 7383 (iv).
Dairying Industry, 7362 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 7381 (iv).
Exhibitions, 5728 (iii), 7389 (iv).
Experimenal Farms, 5724 (iii), 7333, 7392 (iv), 7764 (v).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c., 7377 (iv).
Fumigation Stations, 7380 (iv).
Grant to Charlottetown Exhibition, 7766 (v).
Health of Animals, 7755 (v).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 7380 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, 7748 (v).
Patent Record, 7371 (iv).
Public Works Health Act, 7392 (iv)
Seed Control Act, 7389 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, 7380 (iv).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7391 (iv).
Charges of Management:
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 5607 (iii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 219 (i), 7764 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 7768 (v).
Customs, 243 (i).
Depts., Generally, 8811 (v).
External Affairs, 337 (i).
Finance, 335 (i).
Indian Affairs, 344, 414 (i)
Inland Revenue, 229 (i).
Interior, 7767, 8193 (v).
Justice, 253 (i).
Labour, 235 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 250 (i).
Militia, 7767 (v).
Mines, 336 (i).
Mounted Police, 415 (i).
Naval Service, 8514 (v).
Post Office, 5607 (iii), 6650, 6675 (iv).
Public Works, 333 (i).
Railways and Canals, 246 (i).
Secretary of State, 337 (i), 7767 (v).
Trade and Commerce, 415 (i), 8808 (v).
Customs:
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 1358 (i), 8803, 8807 (v).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 8488 (v)
Timber Protection, 8491 (v).
Water Power Investigations, 8496 (v)
Excise:
Extra Duty at Distilleries, 1331, 1333, 1336 (i).
L. A. Frechette, Translation, 1343 (i)
Methylated Spirits, 1344 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 1344 (i)
Salaries, &c., 1331 (i).
Stamps, 1342 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 1341 (i).
Weights and Measures:
Electric Power Export, 1356 (i)
Salaries, &c., 1354-5 (i).
Travelling Expenses, 1356 (i).
Fisheries:
B. C. Claim *re* Fish Licenses, 8552 (v).
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 8544 (v).
Cold Storage for Bait, &c., 8545 (v).
Dog Fish Works, 8545 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con*
Committee—*Con.*
Fisheries—*Con.*
Fish-breeding Establishments, 5750 (iii), 8540 (v).
Fresh Fish, Transportation, &c., 5747 (iii).
Intelligence Bureau, 8547 (v).
Legislation, &c., 8543 (v).
Licenses, 8547 (v).
Oyster Culture, 8545 (v).
Protection Service, 5752 (iii).
Provincial Rights, &c., 8546 (v).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 8536 (v)
Geological Survey:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 7769 (v).
Explorations, &c., 8555 (v).
General Expenses, 8556 (v).
Maps, &c., 8556 (v).
Mines Branch, Ore Deposits, 8553 (v).
Peat Bog at Alfred, 8553 (v).
Storage of Explosives, 8556 (v).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 8556 (v).
Govt. of Yukon Territory:
Depy. Administrator's Salary, 5615 (iii).
General Expenses, 8487 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 8195, 8494 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 5729 (iii), 8207 (v).
W. T. R. Preston, Rent, &c., 8213 (v)
Indians:
British Columbia, 7858 (v).
Indian Education, 7861 (v).
Man. and N. W. T., &c., 7848, 7858 (v)
New Brunswick, 7846 (v).
Nova Scotia, 7845 (v).
Ont. and Que., 7835 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 7846 (v).
Justice:
Salary to N. W. T. Magistrate, 8799 (v).
Supreme Court, 8798 (v).
Labour Dept.:
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 8799 (v).
Technical Education Commission, 8800 (v).
Legislation:
Indemnity to Absent Members, 7771 (v).
Library, 8801 (v).
Senate, 7771 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 8525 (v).
Ice Breaking, 8526 (v).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers, 8528 (v).
Pensions to Pilots, 8527 (v).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 8527 (v).
Signal Service, 8527 (v).
Wireless Stations, 8513 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
General Vote, 5690, 5711 (iii), 8808-8810, 8811 (v).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 8564 (v)
Engineers' Services, 8569 (v).
Grant to 65th Regt. Armoury, 8570 (v).
5th Regt. Armoury, 8570 (v).
Gratuities, 8571 (v).
Maintenance of Properties, 8571 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Monument at Stoney Creek, 8575 (v)
Ordnance, &c., 8556 (v).
Pay and Allowances, 8573 (v).
Salaries, &c., 8573 (v).
Topographical Survey, 8574 (v).
Minor Revenues:
General Vote, 1358 (i).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Handicrafts Guild, 7866 (v).
Conservation Commission, 7866 (v).
Naturalization Act, 7865 (v).
Royal Mint, 7866 (v).
Royal Society, Printing, &c., 7865 (v)
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8802 (v).
Rifle Range, Regina, 8802 (v).
Naval Service:
Construction, Maintenance, &c., 8495 (v).
Fisheries Protection Service, 8509 (v).
Hydrographic Surveys, 8511 (v).
Steamer to replace 'La Canadienne,' 8510 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Cattle Inspection, 8519 (v).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 8514 (v).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 8521 (v)
Rewards for Saving Life, 8515 (v).
Schools of Navigation, 8518 (v).
Tidal Service, 8512 (v).
Wrecking Plant, 8519 (v).
Post Office:
Additional Amount, 8818 (v).
Mail Service, 5752 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 7865 (v).
R. G. Mercer, Appmnt., 5755 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 7863 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Astronomical Observatory, 416, 536 (i).
Eastern Block, 571 (i).
New Buildings, 548 (i), 7166 (iv),
Royal Mint, 557 (i).
Testing Building, &c., 572 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 566 (i).
Harbours and Rivers:
Port Arthur, &c., Improvements, 5729 (iii); 6101 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, 6102 (iv).
Red River Improvements, 6103 (iv), 8819 (v).
St. John Harbour, 6106 (iv).
Tiffin Harbour, 5746 (iii); 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Harbour, 6122 (iv).
Victoria, Harbour, B.C., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., 5747 (iii); 6123 (iv).
Marine Department:
Permanent Piers, 8523 (v).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 8521 (v)
Dredging Plant, 8523 (v).
Sorel Property, 8523 (v).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia, 8190-91 (v)
Generally 596 (i); 8191 (v).
Manitoba, 8182-8185 (v).
New Brunswick, 580-596 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia, 573-579 (i).
Ontario, 597 (i); 7173-7181 (iv); 7495 8169-8181 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 580 (i).
Quebec, 661-704, 823-833, 926-975 (i); 8814 (v).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 8191-93 (v).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 5607 (iii); 8185-8189 (v).
Dredging:
British Columbia, 6138, 6141 (iv).
Manitoba, 6137 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 4780, 5608, 5716 (iii).
New Plant, 4738, 4755-4780 (iii).
Ont. and Que., 4809 (iii), 6124 (iv).
Repairs, 4731, 5716 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia, 4276-4305, 4715-4730, 5608 (iii).
Generally, 4731 (iii).
Manitoba, 4254-4272 (iii).
Maritime Provinces, 3452 (ii).
New Brunswick, 2697-2710, 3391-3430, 3438-3452 (iii).
Northwest Territories, 4276 (iii).
Nova Scotia, 976-1001, 1158-1192 (i); 8816, (v).
Ontario, 3455-3475, 3833-3862 (ii), 5608 (iii), 8818 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 2693-2697 (ii).
Quebec, 3862-3872, 3875-3914 (ii), 4210-4254 (iii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 4272-4276 (iii).
Yukon Territory, 4730 (iii).
Miscellaneous:
Compensation, S. J. Dale, 6167 (iv).
Deep Waterways Commission, 6163 (iv).
Lake Nipissing Dams, 6164 (iv).
Memorial *re* Telephone at Brantford, 6161 (iv).
Sir Leonard Tilley, 6161 (iv).
Monument, Late Hon. Geo. Brown, 6158 (iv).
Late Sir L. H. Lafontaine and R. Baldwin, 6160 (iv).
Late D'Arcy McGee, 6159 (iv).
National Art Gallery, 6158 (iv).
Richelieu River Survey, 5720 (iii).
River St. John International Commission, 6163 (iv).
Salaries, Engineers' Branch, &c., 5720 (iii), 6163 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 5719 (iii).
Upper Ottawa, Storage Dams, 6162 (iv).
Roads and Bridges:
Chapeau Bridge, 6150 (iv).
Courtenay Bay, Aboiteau, 6150 (iv).
Dom. Bridges, Generally, 6152 (iv).
International Bridge, St. Leonard, N.B., 6151 (iv).
Interprovincial Bridge, Hawkesbury, 6151 (iv).
Interprovincial Bridge, Metapedia, 6152 (iv).
Ottawa City Bridges, 6152 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Slides and Booms:
St. Maurice District, 6149 (iv).
Saguenay District, 6149 (iv).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 5614 (iii), 6156-58 (iv).
Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 6153 (iv).
Moosejaw-Wood Mountain, &c., 6154 (iv).
Sask and Alta., 5614 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Quarantine:
Steamers, 7392 (iv), 7766 (v).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Chambly, 3122 (ii).
Cornwall, 3123 (ii).
Galops, 3124 (ii).
Lachine, 3103 (ii).
Quebec Canals, 3122, 3123 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 3106, 3124 (ii), 5616 (iii).
Soulanges, 3105 (ii).
Statistical Officers, 3131 (ii).
Trent, 3106, 3126 (ii).
Welland, 3120 (ii), 8821 (v).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 3127 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Car, 3127 (ii).
Polytechnic School, Montreal, 8822 (v).
Railway Commission, 3127 (ii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Railway, 3067 (ii), 8819 (v).
Intercolonial Railway, 2872-2887, 2933-2949, 3091 (ii).
National Transcontinental Railway, 3065 (ii), 5229, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3063-3065, 3102 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, 3070 (ii), 8821 (v).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 8810 (v).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 5714 (iii), 8810 (v).
Old Age Pension Fund, 8811 (v).
Salaries, &c., 5713 (iii).
Concurrence:
Trent Canal, Construction, 5602 (iii).

Supplies purchased for Ry. Commissions, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4518 (iii).

Supreme Court, Purchase of Law Books: in Com. of Sup., 8798 (v).

Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).

Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 272 (i).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).

Suzerainty to England, Report of Prime Minister at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2289 (ii).

See 'Privilege.'

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).

Swim's Point, Approach to Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

Swine Commission, Report of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).

——— Report, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5782 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Broder) 5689 (iii).

Sydenham River: *See* 'Martin Island.'

Sydney Free Mail Delivery: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 1022 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1014 (i).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Sydney Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

Tadousac Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).

Talbot, Capt. Réné, Payment *re* Allowances for 1907: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).

Tariff Changes Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 233.'

Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1020 (i).

Tariff with U.S., Importations, &c.: Inquiry for (R. L. Borden) 6100 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5891 (iii).

——— Intermediate Tariff: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 5892 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5759 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S.: M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Fielding) 5942; Resolutions laid on Table, 5967 (iv).

——— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5278 (iii), 6100 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5690 (iii).

——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5762 (iii), 5932 (iv).

Technical Education: in Com. of Sup., 8800 (v).

——— Commission *re* Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1023; Amt. (Mr. King) to adjn. Debate, 1076; agreed to (Y. 78; N. 56) 1098 (i).

——— Replies from Provl. Premiers: Read (Mr. King) 3160 (ii).

——— Postponement of Debate, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3208 (ii).

——— Letters of Premiers: Read (Mr. King) on M. for Sup., 2661 (ii).

Telegraphs, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 104, 105 and 234.'
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii), 6156 (iv).
Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
Telegraph Lines, North Shore, St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 6153 (iv).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Telephones, &c.: *See* 'B. Nos. 104, 145.'
Telephone Memorial at Brantford, Contribution: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1, 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (v).
—— since beginning of present Session, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i). *See* 'Finance.'
Tenecape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Tents, Militia, Average Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i). *See* 'Militia.'
'The Wharfs' Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Thornbury Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Thornton, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 626 (i).
Three-Fathom Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (iii).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup.. 8512 (v).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv).
Tignish Protection Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Tilley, Sir Leonard, Memorial at St. John, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Tobacco, Canadian, Encouragement of: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 1342 (i).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3495 (ii). *See* 'Boat,' &c.
Toney River Channel Protection: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1530 (i).
Topographical Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8574 (v).
Toronto Barracks, Disposal of Site on Humber River: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3167 (ii).
Toronto Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Toronto and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Toronto Harbour, Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
—— Extension, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2929 (ii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii)
—— Payments to John E. Russell: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3735 (ii).
Toronto Sub-Post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Toronto 'World,' Ownership by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5998 (iv).
Tourists' Post Offices, Number temporarily established, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 170 (i)
Tracadie and D'Arcy Island Quarantine Lazarettos: in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv.)
Tracadie Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
Trachoma in Regina Schools: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 3390 (ii).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 621 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i), 8808 (v).
—— Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Trade Commissioners, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Trade Negotiations with U. S., Par. in New York 'Sun': Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6393 (iv).
Trade Relations: *See* 'U. S. Trade,' 'Tariff.'
Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 5278 (iii). *See* 'Germany.'
Train Rules Code, Approval of Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8834 (v).
Traynor's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Treaties with U. S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 268 (i).
Tremblay, Mr. J., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 384 (i).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
—— Damage to Property: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).
—— Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 446 (i).

Trent Canal, Floods in Twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3733 (ii).
—— Floods, Charges against L. F. Clarry: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4714, 5209 (iii), 6096 (iv).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3126 (ii).
Trent Canal, Newmarket: M. (Mr. Campbell) to reduce vote, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).
—— Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
—— Water Powers, Control by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 2185 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
Troy, Inverness, N. S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7288 (iv).
Trusts, Investigation of: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Trust and Loan Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1380 (i).
Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (iv).
—— Tree Planting, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5932, 6181 (iv).
Tusket Wedge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i)
Union Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
U. S. Canals: *See* 'New York State.'
U. S. Emigration from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 431 (i).
U. S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6942 (iv).
U. S. Minimum Tariff, Decision *re* Canadian Exports: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3058 (ii).
—— Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2153, 3480 (ii).
U. S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4712 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'
U. S., Trade Relations with, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8742 (v).
U. S. Training Vessels in Great Lakes, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 132 (i).
—— Passage through Canals, Deptl. Consultations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 108 (i).
—— M. for O. C.'s (Mr. Edwards) 135 (i).
—— Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 103 (i).
See 'War Vessels,' &c.
U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes: M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 791 (i).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Washabuck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 8185 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
Vancouver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Vaudreuil Cove Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Veilleue, Charles, Payments to: Ques. (Mr Girard) 8836 (v).
Ventilation of House of Commons: in Com of Sup., 8170 (v).
Vessels, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Vessels, Reporting of to Customs: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Veteran Land Grants, Number taken Up, Assignments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 447 (i).
See 'S. A. Veterans.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2188 (ii).
Veterinary Service, B. C., Vacancies, Examinations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 132 (i).
Victoria Harbour, B.C., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii), 6123 (iv).
Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1369 (i).
Victoria Immigration Building, Number of Inmates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Victoria Jubilee Bridge Highway, Emigrants' Burying Ground, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 5889 (iii).
Victoria Museum Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duties collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3931 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 87 and 163.'
Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 629 (1).
Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 5890 (iii).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'

Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1373 (i).
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Walton, Mr. George, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3734 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5501 (iii).
War Ships on Great Lakes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8737 (v).
See 'Rush-Bagot,' 'U. S.,' &c.
War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2713 (ii).
—— O. C.'s *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
War Vessels on Great Lakes, Rep. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1367 (i).
See 'Rush-Bagot.'
Warwick, Thos. G., Payment *re* Value of Improvements on Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Water Powers in B. C. Ry. Belt: *See* 'B. No. 187.'
Water Powers, Conservation of: *See* B. Nos. 84, 115, 119, 143, 150 and 185.'
Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 130 (i).
Waterways Commitee, Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 3390 (ii).
Waterways International Commission Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 209 (i).
Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2713 (ii), 4403 (iii).
Waterways Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3481 ii), 6100 (iv).
—— Treaty and Georgian Bay Canal, Privs. of U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3159 (ii).
Waterways Treaty, Papers laid on Table, 5932 (iv).
—— Printing of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7187 (iv).
—— on Order for Cor.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1536 (i).
—— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).
Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 843 (i).
Watson, R. J. Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 2488 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Fisher) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).
Ways and Means, Procedure *re* Supply Bill: M. (Mr. Fielding) 6397 (iv).
—— U.S. Tariff Negotiations, M. for Com., 5942 (iv).
See 'U. S. Trade Relations.'
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hedomadaire,' French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3482 (ii).
Weighing of Cargoes: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Weights and Measures Inspection, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1968 (ii).
—— Land Purchases, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).
—— Route through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 8660 (v).
—— Surveys *re* New Canal: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).
See 'Canals.'
West Advocate Wharf: in Com. of Sup.,1179 (i).
West Baccaro Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
West Dublin Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
Western Canada Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Western Grain Trade: *See* 'Grain,' &c.
Westminster District, Land leased to B.C. Mills, Timber and Trading Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Westport Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Weyburn Security Bank: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Weymouth Port Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).
Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 260 (i).
Wharfs transferred from P.W. Dept. to Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
Wharfs transferred to P.W. Depts., Revenue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5777 (iii).
'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. *re* Printing: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1778 (i), 2428 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 3494 (ii).

Whitby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).
Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3486 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8179 (v).
Whitford, Mr. James, Issue of Scrip, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6935 (iv).
Wiarton Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
'William Joliffe,' Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Williamshead Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Williamsville Post Office, Revenue, Pets. *re* Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7287 (iv).
Winding-up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1370 (i).
Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2930, 3168 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6394 (iv), 8118 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 8364 (v).
Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1777 (i).
Winnipeg Beach, Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (iii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7289 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (v).
Winnipeg Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Winnipeg Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
—— Closing on Sundays: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 3134 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Answer, 3484, 3672 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Winnipeg Wharfs, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).
Wire Fencing, I. C. R., Tenders for 1909, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1974 (ii).
Wireless Stations in Canada, 7395 (v).
—— Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).
Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 3135 (ii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Wolfe's Island Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 6164 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel Purposes in Twp. 50, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4079 (iii).
See 'Hay.'
Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1376 (i).
Woollen Industry, Reps. of Mr. Costello and W. G. Clarke: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
—— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Wrecking Plant for B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
Wrecking Plant on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts: M. for Cor. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 644 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 444 (i).
Yakoun River Obstruction, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Yamaska and Richelieu Rivers, Surveys *re* Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5720, 5724 (iii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Year Book, Amount of Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1020 (i).
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).
Yukon Govt., Administration: in Com. of Sup., 5615 (iii), 8487 (v).
Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of Duty, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3492 (ii).
Zinc Ores, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 182.'